

**Idaho Homeless Coordinating Committee
Special Meeting
Minutes with Attachments
August 31, 2017**

VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairperson: Brady Ellis
Region 1: not present
Region 2: Steve Bonnar, Sojourners' Alliance
Region 3: Nancy Tuttle, Salvation Army
Region 4: Misty McEwen
Region 5: BJ Stensland
Region 6: Bill Campbell, CLUB
Boise City/Ada Co CoC: Maureen Brewer
ID Dept. of Labor: Rico Barrera
ID Dept. of H&W: Alacia Handy
US Dept of VA: Anna Johnson-Whitehead
ID Dept of Education: not present
ID Dept of Corrections: not present
ID Dept of Commerce: not present

OTHER PARTICIPATING ATTENDEES

Sheri Cook, IHFA
Cindy Montoto, IHFA
Dana Wiemiller, IHFA

IHCC MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Brady Ellis at 10:05 am

GREETING AND ROLL CALL

Brady greeted the attendees and Cindy Montoto called roll into the record. The board had a quorum.

PURPOSE OF SPECIAL MEETING

The Board was scheduled to hold a meeting on August 23, 2017 to discuss the action plan of the Coordinated Entry Operating Procedure Manual. A quorum was not present to allow an official meeting to be conducted. However, the participating members remained on the call to review and discuss the plan of action (see Attachment B). IHFA was tasked with revising and distributing the plan of action and to schedule an official board meeting to vote on the plan.

Additionally, the Board will review and vote on the Continuum's project priority listing. This ranking is a component of the application for this year's CoC competition. IHFA staff has received and scored applications according to the process established by The IHCC Written Standards and HUD's CoC competition requirements and priorities.

COORDINATED ENTRY PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Steve Bonnar addressed that he would like to have it acknowledged on the record that the board will revisit changing the quorum requirements in reference to the Board's recent lack of a quorum. Brady stated that this will be discussed in more in depth and possibly voted on during the October on-site meeting.

Steve moved to accept the recommended plan of action of the Coordinated Entry Operating Procedure Manual as written in the memo titled "Coordinated Entry Planning & Implementation" dated August 29, 2017 (see Attachment A). Nancy Tuttle seconded and the motion was approved unanimously by the Board with no further discussion.

2017 COC PROJECT RANKING

IHFA sent out a memo (see Attachment C) and three possible rating/ranking options (see Attachment D) to the Board. Steve asked about the difference in total possible points for projects. Sheri explained that 450 was the total possible points for a renewal application, 437 points was the total possible points for new project applications, and 195 was the total possible points for projects that had not completed a full project year and were new during the previous year.

IHFA recommended Option A to the Board for approval. Rico Barrera moved to proceed with Option A as recommended by IHFA staff. BJ Stensland seconded and the Motion was unanimously approved by the Board with no further discussion or opposition.

GENERAL UPDATES

The IHCC Semi-Annual On site meeting dates are October 26-27th, 2017 in Boise.

There will be a listening session conference call held on September 20th at 3:00pm MST. The intent for this listening session is to give the opportunity to providers and members of the board to offer suggestions or express frustrations to help IHFA better provide additional support, help, or training to providers.

IHFA was recently allocated an additional funding award of around \$500,000 in ESG funding from HUD. Of those funds, around \$200,000 must be allocated to the Boise City/Ada County CoC leaving around \$300,000 to the Balance of State Continuum.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

ATTACHMENT A

Idaho Homelessness Coordinating Committee

TO: IHCC BOARD MEMBERS
FROM: BRADY ELLIS
VICE PRESIDENT, HOUSING SUPPORT PROGRAMS

DANA WIEMILLER
COORDINATED ENTRY SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR
SUBJECT: COORDINATED ENTRY PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION
DATE: AUGUST 29, 2017
CC: IHCC COORDINATED ENTRY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Overview

Comments and concerns recently raised by Board and Committee members regarding the implementation of a Coordinated Entry System (CES) for the Idaho Balance of State Continuum of Care (CoC) have provided an opportunity to revisit the planning process and the roles and responsibilities of the IHCC Board, Coordinated Entry Committee members, and IHFA staff. These concerns have been expressed in various communication methods, including letter, email, and IHCC conference calls. IHFA staff responded via memo (with attachments) on August 11, 2017. Upon request from several Board members, a conference call was scheduled to discuss the elements of IHFA's proposed plan of action intended to address the concerns expressed. The conference call was held on August 23, 2017 and the discussion held led to this revised action plan proposal.

