



Steering Council Meeting Agenda  
December 19, 2025 ▫ 8:30 – 10:30 am  
Heart of West Michigan United Way – 118 Commerce Ave SE

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of November 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes\*
4. Public Comment on Agenda Items (Limit 3 minutes ea.)
5. Approval of Consent Agenda\* – *stand*
  - a. Committee & Initiatives Updates
  - b. Budget Report: Statement of Activity
  - c. Data Reports: None
6. CoC Program Competition and Related Policies (Ranking, Reallocation, etc.)
7. CHC 2.0 – Follow-up on action items
8. Committee Updates and Rosters
  - a. Nominating Committee
  - b. BFO
  - c. 100 in 100
  - d. CE Committee
    - i. MSHDA HCV Prioritization Process\* - *small group notes, CE Committee meeting minutes, and proposed process are included in the agenda packet.*
9. Tabled motion on ad hoc law enforcement advisory council from November 12 meeting
10. EOS Update
11. Year-end celebration/annual report
12. Director's Report – *standing item*
13. Federal Updates
14. Any other matters by Steering Committee Member(s)
15. Public Comment on Any Matter (Limit 3 minutes ea.)
16. Adjournment



## STEERING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2025

8:30am - 10:30am

Facilitator:	Elizabeth Stoddard		
Meeting Attendees:	Elizabeth Stoddard, Lauren VanKeulen, Mark Contreras, Casey Gordon, Kate Berens, Karen Diesing, Tenisa Frye, Thelma Ensink, Sam Westhouse, Alonda Tremmel, Lindsey Reames, Ray King, Ryan VerWys, Adrienne Goodstall, Monique Carter, Paul Smith, Sam Elliot Mosely, Anna Diaz, Angela Gillisse, Vera Beech, Jim Dayas, Nelson Soto, Chris Palusky, Christie White, Tenise Clipper (Youth advocate), Gustavo Perez  Staff: Ronan Parmenter, Brianna Robach, Alyssa Anten, Courtney Myers-Keaton, Robyn Van Dyke		
Time Convened:	8:35 am	Time Adjourned:	10:34

Approval of Agenda			
Motion by:	Ryan VW	Support from:	Laren VK
Discussion			
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes		
Approval of Minutes		October 24, 2025	
Motion by:	Adrienne G	Support from:	Paul Smith
Discussion			
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes		
Approval of Consent Agenda			
Motion by:	Casey G	Support from:	Lauren VK
Discussion			
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes		
CHC Update			
Discussion			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Community Rebuilders gave a brief walkthrough of the CHC demo</li><li>- Updates:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o They're running tests with people with lived experience and seems to be well received.</li><li>o Street outreach testing (5 teams) – They are learning lots and plan to go out another 2-3 times.</li><li>o Presented to Coordinated Entry Committee, CR will be there for the next CE meeting.</li><li>o Site is fully built, ready for implementation.</li><li>o Executive Committee will give a roadmap to launch.</li></ul></li><li>- Brief walkthrough:</li></ul>			



## STEERING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2025

8:30am - 10:30am

- Accessibility features (screen readers, translation, etc.).
- A fast exit button for clients with the help of DV.
- Anyone in the community can access real-time resources based on information in the provider module.
- Optional discovery questionnaire for clients (optional).
- Regularly updated resources.
- Entryway for the Coordinated Entry process.
- Consent process for clients, rights, terms and conditions, and grievances system.
  - Assessment info goes straight into HMIS instead of manual entry (part of the consent process).
- Clients can update their current living situation.
- Outreach workers and CES admin can ensure the ability for clients to log in if they forget their information.
- Offers self-help tools specific to clients.
- Information about the client will automatically get paired with appropriate resources that are currently available. Not only will they be able to see the resources and figure out if it's something they want to pursue, but they will also see the location and necessary documents.
  - If they are denied a resource, their position will remain on the BNL.
- Clients can schedule appointments with providers in real time. It will offer a live chat with the provider.
- Trusted contacts.
- Clients can upload their documents in the secured portal.
- Clients can add/remove family members.
  - Assessment has homeless history section
- On the provider side, they can put in their information (locations served, people served, documents needed, availability, etc.).
- Provider has access to reports.
- CES admin has extended reports that can be made public.
- Staff member will assist in monitoring CHC 2.0
- **Questions:**
  - **Monique:** Asked for re-wording resource eligibility for clarity, specifically about accepting a referral and understanding the necessary follow-up to ensure referrals are not being provided to people who aren't qualified. **Vera** responded with this system will help take the pressure off staff
  - **Ryan VW:** Asked where the CoC decides to modify prioritization and how that works in the system. **Angela** talked about the role of the CES Admin. Ryan let us know that it will be a CoC staff member and that there is a process when things need to be modified.
  - Currently, there is prioritization based on program type. Thresholds will change as new resources come in and out in addition to federal changes in funding criteria
  - **Lauren:** Asked about the timeline, roll-out and adoption. **Vera** said that CR is hoping for a December roll-out and that they're ready whenever the system is. The



## STEERING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2025

8:30am - 10:30am

subscription agreement would include the price but are waiting for their attorneys and will send to Executive Committee when ready. **Elizabeth** asked for budget, **Vera** said \$189k annually and \$35k initiation. They are trying to work on sources of funding and explained the reason for the costs which should be coming in December.

- **Vera** noted that as other subscribers come on board, there may be a way that the system gets less expensive. Since it is built to scale, it will reduce costs. **Courtney** mentioned a potential cohort joining together since there seems to be interest in other coalitions. They are wanting 5-6 communities in the first year with a focus on Michigan.
- API (allows communication between this system and HMIS) issues. Wellsky and MICAH will not be up before March, so there is still some duplicative data entry. Some issues with the connectivity for the API which now require HUD, state, and system are not likely to be finalized until March. Plan to pull in HUD TA to that conversation. **Angela** notes that API works
- **Kate:** Asked how labor intensive it is to load information into the system, entering information into the system would take just about 5 minutes
- There was discussion around the monetary piece and asked if there is an impact of having a lacking API on subscription costs, **Vera** thinks there shouldn't be any.
- Included in the \$189k are five languages, although would need to pay for additional services like important lots of old data, adding 20 additional languages, etc.
  - CR is committed to their developers
  - The subscription document will be provided to a legal counsel.
- **Ryan VW:** Asked if all the details Vera described will be in the subscription document and encourages that we should have an attorney evaluate the subscription document as well.
- Estimated 175 HMIS users and 3000 assessments annually (clients) annually.
- It is imperative that providers and users keep their information updated. **Ryan VW** asked how we can assure that that is kept fresh since it's voluntary participation. **Angela** notes that updates are currently updated through HAP/google spreadsheets, and that the providers need to replicate how they do that utilizing this tool
  - The CES admin can oversee all the information and make decisions based on identified gaps. They will also be able to review client data and deploy outreach staff to update system periodically. Not sure that difficulties will be eliminated entirely, but this shared platform allows at least some efficiency in terms of how system accessing and shares info
  - Clients are welcome back anytime if they fall off the BNL
- The subscription agreement will cover things like functionality, durability, and consistency
- **Elizabeth:** Asked if the subscription agreement could be available by December's Steering. **Vera** says that people are looking for ways to offset the costs of the system. Courtney will get information about what that group meets to discuss so CoC Steering representatives can participate.



