GB Meeting Notes

Lesson 3: Annual Funding Round

6/5/24

[Recording](https://youtu.be/Hht4TZ_Rrd4)

Presentation: [CoC Annual Funding Round](https://www.canva.com/design/DAGFmu77IoI/8TCkVeHZP39QXgUIGztTaA/edit?utm_content=DAGFmu77IoI&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link2&utm_source=sharebutton)

Discussion prompt: What program models and categories of eligibility do you think are most in need of more resources locally?

* Sol: Newcomers to LI who are seeking immigration status are facing difficulties getting housed. There are executive orders against them getting status or being housed in the community.
* Greta: Housing that appears to be most effective is PSH. RRH ideally would ideally be able to turn around more households, as the program ends every 2 years whereas in PSH people may stay there for long periods of time. Unfortunately, due to the high cost of living on LI, it has been difficult for anyone to pay full market rate without a subsidy. Most households in RRH are not able to afford the full amount after 2 years. If there is nothing for those households to transition into, they are at high risk of becoming homeless again. If there could be partnership with PHAs to provide vouchers after the program, that would be something different.
* Alison: Rents are ridiculous. ToB is in a shortfall, so we cannot give out any new vouchers and assist until the shortfall in funds is dealt with. HUD recognizes it. This leads to a negative outlook on RRH for the region.
* Samantha: As someone who has sought housing with a family, it is hard with children to find housing. People will hang up on you when they find out you have kids. Regardless of other populations you may identify with, having vulnerable people that are helpless without you will always complicate things. In terms of housing affordability, housing cooperatives might help keep the rent low – these might be able to be used with program models like RRH. Logistics would be more challenging.
	+ Example partner with cooperative community to have units be PSH set aside, providing guaranteed rent. Often cooperatives get subsides from land trusts, so there would have to be buy in from other entities. For RRH, could help support people with end to subsidy.
		- Challenge for RRH in stationary location, because people must be able to choose their location.
* Sol: Is there challenge getting people into PSH? What percentage of people can be served? What is realistic in terms of placing people in permanent housing? Housing laws and zoning makes this difficult.
	+ Greta: Having a program own a property helps keep rent reasonable, but it costs a lot up front and can only serve a small number of people at a time. A lot of programs are rental programs, which provide assistance to households to pay their rent. The initial grant amount requested is the fair market rent (FMR) at the time the application goes in. If the agency is renting the unit, they pay the full amount of the rent and the participant pays their portion to the program. In rental assistance programs, the lease is in the participant’s name and they are paying their portion, and the program pays the rest. You could serve more households with rental assistance than with a capital project. The problem is when the rents are high, as they are on LI, they are above FMR and the program has to come up with the difference between the amount requested in the grant and the actual rent cost. There may be a small amount they can go over FMR using rent reasonableness, but usually it does not cover the full cost.
* Mike: In discussions about program model, we not need to decide strictly one or another. People have different needs and preferences, and different program models may be better for some people than others. Currently, we have several PSH and RRH and piloting some TH-RRH models. There is a need for all program models. There are many more households than we will ever be able to serve. There is a shortfall in RRH, due to the high rent costs they cannot serve as many households as projected because units cannot be identified at a reasonable cost. So unlike PSH, there are dollars that are not able to be used to the extent to which they are funded.

Discussion & Questions following presentation

* Is there a timeline for the funding round next steps?
* What would be most helpful for new people to be kept up to speed?
	+ [CoC website](https://www.lihomeless.org/coc-nofo) has local application, priority listing, scorecards, and NOFO.
	+ The scorecard considers how programs meet local needs. Reviewing the scorecard and the priority listing can be helpful.
	+ CoC planning staff will be thoroughly reviewing the 2024 NOFO and bring a summary to the GB.
	+ Annual reports can be sent, but they are probably not that helpful.
* Review of last year’s scorecard (used by Ranking Committee to review projects)
	+ Criteria may have a benchmark, where above the benchmark you receive points up to all available, and below the benchmark you lose points.
	+ Raw data is available, as well as the scores on different tabs.
	+ The system administrator can run reports on data quality and completeness in HMIS.
	+ Regional gaps do not have a benchmark, but programs earn points dependent on the program model. Points are split if they have different types of beds fitting into different categories.
	+ Scores are at the bottom for all categories and divided by total possible points they could have earned to get a percentage.
	+ All scores are ranked in order based on percentage score.
	+ What is the criteria being used to determine how well the program did that year?
		- The scores are a ranking. There is no “pass” or “fail” and no threshold below which a program would not be funded.
		- There is a lot of variation. 22% of the score last year was based on a regional gap. If it is a low need program (relatively) they will not get the points. For example, programs that only serve veterans or HIV/AIDS would get 0 points because they do not serve an existing need (there is already more housing of these types than needed).
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