This correspondence is presenting a revised plan of action to the Board for review prior to and during the special meeting scheduled for August 31, 2017. The meeting will be conducted via conference call. The purpose of the special meeting is for the Board to review and approve an acceptable course of action for the CE Committee to address the CE concerns identified, and to further clarify and establish appropriate operational practices, roles, and authorities of various groups or parties within the Idaho Balance of State CoC.

Background

The Board was scheduled to hold a meeting on August 23, 2017 to discuss the action plan outlined in the abovementioned memo (dated August 11th). A quorum was not present to allow an official meeting to be conducted. Nonetheless, the participating members remained on the call to review the plan of action jointly in an unofficial discussion. Each bullet of the action plan was reviewed and commented on. IHFA was tasked with revising the plan of action, distributing a copy of the revised plan, and scheduling a Board meeting to vote on the plan.

A memo issued to IHCC Board members by IHFA on August 11, 2017 with the subject of 'Coordinated Entry Planning and Implementation' should be referenced for additional background on this matter.

Revised Proposed Plan of Action

In order to proceed with CES planning and implementation in a manner that is productive, timely, and encourages immediate feedback and input from Board and Committee members, IHFA is proposing the following plan of action:

- Despite approval of a prior version of the Written Standards which included a CES policy section, refer the Coordinated Entry Operating Procedures manual back to the CE Committee. The committee will be responsible for supporting further development of outstanding procedural items, where needed; review IHCC member concerns and update the manual accordingly; and present the Board with a final proposed manual with the backing of Committee members.

- Development of outstanding procedural items will include those created since the August 2016 draft of the IHCC Written Standards.
- Establish a Coordinated Entry Committee meeting schedule to include two meetings each month through full CES implementation.
- Acknowledge committee meeting provisions established in the IHCC Operating Guidelines which state... “A simple majority of member entities present is sufficient to conduct committee business.”
- Committee chairs, or designated party, will provide Committee members with a meeting agenda and all related materials at least three days in advance of a scheduled meeting and will draw attention to high priority review and action items included on the agenda.
- Agenda action items will be considered complete upon agreement of a majority of present committee members, unless the Board requests further action by the Committee. Committee members who are unavailable for Committee voting may identify an alternate/proxy representative in writing in advance of the meeting. It is the responsibility of the absent Committee member to make the alternate representative aware of past and current Committee activities and governance.
- Committee proposals should be advanced to the Board upon agreement of the majority of Committee members participating in the vote. The necessity of Board approval shall be determined by the type of work being developed. Policy level decisions will require board approval. Procedural and process decisions may be made by the administrative agency based on the input of Committees and other stakeholders; however, the Board maintains the ability to request the submission of operating procedures and processes for review and comment. The Board may request updates, overviews, or status reports from an administrative agency. The Board may also institute monitoring or other reporting activities meant to evaluate a procedures adherence to policy or impact on system wide goals and priorities. Policy will be defined as a guiding principle or framework used to set direction for the system or particular goals and functions of the system. Procedure will be defined as the manner by which the system will operate administratively within the established policy, including steps, processes, policy controls or monitoring, and process improvements, among other elements.
- As the *Coordinated Entry Operating Procedures* manual is referred back to the CE Committee for further review and development, the Collaborative Applicant is allowed to use the current version for purposes of completing the CoC’s FY2017 CoC general application. Narrative responses in the application will refer to the manual as developmental, not finalized, and in place to guide the piloting of coordinated entry in one region of the CoC.
- Recommendations pertaining to CoC governance, and not CE specific, listed herein that are approved by the Board will be adopted into the CoC’s Operating Guidelines and applicable to all future Board and Committee activities.

Next Steps

The plan of action proposed herein is offered as a framework for moving forward with CES implementation. Each Board member should be prepared to participate in the special meeting scheduled for August 31, 2017 at 10 am MST.