## STEERING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2025

8:30am - 10:30am

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Distribute link about getting involved in testing Sharing information	CoC	
<b>PIT Count Planning Update</b>		
Discussion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Alyssa provided updates on the PIT Count.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Planning on Jan 28<sup>th</sup> count and figuring out staff for night of and morning after</li> <li>o <b>Courtney:</b> Brought up concerns due to significant cuts that reduce the capacity to perform outreach, specifically getting into places where people may be sleeping that evening. <b>Alyssa</b> thinks it would be nice for 10 extra bodies. Catherine's Health would be willing to help in this work. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Weeks leading up to NOFO are staff intensive to prep volunteers, materials.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>Steering Council Elections Process</b>		
Discussion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Courtney:</b> Reminded us that we are in the process of Steering Council nominations with four seats open. Nominees will be reviewed and put together a slate in addition to putting an asterisk by those who are recommended. There will be a ballot listing everyone nominated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rationale will be provided for why someone was or was not chosen</li> <li>o No governance doc changes needed to allow this</li> <li>o Conversations about getting law enforcement participating</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Lauren</b> motioned for an ad hoc advisory council to get information from key community members who cannot sit on Steering Council, but where insight is needed, supported by <b>Ryan VW. Paul</b> notes that nominating could do legwork on this subject. The motion was tabled until December to allow more feedback from stakeholders that we would want to have included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o They could help with discharging planning</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Tabled motion to December on ad hoc advisory council		
<b>CoC Program Competition</b>		
Discussion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Courtney</b> ensured that it is not too late for congress to nullify this.</li> <li>- Changes if this moves forward as currently written: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Annual renewal demand (ARD): 11 mil <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Put out an RFP for renewal and new projects.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Tier 1: you are usually allowed to put about 90% of your renewal demand into it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Now allowed to be only 30% of your ARD</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Tier 2: more competitive, you are essentially competing nationally to keep your Tier 2 funding, based on points. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tier 2 is now 70% of your ARD</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Permanent housing capped at 30% of ARD</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		



## STEERING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 21, 2025

8:30am - 10:30am

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ PSH, RRH, Joint TH-RRH all considered permanent housing. ALL of our annual funds are spent on this category (other than infrastructure and 2 youth programs) So, from about \$7M now to about \$3M cap. A lot will have to be shifted into transitional housing to preserve funds<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ HUD is also saying any project/program or agency that CURRENTLY OR IN THE PAST has supported racial preferences or supported other than binary definitions of gender can be disqualified.</li><li>○ Required services for all recipients in TH, 40 hours a week of required services. Time individual spends working is deducted. Agreements needed between client and agency</li><li>○ Scoring for the application includes significant points that the WHOLE geography must have enforcement on a camping ban</li></ul></li><li>- Discussion about the approach to how to address these changes strategically in terms of how to best keep people housed</li><li>- Other updates tabled for next meeting</li><li>- CoC Exec going to take a request for a one-time roll-over of vacation</li></ul>			
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Putting out a notice for those who want to apply			
Any other matters by Steering Committee Member(s)			
Discussion			
-			
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Public Comment on Any Agenda Item			
Discussion			
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Adjourn			
Motion by: Elizabeth Stoddard		Support from:	



**GRAND RAPIDS/WYOMING/KENT COUNTY  
STEERING COUNCIL ANTICIPATED TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION 2024**  
Updated annually. These are subject to change.

**JANUARY**

- Executive Officer Elections
- Point in Time Count
- Steering Council Annual Conflict of Interest Forms Completed
- Strategic Plan: Review and Update

**FEBRUARY**

- Steering Council Annual Membership Meeting
- City of Grand Rapids Emergency Solutions Grant Application\*
- Data Review

**MARCH**

- Project Performance Discussion
- Data Quality Committee Report
- CoC and ESG Mid-Term Monitoring
- Budget Presentation and Approval – *dependent upon fiduciary's timeline*

**APRIL**

- Point in Time Count Submitted to HUD\*
- Strategic Plan Review

**MAY**

- Governance Charter Recommended Changes to CoC Membership
- Director Evaluation Initiated by Fiduciary

**JUNE**

- CoC Program Funding Process Review
- Budget Review
- Open Call for New CoC Members
- Anticipated MSHDA ESG Funding Discussion\*
- PIT Data Released\*

**JULY**

- NAEH Annual Conference
- Strategic Plan Review

**AUGUST**

- Anticipated HUD CoC Program Funding Vote\*
- System Performance Measures Reported to CoC
- MSHDA Emergency Solutions Grant Application\*

**SEPTEMBER**

- Anticipated HUD CoC Program Application Due\*
- PIT Planning Begins

**OCTOBER**

- Governance Charter Review
- Fiduciary MOU and HMIS Lead Agency Review
- Strategic Plan Review

**NOVEMBER**

**DECEMBER**

- Steering Council elections (*at CoC meeting*)
- Director Mid-Year Evaluation Initiated by Fiduciary
- Budget Preparation Begins
- Strategic Plan: Review & Update Annual Priorities

**AS NEEDED**

- LIHTC Developer Presentations to Steering
- Formation of Nominating Committee

\*dependent on funder (federal, state, city) timelines

## Monthly Committee Updates for Steering

### December 2025

---

#### **COORDINATED ENTRY**

- November meeting was cancelled due to lack of agenda items and December was cancelled due to CoC staff dedicating time to the CoC NOFO, now rescinded.

#### **YOUTH ACTION BOARD**

- No updates at this time.

#### **FAMILY FUNCTIONAL ZERO**

Currently not meeting.



## Continuum of Care Grant Financial Status

As of 11/30/2025

Grant	Grant Award Amount	Grant Spend To Date	% Spent	Total Projected Expenses	Overspent or (Underspent)	Grant Year End Date	Notes
MSHDA Pass Thru Grants							
MSHDA 2025 ESM	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	100%	\$ 245,000	\$ -	9/30/2025	Fully spent, final FSR filed.
MSHDA 2024 ESF-02	\$ 172,185	\$ 172,185	100%	\$ 172,185	\$ -	9/30/2025	Fully spent, final FSR filed.
MSHDA 2024 ESM-02	\$ 17,304	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ (17,304)	9/30/2026	
MSHDA 2025 ESF-02	\$ 400,232	\$ -	0%	\$ (400,232)	\$ (800,464)	9/30/2026	
MSHDA Steps to Stability	\$ 150,000	\$ 38,016	25%	\$ 38,016	\$ (111,984)	9/30/2026	Will be P/T with The Salvation Army
HWMUW (Match)	\$ 7,000	\$ -	0%	\$ -	\$ (7,000)	6/30/2026	Need to spend in Dec-June timeframe to put spend in proper match period.
City of GR CDBG (Match)	\$ 20,000	\$ 7,367	37%	\$ 20,000	\$ (0)	6/30/2026	
City of Wyoming CDBG (Match)	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,196	24%	\$ 5,000	\$ (0)	6/30/2026	
HUD Planning 11.30.25	\$ 395,557	\$ 395,557	100%	\$ 395,557	\$ 0	11/30/2025	
HUD Planning 11.30.26	\$ 467,490	\$ -	0%	\$ 460,744	\$ (6,746)	11/30/2026	
HUD SSO 5.31.2026 #1	\$ 239,368	\$ 36,151	15%	\$ 239,368	\$ 0	5/31/2026	
HUD SSO 5.31.2026 #2	\$ 68,953	\$ -	0%	\$ 68,953	\$ -	5/31/2026	
HUD SSO 1.31.2026 #3	\$ 219,696	\$ 185,402	84%	\$ 219,696	\$ (0)	1/31/2026	
Kent County CUNP 9.30.26 (Match)	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,759	14%	\$ 18,796	\$ (1,204)	9/30/2026	
Kent County CUNP 9.30.25 (Match)	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	100%	\$ 24,000	\$ (0)	9/30/2025	
DeVos Family Foundation	\$ 26,000	\$ 26,000	100%	\$ 26,000	\$ -	12/31/2025	
DeVos/Trillium Foundation 22.23	\$ 330,000	\$ 271,647	82%	\$ 271,820	\$ (58,180)	1/31/2026	Have requested extension due to open position.
HMIS, HUD 11.30.25	\$ 138,304	\$ 138,304	100%	\$ 138,304	\$ (0)	11/30/2025	
HMIS, HUD 11.30.26	\$ 144,594	\$ -	0%	\$ 144,594	\$ (0)	11/30/2026	
DeVos Outreach Coordination Ph I	\$ 16,420	\$ 16,420	100%	\$ 16,420	\$ -	12/31/2025	
Housing Navigation Pgm 23.25	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000	100%	\$ 240,000	\$ -	8/31/2025	
Total	\$ 3,347,103	\$ 1,800,004	54%	\$ 2,344,220	\$ (1,002,883)		

### CoC Fund Balance

Fund Balance @ 6/30/20

\$ -

Add:

HWMUW grant fye 6.30.21 (not spent) 6,600  
Mission Matters - Strategic planning (4,000)  
Comm Solutions Int'l income 1,000

6,600  
(4,000)  
1,000

CoC Fund Balance 6/30/22

\$ 3,600

NPTA remaining

100

Kent County ESG (admin)

(909)

Misc small grant closeout adj

(591)

CoC Fund Balance 6/30/23

\$ 2,200

Misc small grant closeout adj

(1,705)

CoC Fund Balance 1/31/2025

\$ 495

Misc small grant closeout adj's

(495)

CoC Fund Balance 2/28/2025

\$ (0)

### 100 in 100 Summary

Cash Donations

Expenses

July	\$ 102.50	
August	5,157.60	
Sept	599.33	
Oct	552.07	\$ 970.36
Nov	1,376.51	958.94
Dec	9,094.34	42.61
Jan		4.10
Feb		195.22
May	2,000.00	10,000.00
Total	\$ 18,882.35	\$ 12,171.23

**Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness**  
**Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County Continuum of Care – MI 506**

**FY2023 CoC Program Competition – Local Ranking Policy**

**i. Background:**

Annually, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) holds a national competition for Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Funds through the CoC Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). This competition procures funds into the Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County area to provide housing and services to individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness.

During the Program Competition, New Projects may be created through reallocation and/or eligible bonus funding. Through reallocation or bonus funding, applicants may apply to operate New Projects or expand Renewal Projects as defined by the annual NOFO.

The Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County Continuum of Care (CoC) – MI 506 will competitively rank projects based on projects' improvement of system performance. The CoC seeks to facilitate a coordinated, equitable, and outcome-oriented community process for the solicitation, review, ranking, and selection of project applications, and a process by which renewal projects are reviewed for performance and compliance with 24 CFR 578.

**ii. Review**

All projects submitted to the Continuum of Care will be thoroughly reviewed at the local level. Deficient project applications prolong the review process for HUD, which results in delayed funding announcements, lost funding for CoCs due to rejected projects, and delays in funds to house and assist individuals and families experiencing homelessness. CoCs are expected to closely review information provided in each project application to ensure:

1. All proposed program participants will be eligible for the program component type selected;
2. The information provided in the project application and proposed activities are eligible and consistent with program requirements in 24 CFR part 578;
3. Each project narrative is fully responsive to the question being asked and that it meets all the criteria for that question as required by this NOFO;
4. The data provided in various parts of the project application are consistent; and,
5. All required attachments correspond to the list of attachments in *e-snaps* and contain accurate and complete information.

To ensure that all projects submitted to HUD for funding consideration are of a high quality, CoC staff will complete a Threshold and Project Quality review of all project applications.

**iii. Scoring**

The CoC Board appoints a Funding Review Committee to review and objectively score all Renewal and New Project applications. Scoring is the process of using subjective, objective, and performance-based criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of Renewal Projects and New Projects in reducing and ending homelessness. Scoring is conducted by the Funding Review Committee (FRC) after the Project Applications have been reviewed for Threshold and Project Quality by CoC staff.

Independent review and scoring of project applications must be performed with individuals who are independent of CoC-funded programs, projects, or agencies. FRC members must disclose any conflicts of interest. FRC ensures the highest level of objectivity when it comes to the scoring of project applications for CoC Program funding.

#### **iv. Ranking Policy**

During the CoC Program NOFO, HUD uses a Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding selection process. Each year, HUD will establish each CoC's Tier 1 and Tier 2 amounts based on the total amount of funds requested by eligible Renewal Project applications on the Renewal Project Listing combined with the eligible Renewal Project amount(s) that were reallocated as listed on the reallocation forms in the CoC Priority Listing. Project applications in Tier 1 will be conditionally selected from the highest scoring CoC to the lowest scoring CoC, provided the project applications pass both project eligibility and project quality threshold review, and if applicable, project renewal threshold. Any type of New or Renewal Project application can be placed in Tier 1, except CoC Planning. Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the maximum amount of renewal, reallocation, and CoC Bonus funds that a CoC can apply for, but does not include CoC planning projects, or projects selected with DV Bonus funds. Project applications placed in Tier 2 will be assessed for project eligibility and project quality threshold requirements, and if applicable, project renewal threshold requirements. Funding will be determined using the CoC Application score as well as the factors listed in the NOFO.

The Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC will rank all projects which have passed Threshold and Project Quality Review by CoC staff and scoring by the FRC on the Priority Listing in the following manner:

- 1) Non-competitively Ranked Projects
  - a) The CoC has deemed projects supporting HMIS and Coordinated Entry (CE) as critical to the infrastructure of the CoC. Thus the HMIS and SSO-CE Renewal and Expansion Project applications, referred to as infrastructure projects, will be non-competitively ranked above all ranked projects.
  - b) Projects that have not completed a full program year under the current CoC Program NOFO will be non-competitively ranked above competitively ranked projects and below infrastructure projects. It is expected that the project submits an Annual Performance Report for the amount of time the project has been implemented.
- 2) Renewal Projects
  - a) Renewal Projects will be ranked in descending order by score.
- 3) New Projects
  - a) New Projects will be ranked in descending order by score

#### **viii. Ranking Procedure**

CoC Staff will then populate the Priority Listing using the Ranking Policy above. The Priority Listing will be provided to Steering Council for approval prior to submission during the CoC Program Competition.



## DRAFT HUD CONTINUUM OF CARE PROGRAM REALLOCATION POLICY GUIDANCE

### Background

The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness which serves as the Continuum of Care (CoC) for the Cities of Grand Rapids and Wyoming and Kent County is committed to maximizing effectiveness of financial resources to house as many individuals and families as possible. To this end, reallocation of US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) funding may be used and should be undertaken with the utmost care.