It is IHFA’s desire to fulfill its responsibilities as the administrator of the CoC and its governing body in a manner that is consistent with HUD goals, strategies, priorities, regulations, initiatives, and deadlines. We look forward to continuing our collaboration to identify, fund, and support efforts to prevent and end homelessness in Idaho.

ATTACHMENT B

Coordinated Entry Operating Procedures Board Comments & Responses

#	Question/Comment	Submitted By	Response
1	Document exhibits were not initially made available for review and some exhibits were not included	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	As referenced in a 7/27/17 email, most of the exhibits are charts, forms, and procedural documents. The Board had agreed to a policy review of the Operating Procedures, so the exhibits were not initially included in the correspondence to the Board. Some exhibits have not been completed and were unavailable for review and comment. Exhibit 8, the Procedures for Decentralized Access Points, is still in development. Generally, this document clarifies the
2	VI-SPDAT - concerned about compliance with fair housing laws, exposure to and risk of litigation	BJ Stensland/Aid for Friends	Several concerns have been expressed regarding the use of the VI-SPDAT. IHFA has been attempting to address fair housing concerns through a number of activities, including consultation with legal counsel; discussions with HUD; clarifications with OrgCode, developer of the VI-SPDAT; and inquiries with Intermountain Fair Housing. Responses and a resolution to fair housing questions and concerns are pending. Concerns about the intensity and invasiveness of the questions will be further discussed with the CE Committee for resolution. Information from OrdCode on the development and testing of v2.0 of the VI-SPDAT can be found at: http://www.nceh.org/media/files/page/359d0ab6/VI-SPDAT_v2_Background.pdf <i>Note: The VI-SPDAT was one of several prioritization/assessment tools reviewed and discussed by the CE Committee in a December 2015 workshop with a HUD technical assistance consultant. Through additional committee discussion, the CE Committee came to a consensus agreement in April 2016 to use the VI-SPDAT as the prioritization tool in the coordinated entry assessment process. Use of the VI-SPDAT was referenced in Section 5, Item 3B of the Written Standards approved by the IHCC Board on August 29, 2016.</i>
3	VI-SPDAT - intensity and invasiveness of questions	BJ Stensland/Aid for Friends Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	
4	VI-SPDAT - reliability and validity of Version 2	BJ Stensland/Aid for Friends	
5	VI-SPDAT - fair housing concerns may force agencies to forego HUD funding.	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	
6	Is the use of the Coordinated Assessment of Barriers to Housing an option for an alternative assessment tool?	BJ Stensland/Aid for Friends	The Coordinated Assessment of Barriers to Housing was not originally evaluated for use in the coordinated entry assessment process by the CE Committee in December 2015. This assessment was developed locally and has not been tested for reliability or validity.

7	Provision that all HUD-funded providers in a region will assume responsibilities of an access point if an agency is not established as the access point. (p17)	BJ Stensland/Aid for Friends Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	<p>CoCs must utilize a standardized assessment tool in accordance with 24 CFR 578.3 According to HUD Coordinated Entry Notice: Section 11.b.2.a - <i>A CoC must consistently apply one or more standardized assessment tool(s), applying a consistent process throughout the CoC in order to achieve fair, equitable, and equal access to services within the community.</i></p> <p>In the absence of an access point within a region, all HUD-funded homelessness service providers would need to utilize the CoC's adopted assessment process and tools. Due to the limited number of HUD-funded homelessness service providers in each region and the difficulty experienced to date in securing access points, this provision was included to ensure all regions within the CoC are able to maintain compliance with the HUD requirement for a consistent, standardized assessment process.</p>
8	Why is transitional housing included in the document when this type of housing is no longer funded by HUD?	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	Participation in a coordinated entry system is not limited to HUD-funded homelessness service providers. Agencies operating transitional housing with other funding sources may wish to participate in a region's coordinated entry system and, therefore, agree to receive housing referrals. As such, transitional housing is included as a housing option in the Operating Procedures and related charts and forms.
9	The CE Committee does not have the right to vote for an access point.	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	The CE Committee can further discuss this item to clarify its role in confirming access point agencies and/or revisions can be made to the Operating Procedures to further clarify the process of confirming access point agencies.