### Definition

Reallocation; per Section III.B.2.w of the FY 2021 CoC Program NOFO: Reallocation is when a CoC shifts funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects without decreasing the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). New Projects created through reallocation must meet the requirements set forth in the annual CoC Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and project eligibility and project quality thresholds established by HUD at a minimum. Each year HUD determines eligible reallocation project types in the CoC NOFO. Involuntary reallocation of funds should be considered only when projects are determined to be underperforming, obsolete, or do not contribute substantially to meeting the goals of the Continuum of Care for preventing and/or reducing homelessness.

### Process Overview

The process used in determining reallocation of funds should be structured in such a way that mitigates perceptions of reallocation as a threat or in a way that removes barriers to a provider thinking critically about the performance of a project. In some cases, projects in which CoC funding is reallocated may be eligible for another source of funding which might be more appropriate than HUD CoC funding. Reallocation action will be taken with the goal of alignment with the HUD and HEARTH ACT policy guidance, performance criteria specified in the annual HUD NOFO with emphasis on local needs, data and project performance. Consideration will also be given to the potential impact that involuntary (performance based) reallocation may have on increasing homelessness resulting from a reduction in services caused by the reallocation.

Decisions to reallocate funds shall be evidence-based. Each CoC funded project will be evaluated annually using specific information to include but not be limited to: data entered into HMIS, the HUD Annual Performance Report, the HUD Longitudinal Systems Analysis, the CoC project application, cost per household served and other HUD recommended data tools. **Types of Reallocation**

Projects may be allocated in the following ways:

- Funding (in whole or part) from one project into a new project by the same provider
- 
- Funding (in whole or part) from multiple projects into one new project
- Funding (in whole or part) from multiple projects into many new projects

## I. VOLUNTARY REALLOCATION

If a provider has determined that a project could better serve the community with changes made through reallocation, they may voluntarily submit the project for reallocation. If a provider elects to voluntarily reallocate a project, the provider shall notify the CoC Program Manager of their intent prior to the release of the local application. The provider has the option to submit an application for a new project utilizing the reallocated funds (see *Types of Reallocation* above for all configurations), or they may opt not to apply which will make the funds available to all other new applicants. The reallocated project will submit as a new project and must meet deadlines established locally for new project applications. The new project must meet HUD threshold and be in alignment with the current NOFO. The new project cannot be a continuation of an old project.

### Scoring and Ranking

The provider will be able to apply through reallocation for their reallocated funds without those funds being included in the available funding to all new applications. Providing minimum threshold and NOFA requirements are met, the project will be scored and ranked against other projects in the project priority listing submitted to HUD using elements listed above under "Mandatory Scoring Elements".

### When a Project Can Reallocate

Projects should consider if the changes they wish to make would best be accomplished through requesting a grant amendment. Examples of situations that would best be handled through a grant amendment versus reallocation follow.

Grant Amendment	Reallocation
A permanent supportive housing program wishes to shift funds within its existing grant from service costs to rental assistance costs in order to create additional units.	Component changes, such as transitional housing that wants to change to permanent supportive housing.
If a transitional housing project wants to reduce the average length of time households are in their programs, they can do so without reallocating.	Major population changes, such as if a project wanted to change from serving families with children to serving individuals experiencing chronic homelessness.

## II. INVOLUNTARY REALLOCATION

Renewal projects scoring below the scoring threshold, not serving an identified community need, found to not meet minimum benchmark scores on performance measures (as determined by the community), not utilizing funding effectively, or not meeting HUD statutory, regulatory, threshold and compliance requirements may be considered for reallocation. Funding from reallocated project(s) will be used to fund new projects via the CoC Program Competition local funding process.

### Mandatory Scoring Areas (Additional Areas of Scoring May Be Considered)

- Project performance and utilization
- Cost effectiveness
- Current residents of existing project

- HMIS Data Quality
- Expenditure of grant funds
- Organization experience and capacity
- Alignment with current NOFA  
Coordinated Entry use
  - System Performance Measures
- 
- Alignment with HUD CoC regulations and policy priorities
  - Does project meet minimum threshold
  - Coordinated Entry use
  - Alignment with HUD Notice on Prioritization
  - Alignment with HUD CoC regulations and policy priorities

This will policy be reviewed, and modified if needed, following the release of the annual CoC Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

**Policy Approved by Steering Council:**

March 20, 2015

September 9, 2016

---

**REALLOCATION POLICY**  
**APPENDIX A**  
**HUD THRESHOLDS AND REQUIREMENTS**

**1. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements.**

To be eligible for funding under the CoC Program Funding, project applicants must meet all statutory and regulatory requirements in the Act and 24 CFR part 578. Project applicants can obtain a copy of the Act and 24 CFR part 578 on the HUD Exchange or by contacting the NOFA Information Center at 1-800-HUD-8929 (1-800-483-8929).

**2. HUD Threshold Requirements**

**A. Ineligible Applicants.** HUD will not consider an application from an ineligible project applicant, including an application submitted for CoC planning funds or UFA Costs from an applicant other than the Collaborative Applicant.

**B. DUNS Number Requirement.** All project applicants seeking funding under this program must have a DUNS number and include the number in the Standard Form 424 (SF-424). The SF-424 must be submitted along with the project application in e-snaps. See Section IV.C.2. of the FY 2015 General Section for additional information.

**C. Active Registration in SAM.** All project applicants seeking funding under this program must have an active SAM registration. HUD will not issue a grant agreement for awarded funds to a project applicant until an active SAM registration has been verified. See Section IV.C.1. of the FY 2015 General Section for additional information.

**D. Project Eligibility Threshold.** HUD will review all projects to determine if they meet the following eligibility threshold requirements on a pass/fail standard. If HUD determines that the applicable standards are not met for a project, the project will be rejected from the competition. Any project requesting renewal funding will be considered as having met these requirements through its previously approved grant application unless information to the contrary is received (e.g., monitoring findings, results from investigations by the Office of Inspector General, the recipient routinely does not draw down funds from LOCCS at least once per quarter, consistently late APRs.). Approval of new and renewal projects is not a determination by HUD that a recipient is in compliance with applicable fair housing and civil requirements.

**(1)** Project applicants and potential subrecipients must meet the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as described in 24 CFR part 578 and provide evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation).

**(2)** Project applicants and subrecipients must demonstrate the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project as detailed in the project application and to administer Federal funds. Demonstrating capacity may include a description of the applicant/subrecipient experience with similar projects and with successful administration of SHP, S+C, or CoC Program funds for renewing projects or other Federal funds.

**(3)** Project applicants must submit the required certifications as specified in this NOFA.

**(4)** The population to be served must meet program eligibility requirements as described in the Act, and the project application must clearly establish eligibility of project applicants. This includes the following additional eligibility criteria for certain types of projects:

**(a)** The only persons who may be served by any non-dedicated permanent supportive housing beds are those who come from the streets, emergency shelters, safe havens, institutions, or transitional housing.

i. Homeless individuals and families coming from transitional housing must have originally come from the streets or emergency shelters.

ii. Homeless individuals and families with a qualifying disability who were fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life threatening conditions and are living in transitional housing are eligible for permanent supportive housing even if they did not live on the streets, emergency shelters, or safe havens prior to entry in the transitional housing.

iii. Persons exiting institutions where they resided for 90 days or less and came from the streets, emergency shelter, or safe havens immediately prior to entering the institution are also eligible for permanent supportive housing.

**(b)** The only persons who may be served by dedicated or 29 prioritized permanent supportive housing beds are chronically homeless individuals and families as defined in 24 CFR 578.3.

**(c)** Rapid Re-housing projects originally funded to serve individuals and families coming from the streets or emergency shelters or persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homeless, must continue to do so.

**(d)** New Rapid Re-housing projects created through reallocation may serve individuals, including unaccompanied youth, and families coming from the streets or emergency shelters or persons fleeing domestic violence or other persons who qualify under paragraph (4) of the definition of homeless; however, these program participants must meet the all other criteria for this type of housing (i.e., individuals and household with children who enter directly from the streets or emergency shelter).

**(e)** The projects originally funded as part of the FY 2008 Rapid Re-Housing for Families Demonstration may transition in this CoC Program Competition to permanent housing: rapid rehousing. Therefore, any of these projects that want to change from transitional housing with leasing, may change the current budget line items from leasing to tenant-based rental assistance (may request actual rent or FMR) and move any operating costs to an eligible supportive services activity, an HMIS budget line item, or may be used to add additional units. If the project wants to remain as transitional housing, it must continue operating in accordance with the FY 2008 CoC Homelessness Assistance Grants Programs NOFA.

**(f)** Renewal projects originally funded under the Samaritan Housing Initiative must continue to exclusively serve chronically homeless individuals and families, unless there are no chronically homeless individuals and families within the CoC geographic area that can be served by the project. CoCs should not hold units vacant, but instead should prioritize other vulnerable and eligible households as outlined in Notice CPD-14-012.

**(g)** Renewal projects originally funded under the Permanent Supportive Housing Bonus in previous years must continue to serve the homeless population in accordance with the respective NOFA under which it was originally awarded.

**(h)** Renewal projects that indicated they would prioritize chronically homeless persons in beds that become available through turnover in non-dedicated permanent supportive housing projects must continue to do so.



(5) The project must be cost-effective, including costs of construction, operations, and supportive services with such costs not deviating substantially from the norm in that locale for the type of structure or kind of activity.

(6) Project applicants, except Collaborative Applicants that only receive awards for CoC planning costs and, if applicable, UFA Costs, must agree to participate in a local HMIS system. However, in accordance with Section 407 of the Act, any victim service provider that is a recipient or subrecipient must not disclose, for purposes of HMIS, any personally identifying information about any client. Victim service providers must use a comparable database that meets the needs of the local HMIS.

(7) Project applicants must administer their programs or activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified homeless with disabilities. This means that programs or activities must be offered in a setting that enables the homeless with disabilities to interact with others without disabilities to the fullest extent possible.

**E. Project Quality Threshold.** HUD will review all new project applications to determine if they meet the following project quality threshold requirements with clear and convincing evidence. Any project requesting renewal funding will be considered as having met these requirements through its previously approved grant application unless information to the contrary is received (e.g., monitoring findings, results from investigations by the Office of Inspector General, consistently slow draws from LOCCS, consistently late APRs) and if the renewal project has compliance issues which results in the project not operating in accordance with 24 CFR part 578. The housing and services proposed must be appropriate to the needs of the program participants and the community. A determination that a project meets the project quality threshold is not a determination by HUD that a recipient is in compliance with applicable fair housing and civil rights requirements.

(1) To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, new permanent housing–permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing–project applications must receive at least 3 out of the 5 points available for the criteria below. New permanent housing project applications that do not receive at least 3 points will be rejected.

(a) Whether the type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the program participants (1 point);

(b) Whether the type and scale of the supportive services fit the needs of the program participants–this includes all supportive services, regardless of funding source (1 point);

(c) Whether the specific plan for ensuring program participants will be individually assisted to obtain the benefits of the mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible to apply meets the needs of the program participants (1 point);

(d) Whether program participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs (1 point); and,

(e) Whether at least 75 percent of the proposed program participants come from the street or other locations not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, safe havens, or fleeing domestic violence (1 point).

(2) To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, new SSO projects for centralized or coordinated assessment systems must receive at least 2 out of the 4 points available for the criteria below. SSO projects for centralized or coordinated assessment systems that do not receive at least 2 points will be rejected.

- (a)** Whether the centralized or coordinated assessment system is easily accessible for all persons within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking information regarding homelessness assistance (1 point);
  - (b)** Whether there is a strategy for advertising the program that is designed specifically to reach homeless persons with the highest barriers within the CoC's geographic area (1 point);
  - (c)** Whether there is a standardized assessment process (1 point); and
  - (d)** Whether the program ensures that program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs (1 point).
- (3)** To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, new HMIS project applications must receive at least 3 out of the 4 points available for the criteria below. New HMIS projects that do not receive at least 3 points will be rejected.
  - (a)** How the HMIS funds will be expended in a way that is consistent with the CoC's funding strategy for the HMIS and furthers the CoC's HMIS implementation (1 point);
  - (b)** Whether the HMIS collects all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the HMIS Data Standards (1 point);
  - (c)** Whether the HMIS un-duplicates client records (1 point); and
  - (d)** Whether the HMIS produces all HUD-required reports and provide data as needed for HUD reporting (e.g., APR, quarterly reports, data for CAPER/ESG reporting) (1 point).
- (4)** To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, the Collaborative Applicant's application for new CoC planning funds must receive at least 6 out of 10 points using the criteria below. Applications that do not receive at least 6 points will be rejected. Applications for UFA Costs are not subject to a threshold review, as UFA status was determined as part of Registration.
  - (a)** Governance and Operations. Whether the CoC conducts meetings of the entire CoC membership that are inclusive and open to members and whether the CoC is able to demonstrate that it has a written governance charter in place that contains CoC policies (2 points).
  - (b)** CoC Committees. Whether the CoC has CoC-wide planning committees, subcommittees, or workgroups to address homeless needs in the CoC's geographic area that recommend and/or set policy priorities for the CoC (2 points).
  - (c)** The proposed planning activities that will be carried out by the CoC with grant funds are compliant with the provisions of 24 CFR 578.7 (4 points); and
  - (d)** The funds requested will improve the CoC's ability to evaluate the outcome of both CoC Program-funded and ESG-funded projects (2 points).
- (5)** Additionally, HUD will assess all new projects for the following minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards. To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, all new projects must meet all of the following criteria:
  - (a)** Project applicants and potential subrecipients must have satisfactory capacity, drawdowns, and performance for existing grant(s) that are funded under the SHP, S+C, or CoC Program, as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients, regular drawdowns, and timely resolution of any monitoring findings;
  - (b)** For expansion projects, project applicants must clearly articulate the part of the project that is being expanded. Additionally, the project applicants must clearly demonstrate that they are not replacing other funding sources; and
  - (c)** Project applicants must demonstrate they will be able to meet all timeliness standards per 24 CFR 578.85. Project 33 applicants with existing projects must demonstrate that they have met all project

renewal threshold requirements of this program. HUD reserves the right to deny the funding request for a new project, if the request is made by an existing recipient that HUD finds to have significant issues related to capacity, performance, or unresolved audit/monitoring finding related to one or more existing grants. Additionally, HUD reserves the right to withdraw funds if no APR is submitted on the prior grant.

**F. Project Renewal Threshold.** A CoC must consider the need to continue funding for projects expiring in the next calendar year. Renewal projects must meet minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards identified in this program's annual NOFA or they will be rejected from consideration for funding.