10	What are the consequences of not implementing coordinated entry by the January 2018 deadline?	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	<p>The specific consequences of non-compliance are unknown; however, it is highly likely that non-compliance could have a significant financial impact on the 2018 CoC application. Coordination and Engagement questions represent 22% of the total CoC application score - points which would be at risk without coordinated entry compliance. The loss of these points would very likely result in the CoC application falling below the threshold for Tier 2 funding. Falling below the threshold would also eliminate the opportunity for bonus funding.</p> <p>In addition, CoC project applications could be at risk for a loss of points and potential funding reductions.</p>
11	Who has responsibility for gathering feedback from survey's, focus groups, etc. and ongoing planning and stakeholder consultation?	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	As the collaborative applicant, IHFA will be responsible for administering the coordinated entry system, including ongoing outreach and evaluation. Specifically, the Coordinated Entry System Administrator will be responsible for administering these activities in collaboration with access points and regional stakeholders.
12	What are the safety planning protocols referenced on page three?	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	Safety planning protocols refer to operating procedures that ensure safe and confidential access to the coordinated entry process. Specifically, some of these procedures include immediate referral of victims to DV providers by access points, having DV victims assessed by DV providers, and nondisclosure of assessment details to access points for DV victims.
13	Should add language referring to Supportive Services for Veteran Families providers in addition to the VA for veterans resources (p17)	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	Thank you for recommending this addition. The Operating Procedures will be revised to include this resource.
14	Will access sites need to use CMIS for data collected from DV clients or use a different data and tracking system?	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	Access sites, or other non-DV service providers, are not required to use CMIS for client data collection and tracking. It is anticipated that DV clients will be included in the prioritization queue utilizing their assessment score without any identifying information made available to the access point or non-DV service provider. HMIS may be used for DV clients; however, only with a DV client's written consent.
15	Who's responsible for creating and making available marketing and outreach materials?	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	IHFA will create and produce coordinated entry marketing and outreach materials. IHFA will seek the assistance of access points and/or other stakeholder agencies in the region for local distribution and inventory control.

16	Real-time data entry - what are the access point's responsibilities? Do they call providers every day to take inventory? What is inventory based on?	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	<p>Access points are not required to conduct real-time data entry. According to current CoC HMIS policies and procedures, agencies must adhere to weekly data entry.</p> <p>As referenced on p. 31 of the Operating Procedures, participating projects are to notify the access point of a current or impending unit availability. Access points are not responsible for contacting providers to determine daily unit availability.</p> <p>What is inventory based on? Not clear on the question and cannot provide a response.</p>
17	Exhibit 3 - Chart implies committees are accountable to the CoC rather than the IHCC	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	The chart in Exhibit 3 includes the IHCC as the governing board of the CoC. The chart can be revised to place the IHCC between the CoC and the committees.
18	Exhibit 4 - Why are IHCC Committees included under CES on the CES Organizational Structure?	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	The chart in Exhibit 4 illustrates the relationship of the Coordinated Entry System (CES) to the various entities that have a role in the support and administration of the "system." The system must adhere to policy direction established by the IHCC, while the IHCC committees, IHFA and other agencies engage in the support and administration of the system.
19	Exhibit 8 - the Procedures for Decentralized Access Points document was not available for review	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	As mentioned above in response to Item 1, the procedures for decentralized access points are in development. The provision in the Operating Procedures referencing Exhibit 8 was included in the document just prior to submission to the Board for review. As referenced in Item 1, Exhibit 8 outlines procedures only in those process areas that are different when there are multiple access points under a decentralized system instead of a single point of entry through one agency serving as an access point.
20	Exhibit 9 - Same information as the Assessment to Housing Barriers. Why not use the previous tool?	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	<p>Refer to the response to Item 6 above.</p> <p>In addition, the Coordinated Entry assessment process is phased, as recommended in HUD's <i>Coordinated Entry Policy Brief</i>. Exhibit 9, Pre-Screening Questions, includes very basic questions as part of the first phase of identifying a household's immediate needs. The next steps in the assessment process build upon each other using additional assessment and prioritization tools.</p>
21	Exhibit 9 - Are youth age 18 referred back to foster care if they have aged out of the system?	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	No. Youth who have aged out of the foster care system will not be referred to foster care. Transition-aged youth (18-24) will be referred to agencies specializing in youth services if such agencies are available within the region.