(1) When considering renewal projects for award, HUD will review information in LOCCS; Annual Performance Reports (APRs); and information provided from the local HUD CPD Field Office, including monitoring reports and A-133 audit reports as applicable, and performance standards on prior grants, and will assess projects using the following criteria on a pass/fail basis:

- (a) Whether the project applicant's performance met the plans and goals established in the initial application as amended;
- (b) Whether the project applicant demonstrated all timeliness standards for grants being renewed, including that standards for the expenditure of grant funds have been met;
- (c) The project applicant's performance in assisting program participants to achieve and maintain independent living and record of success, except HMIS-dedicated projects are not required to meet this standard; and
- (d) Whether there is evidence that a project applicant has been unwilling to accept technical assistance, has a history of inadequate financial accounting practices, has indications of project mismanagement, has a drastic reduction in the population served, has made program changes without prior HUD approval, or has lost a project site.

(2) HUD reserves the right to reduce or reject a funding request from the project applicant for the following reasons:

- (a) Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;
- (b) Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
- (c) History of inadequate financial management accounting practices;
- (d) Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
- (e) History of other major capacity issues that have significantly affected the operation of the project and its performance;
- (f) History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly; and
- (g) History of serving ineligible program participants, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes.

**G. Resolution of Outstanding Civil Rights Matters Threshold.** In order for a project application to be eligible for rating and ranking by HUD, the project applicant and the proposed subrecipient must meet the civil rights threshold requirements in Section III.C.2.b. of the FY 2015 General Section. h. Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan. For each applicant that is not a State or unit of local government, the applicant must submit a certification by the jurisdiction in which the proposed project will be located that the applicant's application for funding is consistent with the jurisdiction's HUD-approved consolidated

plan. The certification must be made in accordance with the provisions of the consolidated plan regulations at 24 CFR part 91, subpart F. Form HUD-2991 must be used and must list all new projects, CoC planning, UFA Costs, and renewal projects within the jurisdiction that are consistent with the Consolidated Plan. For a project applicant that is a State or unit of local government, the jurisdiction must certify that it is following its HUD-approved Consolidated Plan.

**3. Other HUD Requirements.** The list below highlights requirements contained in the General Section (and in other regulations) that is especially important for CoCs and project applicants to review in detail. This is not an exhaustive list of all HUD requirements. All of the requirements of the FY 2015 General Section apply to the CoC Program, except as otherwise specified in the current year NOFA. An applicant can access the General Section of HUD's FY 2015 NOFA [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program\\_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail/2015gensec](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail/2015gensec). Note that the General Section of HUD's FY 2015 NOFA is critical and must be carefully reviewed to ensure an application can be considered for funding, with the exception of reference to the [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) application process and other exceptions specifically listed in the NOFA. The CoC Program uses an electronic system outside of [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) called e-snaps. Notification of the availability of the application will be released via HUD's websites located at [www.hud.gov](http://www.hud.gov) and [www.hudexchange.info](http://www.hudexchange.info). To sign up for HUD's CoC Program email-based listserv, go to [www.hudexchange.info/maillinglist/](http://www.hudexchange.info/maillinglist/).

**A. Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.** See 24 CFR 578.93 for specific requirements related to Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

**B. Equal Access to Housing in HUD Programs Regardless of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity.** See the Federal Register dated February 1, 2012, Docket No. FR 5359-F-02 and Section VI.B.2. of the General Section.

**C. Debarment and Suspension.** See Section III.C.4.c. of the FY 2015 General Section. Additionally, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that all subrecipients are not debarred or suspended. (24 CFR 578.23((3)(c)(4)(v)).

**D. Delinquent Federal Debts.** See Section III.C.4.a. of the FY 2013 General Section.

**E. Compliance with Fair Housing and Civil Rights.** See Section III.C.3.a. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**F. Executive Order 13166, "Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP)."** See Section III.C.3.d. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**G. Economic Opportunities for Low- and Very Low-income Persons (Section 3).** See Section III.C.3.c. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**H. Real Property Acquisition and Relocation.** See Section VI.B.4. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**I. Conducting Business in Accordance with Core Values and Ethical Standards/Code of Conduct.** See Section III.C.3.f. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**J. Prohibition Against Lobbying Activities.** See Section III.C.3.h. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**K. Participation in HUD-Sponsored Program Evaluation.** See Section VI.B.6. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**L. Environmental Requirements.** Notwithstanding provisions at 24 CFR 578.31 and 24 CFR 578.99(a) of the CoC Program interim rule, and in accordance with Section 100261(3) of MAP-21 (Pub. L. 112-141, 126 Stat. 405), activities under this program's NOFA are subject to environmental review by a responsible entity under HUD regulations at 24 CFR part 58.

**(1)** For activities under a grant to a recipient other than a State or unit of general local government that generally would be subject to review under part 58, HUD may make a finding in accordance with 24 CFR 58.11(d) and may itself perform the environmental review under the provisions of 24 CFR part 50 if the recipient objects in writing to the responsible entity's performing the review under part 24 CFR part 58.

(2) Irrespective of whether the responsible entity in accordance with 24 CFR part 58 (or HUD in accordance with 24 CFR part 50) performs the environmental review, the recipient must supply all available, relevant information necessary for the responsible entity (or HUD, if applicable) to perform for each property any required environmental review. The recipient also must carry out mitigating measures required by the responsible entity (or HUD, if applicable) or select alternative property.

(3) The recipient, its project partners, and their contractors may not acquire, rehabilitate, convert, lease, repair, dispose of, demolish, or construct property for a project under this NOFA, or commit or expand HUD or local funds for such eligible activities under this NOFA, until the responsible entity (as defined by 24 CFR 58.2(a)(7)) has completed the environmental review procedures required by 24 CFR part 58 and the environmental certification and Request for Release of Funds (RROF) have been approved or HUD has performed an environmental review under 24 CFR part 50 and the recipient has received HUD approval of the property. HUD will not release grant funds if the recipient or any other party commits grant funds (i.e., incurs any costs or expenditures to be paid or reimbursed with such funds) before the recipient submits and HUD approves its RROF (where such submission is required).

**M. Drug-Free Workplace.** See Section VI.B.9. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**N. Safeguarding Resident/Client Files.** See Section VI.B.10 of the FY 2015 General Section.

**O. Compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006** (Pub. L. 209-282) (Transparency Act), as amended. See Section VI.B.11. of the FY 2015 General Section.

**P. Lead-Based Paint Requirements.** For housing constructed before 1978 (with certain statutory and regulatory exceptions), CoC Program recipients must comply with the requirements of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4801, et seq.), as amended by the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 4851, et seq.); and implementing regulations of HUD, at 24 CFR part 35; the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at 40 CFR part 745, or State/Tribal lead rules implemented under EPA authorization; and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration at 29 CFR 1926.62 and 29 CFR 1910.1025.



## CoC Data Analysis Committee Roster

First Name	Agency	Email
Eleibny Feliz	Community Member	<a href="mailto:felizellef@gmail.com">felizellef@gmail.com</a>
Francisco Calderon	Family Promise	<a href="mailto:franciscoc@familypromisegr.org">franciscoc@familypromisegr.org</a>
Gustavo Perez	Kent Community Action	<a href="mailto:gustavo.perez@kentcountymi.gov">gustavo.perez@kentcountymi.gov</a>
Johanna Schulte	City of Grand Rapids	<a href="mailto:jschulte@grand-rapids.mi.us">jschulte@grand-rapids.mi.us</a>
Lee Nelson Weber	Community Member	<a href="mailto:leemarie.weber@gmail.com">leemarie.weber@gmail.com</a>
Rebecca Long	Dwelling Place	<a href="mailto:rlong@dpgr.org">rlong@dpgr.org</a>

Quorum = 4

Name	Organization	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Annual Attendance	% Annual Attendance
Artemis Tally, Kalissa Thompson, Leshia Love	Arbor Circle	x			x	x		x		x	x	x		7	58%
Brian Sommer	AYA	x			x	x		x		x	x	x		7	58%
	Catherine's Health	x			x									2	17%
Tammy Vincent	City of GR	x			x	x		x			x	x		6	50%
Bill Stapleton, Catherine Sheroski, Jennifer Shields	Community Rebuilders	x			x	x				x	x	x		6	50%
Brian Bruce	Dwelling Place									x				1	8%
Tyler Kregel, Will Williams, Michael Maher	Mel Trotter Ministries				x	x		x		x	x	x		6	50%
Andrew Asdell, Danielle Friedman	network180/HOT	x			x	x					x	x		5	42%
Bryan Holt, Inez Escareno, James Schuen, Kevin Sears, Melonie Cooper, Brandon	Pine Rest	x			x	x		x		x	x	x		7	58%
Nydra Moore	VA	x			x	x				x				4	33%

\*Some of membership may be outdated. Annually looking at committee participation in January 2026

**Nominating Committee Roster:**

- Erin Banchoff
- Paul Smith
- Jazz McKinney

**Funding Committee Roster:**

- William Weld-Wallis
- Pat Loner
- Mark Contreras
- Josh Bernstein
- Adrienne Goodstall
- Molly Perez
- Becki Postma

**Youth Committee Roster:**

- In the process of identifying new membership



<b><u>Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Staff</u></b>
Arbor Circle	Dani Shields, Heather Nyenhuis
AYA Youth Collective	Stephanie Collier, Korey Mills
Catherine's Health	
City of Grand Rapids	Erin Banchoff, Johanna Schulte, Tammy Vincent
Community Rebuilders	Angela Gillisse, Anna Diaz, Catherine Sheroski, Maranda VanZegeren, Patrick Buhay, Vera Beech
Covenant House	LoRae Robinson
Degage	Marissa Lee
Dwelling Place	Alonda Trammell, Brian Bruce, Christina Slofstra-Moore, Rebecca Long, Kristy Hawkins, Shannon Trout
Fair Housing Center West Michigan	Becky Nespital
Family Promise	Francisco Calderon, Hannah Salas, Mackenzie Vilmont, Moriya DeJesus Sauro
Genesis Nonprofit Housing Commission	Dave Gantz, John Wynbeek, Katherine Besaw
GR Housing Commission	Felicia Clay, Joyce Williams, Latasha Maberry, Rachel Siebert, Shakerah McRae, Lindsey Reames, Jose Capeles
GR Urban League	Kari Sherman
ICCF	Gaby Guzman, Veronica Arvizu, Tony Evans, Meselech Beld
KCCA	Emily Stroka, Noelia Garcia, Sherrie Gillespie
Mel Trotter	Tyler Kregel, Nikia Belcher
North Kent Connect	Adrienne Goodstal
Other Way Ministries	Frieda Campos
Pine Rest	Bryan Holt, Christina White, James Schuen
Safe Haven	Holly Wilson, Tanesha Jordan, Zenaida Jimenez
Salvation Army	Sam Westhouse
United Way	Becki Postma, Jessie Verville, Alyssa Bryan
VA	Alicia Cox, Jordan Brinker, Nydra Moore
YWCA	Fallon Lee

Quorum = 12

1



Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC  
Coordinated Entry Committee  
**MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT**  
October 21, 2025 2:00-3:30 pm

Facilitator:	Brian Bruce		
Meeting Attendees:	Brian Bruce, Tammy Vincent, Brian Sommer, Tyler Kregel, Marsha Mooney, Emily Stroka, Meselech Beld, Brody Ennis, Lila Carson, Gaby Guzman, Hannah Salas, Moriah DeJesus, Shakerah McRae, Sam Westhouse, Marissa Lee, Eileen McKeeever, Fallon Lee, Becky Nespital, Rachel McDowell, Dani Shields, Heather Nyenhuis, Frieda Campos, Felicia Clay, Zenaida Jimenez, Angela Gillisse, Brianne Jurs  Staff: Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Robach, Ronan Parmenter		
Time Convened:	2:09pm	Time Adjourned:	3:07pm

Approval of Agenda			
Motion by:	Hannah Salas	Support from:	Tammy Vincent
Discussion			
Amendments	Adding November CEC Meeting as agenda item		
Conclusion	All in favor with amendment, motion passes		
Approval of Minutes		August 12, 2025	
Motion by:	Hannah Salas	Support from:	Becky Nespital
Discussion			
Amendments			
Conclusion	All in favor, motion passes		
HCV Pre-Application Processes – <i>informational only</i>			
Discussion			
Brienne shared a presentation overviewing the process.			
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Email presentation slides to this committee		Ronan	11/1/2025
HCV Prioritization Process*			
Discussion			
<p>A small workgroup was formed in August to develop a prioritization process for HCVs. The workgroup met over the last few months and came up with considerations based on feedback from previous rounds of applications as well as staff recommendations. The prioritizations considerations identified by the workgroup include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Cannot screen people out due to perceived barriers</li><li>- Criteria is identifiable based on HMIS data due to sustainability</li><li>- Consider effects on permanent housing projects</li><li>- Keep it simple</li><li>- Ensure the most vulnerable are connected</li><li>- Focus on maintaining long term housing stability</li><li>- Prevent returns to homelessness</li><li>- Consider all populations</li></ul>			



Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC  
Coordinated Entry Committee  
**MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT**  
October 21, 2025 2:00-3:30 pm

Workgroup determined two potential buckets for criteria, recommending that this committee have discussion around determining which buckets to recommend to Steering Council:

- Chronically homeless households
- Households are on the active prioritization list who have returned to homelessness within 24 months after exiting from any program to a permanent destination
- OR split the prioritization 50/50 to avoid overloading shelter and ensure that single, youth, and family households are served

Brianne reviewed the Stella P dashboard

- Number of households that have exited and number who have returned to homelessness within 12 months, 24 months

Discussion:

- Concerns about unintended consequences; Brianne noted this workgroup put a lot of thought into that piece
- Concerns around the pre-application process and completing it in a reasonable time
- Discussion around how this process aligns with the current CE Policy
- Several noted concerns for long-term shelter stayers, particularly families
- Brianne noted MSHDA has requested that we do not screen anyone out, but leave that to MSHDA (while also being transparent about the possibilities with clients)

**Hannah Salas, Shakerah McRae – Motion to recommend the 50/50 split prioritization process to Steering Council, with 24 votes in favor and 2 votes against; the 2 dissenting voters noted they do not support due to it being too much of a diversion from the current process. This prioritization will move forward to Steering.**

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>Youth Inactive Contact Process – <i>informational only</i></b>		
Discussion		
Recently expanded BFZ for youth, with one requirement that if exiting someone, we are attempting to contact them to determine whether they are inactive or still in need of support.		
Brianne reviewed the policy, noting that youth providers are currently piloting this with youth. When nearing the inactive date (approximately 60-75 days), providers are asked to follow up with that youth and track data to ensure they are still residing in Kent County and still experiencing literal homelessness.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>November CEC Meeting Reschedule</b>		
Discussion		



Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC  
Coordinated Entry Committee  
**MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT**  
October 21, 2025 2:00-3:30 pm

November meeting scheduled for Veteran's Day; Brianne wanted to get a sense of whether we should reschedule or cancel.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Cancel November CEC meeting	Ronan	11/1/2025
<b>Coordinated Entry Concerns – <i>Standing Item</i></b>		
Discussion		
None		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>Action Items and Next Steps</b>		
Discussion		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
<b>Adjournment</b>		

## HCV Prioritization Workgroup 9/23/25

**Attendees:** Sam Westhouse, Hannah Salas, Amy Lloyd, Johanna Schulte, Courtney Myers-Keaton, Brianne Robach, Ronan Parmenter

### Reviewed HCVs and desired higher-level considerations:

- Keep it simple
- Connecting the most vulnerable
- Preventing returns to homelessness
- Mitigating downstream impacts on housing

### Discussion:

Discussion around prioritization brought by Sam - ensure we are considering all populations when choosing factors

- Discussion around the limitations of using the current prioritization brought by Johanna. CMK noted this is a long-term resource and wants to ensure we are using this wisely as we don't have many long-term resources available and prioritized via CE.
- Brianne noted we usually have a fairly low rate of returns. Reviewed returns to homelessness in 24 months per the LSA data/Stella. Note that not all returns will be active in the system at any one point in time.
- Prioritize those who exited with a system resource and returned? CMK recommends prioritizing chronic still. Discussion around allocating a certain percentage to chronic and a certain percentage to the group of those who have returned. Potentially 50/50?
- Brianne will research whether information is available on how other communities across the state have prioritized these resources.
- Connecting HCV with additional resource suggested by Johanna

### Revisited list of potential prioritization factors:

- ~~Households who have stayed in shelter more than once in the past 3 years~~
- ~~People who have returned to homelessness after exiting PH~~
- ~~Active prioritization list~~
- ~~Long-term homeless 6-9+ months continuous~~
- Chronic
- ~~In RRH without increase in income after 9 months~~
- ~~Household size~~
- People who have returned to homelessness within 24 months after exiting from any program to a permanent destination

### Outcome:

- Brianne to bring recommendation of the two prioritization pools noted above to Coordinated Entry for discussion on whether and how to split an allocation between these pools. The committee will recommend a prioritization process to Steering Council for final approval.

## MSHDA Homeless Preference HCV Prioritization Process

### Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC – MI 506

MSHDA's Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program aims to assist low-income families and individuals in paying a portion of their rent. Participants are usually responsible for paying approximately 30-40% of their income toward rent. All rental units are subject to a housing inspection by the subsidy provider and both the participants and landlords are bound by the rules and regulations of the HCV Program. Since housing assistance is provided on behalf of the household, participants are able to find their own housing, including single-family homes, townhouses, and apartments. The MSHDA HCV program includes a homeless preference, referrals based on this preference are managed locally. A prospective household must meet the following definition of homeless to qualify:

1. An individual or family with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground.
2. Individual or family living in a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designated to provide temporary living arrangements
3. Individual who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation & exiting an institution where he/she temporarily resided
  - a. The individual must have been homeless prior to entering the institution
  - b. "temporarily resided" now means a period of 90 days or less

HCVs become available within a county through attrition and MSHDA notifies Coordinated Entry (CE) of the number of households which may be added to the HCV waitlist to be drawn for a voucher. Coordinated Entry will prioritize households who are in need of long-term support to maintain stable housing. This will be implemented by equally splitting the number of allocated vouchers between the priority pools following the order of priority below:-

<u>Chronically homeless households</u>	<u>Households are on the active prioritization list who have returned to homelessness within 24 months after exiting from any program to a permanent destination</u>
--	--

- ~~1.—Households with an adult member(s) who have a fixed income in a Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) project, prioritized by CE assessment score and length of time homeless, THEN~~
- ~~2.—Households with an adult member(s) who have a fixed income and who are on the active prioritization list (enrolled in Street Outreach [SO], Emergency Shelter [ES], Transitional Housing [TH], and/or Coordinated Entry [CE]), prioritized by CE assessment score and length of time homeless, THEN~~
- ~~3.—Households in RRH or on the active prioritization list (in SO, ES, TH, CE) with 3+ persons and adult member of the household has a fixed income or household is under 30% AMI, prioritized by CE assessment score and length of time homeless.~~

Within each of the priority population pools, households will be prioritized based on the most recent CE assessment score. To be on the active prioritization list, households must have a CE

assessment within the last 90 days. ~~For households enrolled in RRIH, their CE assessment score may be more than 90 days old. This score will still be considered as it reflects vulnerability at the time they were connected to the housing resource.~~ In the case where multiple households have the same score, length of time homeless will be used as a tie breaker.

DRAFT





## **COMMITTEE OPERATIONS EXPECTATIONS GUIDANCE**

The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (CTEH) Governance Charter identifies various committees that serve to implement the work of the Continuum of Care (CoC). The Charter details committee roles and responsibilities, participants and terms of service, meeting frequency, and related matters. This document outlines expectations for the manner in which committees carry out their work and seeks to provide structure and accountability.

### **Committee Roles and Responsibilities**

In addition to committee roles and responsibilities identified in the Governance Charter, each committee shall be responsible for:

- Recruiting its members
- Selecting a chairperson, vice-chairperson, and secretary
- Establishing its policies and procedures, consistent with the Charter, and providing them to the Steering Council and CoC staff.
- Recording its minutes and attendance and providing them to CoC staff.
- Ensuring transparency of its process and meetings and reporting regularly to the Steering Council and CoC membership.

### **Committee Membership**

All committees, except those requiring election, may include any CoC member. However, in committees where there may be two or more members from the same agency, voting will be limited to one vote per agency. Whenever possible, at least one (1) Steering Council member shall serve on each committee. Any CoC member can request to join a committee's roster by emailing the committee chairperson and/or CoC staff.

Committee rosters will be confirmed each year in January. In order to maintain an up-to-date roster and quorum, if a member misses more than 2 scheduled meetings without notice within a rolling 6-month period, CoC staff or the Committee Secretary will request that they remove themselves from the roster or reaffirm their commitment to participation.

### **Committee Leadership**

- Each committee shall choose a chairperson, vice-chairperson, and secretary.
  - The chairperson, and vice-chairperson in the chairperson's absence, shall coordinate each committee.
  - The secretary shall record meeting minutes and maintain an up-to-date committee membership and contact list.
- The chairperson, vice-chairperson, and secretary shall retain their position for a 12-month term beginning in January of each year.

### **Meeting Structure**

- An agenda shall be prepared for each committee meeting. Meeting agendas shall be action-oriented and reflect CTEH Strategic Plan actions assigned to the committee.
- A majority of 51% of the membership constitute a quorum at all committee meetings. If 51% of the membership is not in attendance at a meeting, no votes may take place during the meeting.
- Robert's Rules of Order will be followed and a simple majority of the members present is necessary for any vote to pass. All formal decisions must be ratified by the Steering Council.

### **Reporting**

Minutes of all meetings shall be circulated and approved at the subsequent meeting. Once approved, minutes shall be made available on the CTEH website. Meeting minutes shall detail how the committee's work is making progress toward assigned actions identified in the CTEH Strategic Plan.

Committee leadership shall utilize standardized templates provided by CoC staff to prepare meeting agendas, minutes, membership rosters, and other documents as deemed appropriate.