22	Exhibit 10 - Client Privacy Notice indicates data will be entered into HMIS which causes fair housing concerns.	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	CES policy currently restricts the sharing of assessment responses so that only access point agencies are able to view client assessment data. IHFA can consult with Intermountain Fair Housing and the Boise CoC on information recording and sharing. This can be further reviewed and investigated by the Committee if need be.
23	Exhibit 10 - Client Privacy Notice indicates "some" data will be entered into HMIS. Not sure which data will be entered without Exhibit 18, Coordinated Entry HMIS Work Flow	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	Exhibit 18, Coordinated Entry HMIS Work Flow, is still in development. Feedback received through a pilot program in Region 1 will be used to inform the HMIS data entry process and the final draft of the HMIS work flow. As a procedural document, the HMIS Work Flow may be updated and revised as necessary to maintain operational efficiency.
24	Exhibit 11 - Questions 15-18 are exit questions? Need instructions to indicate	Misty McEwan/South Central Community	Refer to the response for Item 23 above.
25	Exhibit 11 - The Screening Assessment	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	Refer to the response for Item 20 above.
26	Exhibit 12 - the threshold score of 20 out of 24 points for the Homelessness Prevention Assessment is high and may	Misty McEwan/South Central Community Action Partnership	This item can be referred back to the CE Committee for further discussion.
27	Exhibit 14 - Why is transitional housing referenced in the Housing Assessment?	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	Refer to the response for Item 8 above.
28	Exhibit 15 - Why is transitional housing referenced in the Housing Intervention Summary?	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	Refer to the response for Item 8 above.
29	Exhibit 16 - Letter is included as a sample and is not complete.	Steve Bonnar/Sojourner's Alliance	The Queue Removal Letter included as Exhibit 16 is intended to be a representative example of text that could be used in correspondence prepared by an access point. The Operating Procedures do not prescribe a specific form or letter to notify clients of possible removal from the prioritization queue. Access points may draft a letter using all, some or none of the sample text included in Exhibit 16.

ATTACHMENT C

Idaho Homelessness Coordinating Committee

to: IHCC Board Members
from: Brady Ellis
VICE PRESIDENT, HOUSING SUPPORT PROGRAMS
CHAIR, IHCC

sheri e. cook
SENIOR SPECIAL NEEDS GRANTS COORDINATOR
DESIGNATED HUD CONTACT FOR THE COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT

subject: BOARD REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FINAL 2017 COC Project ranking
date: August 29, 2017
cc: special needs assistance programs team

Purpose

HUD requires the governing body of each Continuum of Care (CoC) to review and approve the final prioritization of project applications within the COC's jurisdiction. The Idaho Balance of State Continuum of Care governing body is the Idaho Homelessness Coordinating Committee (IHCC).

Background

HUD's CoC competition requires CoC's to prioritize all new and renewal project in rank order. The listing must be broken into two tiers. Tier 1 will consist of 94% of our annual renewal funding amount. Tier 2 will consist of 6% of the annual renewal amount plus a bonus project opportunity of 6% of the annual renewal amount.

The IHCC Written Standards detail the governing principles applied to ranking and prioritization processes. Section 4.5 (A-D) outlines the review and ranking criteria, applicable performance goals, reallocation methods, and guidelines for new projects.

IHFA, as the Collaborative Applicant (CA) received 19 renewal applications and 2 new applications. Five of the 19 renewals are in their first year of operation. Fourteen represent Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects, and five are Rapid Rehousing (RRH) projects. One new application did not meet threshold and has been excluded based on the provisions of the Written Standards. The second (accepted) new application is included in the ranking options outlined herein.

The CoC has reallocation funding available and a potential to receive "bonus" funding; a cumulative amount of \$306,402. The ranking options include the accepted new project application and a proposed expansion of the Balance of State Coordinated Entry grant to include Housing Specialist positions in the six regions covered by the CoC.

Ranking Options

IHFA has received and scored applications according to the process established. Traditionally, the CA provides the Board with three options, based on HUD priorities and CoC-identified goals. In accordance with this practice, IHFA offers the following options, which are detailed in attachments A-C:

- *Option A:* The first option would expand Coordinated Entry, include all renewals, and add the one accepted new application. Ranking would align with the Written Standards, placing

all HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects in primary rank order, followed by the remaining new and renewal applications in raw score order. Please refer to Attachment A for prioritization according to this option.

- *Option B:* The second option would expand Coordinated Entry, include all renewals, and add the one accepted new application. Ranking would align with the Written Standards, placing all HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects in primary rank order, followed by the remaining renewal applications, with the accepted new application at the bottom of the ranking. Please refer to Attachment B for prioritization according to this option.
- *Option C:* The third option would expand Coordinated Entry, include all renewals, and add the accepted new application. Ranking would align with the Written Standards, placing all HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects in primary rank order, followed by renewal applications in score order. The accepted new project would be ranked above renewal projects whose scores fall into tier 2 (the new project being the last project included in tier 1). Please refer to Attachment C for prioritization according to this option.

Recommendations

The CA recommends Option A. This option best aligns with the Written Standards, and allows the CoC to support performing renewal projects with continued funding.

Resolution

ATTACHMENT D

OPTION A

Rank	Region	Component Type	Reviewers Score	Possible Score	Percentage %
1	statewide	HMIS			
2	statewide	HMIS			
3	statewide	CE			
4	statewide	CE			
5	5	PSH	189	195	97%
6	3	RRH	377	437	86%
7	6	PSH	371	450	82%
8	4	RRH	368	450	82%
9	5	PSH	364	450	81%
10	4	PSH	158	195	81%
11	1	PSH	354	450	79%
12	6	PSH	354	450	79%
13	2	PSH	349	450	78%
14	6	PSH	351	450	78%
15	3	RRH	150	195	77%
16	5	RRH	150	195	77%
17	2	RRH	342	450	76%
18	5	RRH	343	450	76%
19	1	PSH	334	450	74%
20	1	PSH	319	450	71%
21	1	PSH	139	195	71%
22	statewide	PSH	311	450	69%
23	5	PSH	302	450	67%
24	3	PSH	260	450	58%

\$744.00

Total \$2,858,418.00
 Tier 1 \$2,686,912.92
 Tier 2 \$171,505.08

OPTION B

Rank	Region	Component Type	Reviewers Score	Total Score	Percentage %	
1	statewide	HMIS				
2	statewide	HMIS				
3	statewide	CE				
4	statewide	CE				
5	6	PSH	371	450	82%	
6	4	RRH	368	450	82%	
7	5	PSH	364	450	81%	
8	1	PSH	354	450	79%	
9	6	PSH	354	450	79%	
10	2	PSH	349	450	78%	
11	6	PSH	351	450	78%	
12	2	RRH	342	450	76%	
13	5	RRH	343	450	76%	
14	1	PSH	334	450	74%	
15	1	PSH	319	450	71%	
16	statewide	PSH	311	450	69%	
17	5	PSH	189	195	97%	
18	4	PSH	158	195	81%	
19	3	RRH	150	195	77%	
20	5	RRH	150	195	77%	
21	1	PSH	139	195	71%	
23	5	PSH	302	450	67%	
24	3	PSH	260	450	58%	\$61,272.00
22	3	RRH	377	437	86%	
			Total	\$2,858,418.00		
			Tier 1	\$2,686,912.92		
			Tier 2	\$171,505.08		

OPTION C

Rank	Region	Component Type	Reviewers Score	Total Score	Percentage %
1	statewide	HMIS			
2	statewide	HMIS			
3	statewide	CE			
4	statewide	CE			
17	5	PSH	189	195	97%
5	6	PSH	371	450	82%
6	4	RRH	368	450	82%
7	5	PSH	364	450	81%
18	4	PSH	158	195	81%
8	1	PSH	354	450	79%
9	6	PSH	354	450	79%
10	2	PSH	349	450	78%
11	6	PSH	351	450	78%
19	3	RRH	150	195	77%
20	5	RRH	150	195	77%
12	2	RRH	342	450	76%
13	5	RRH	343	450	76%
14	1	PSH	334	450	74%
15	1	PSH	319	450	71%
21	1	PSH	139	195	71%
16	statewide	PSH	311	450	69%
22	3	RRH	377	437	86%
23	5	PSH	302	450	67%
24	3	PSH	260	450	58%

\$744.00

Total \$2,858,418.00
Tier 1 \$2,686,912.92
Tier 2 \$171,505.08