GRCoC System and Project Performance Measures Public Comments and Responses
July 18, 2016

No.	Date Received	Comment – Question	Response
1	7/12/16	In looking at the Performance measurement grid it appears as if the scoring is based on the 2016 – 2017 targets – is that correct and if so how is that possible? I would expect scoring to be based on past performance not future performance. What is the rationale for the weighting of the measures (1-7 range seems very broad)?	One HUD policy priority is the strategic allocation of resources based on performance in order to maximize the resources available to end homelessness. Upon review by the Ranking and Performance Measurement committees, the targets are set in order to achieve CoC goals of improved performance and to meet HUD system performance goals thereby increasing access to resources. Agencies performing above the current year baseline will receive a higher score. The measures are weighted in accordance with the relative importance based on the FY15 CoC application debrief and feedback from DHCD on the VHSP funding application.
2	7/12/16	A.4 – Grant Spending Rate – Draws within 90 days (5 points) – 90 days from what? The last draw? When the grant started? I'm just not clear on the wording of this. I'm concerned because sometimes (as you well know) there is a major hold up getting contracts through, so we can't draw. For example – with our dFind Cary 15 grant – that grant technically started 1/1/16 – but we have not been able to draw in eLOCCS yet because Tom has not allowed us to submit our first draw to him for review yet. We have been completing the draws and accruing the balance, so once it is "open" we will draw daily for each month until we are caught up, but we are way over the 90 days of start date of the grant – but through no fault of our own. (#2-5 are from the same commenter)	We will add language clarifying that draws must be made every 90 days (every quarter) from the date that funds can be accessed. The supplemental application will provide an opportunity to describe extenuating circumstances.

GRCoC System and Project Performance Measures Public Comments and Responses
July 18, 2016

No.	Date Received	Comment – Question	Response
3	7/12/16	PSH. 4 – Placement in Permanent Housing – I'm still learning this process (and will be attending my first singles housing team meeting this afternoon) but the feedback that I have gotten was that at times referral packets are incomplete (for example, an expired ID) and time is added. Can you clarify to state that it is the time between a complete housing team referral to lease up?	We will add the word "complete" for clarification. Please note that it will be the responsibility of the PSH provider to inform the Housing Team of the date that the referral packet is complete. If the no other date is provided, the initial date of Housing Team referral will be used to calculate this measure.
4	7/12/16	PSH. 5 – Bed Utilization – just clarification for my own behalf – this is based on the number of beds written into the grant, correct (and not the "extended" units that have to be added at times to expend all the rental assistance dollars)?	The bed utilization rate is calculated by taking the average number of people in beds throughout the year (from the APR, Tab B) divided by the number of beds on the Housing Inventory Count.
5	7/12/16	PSH .7 and PSH. 8 – increase income employment and increased income other sources? Is it a HUD requirement to be worded this way (vs. increase or maintain)? I'm just worried that for some of our individuals who have been in the program for longer terms who are unable to work because of their disability who have been getting full benefits – there is no way to increase this. The "success" here is that they obtained and are now maintaining their benefits/income, but there is no way that additional benefits/income will occur.	We will revise the measures to read "Increase or maintain" income from employment or other sources.

GRCoC System and Project Performance Measures Public Comments and Responses
July 18, 2016

Summary of Changes to Performance Measures

System Performance Measures: No Change

Project Performance Measures: All of the changes made were for the purpose of clarity or more accuracy and did not change the substance of the measure:

1. Clarifying language added to measures A.4, PSH.4, PSH.7 and PSH.8 to address public comments as noted above.
2. Staff changed language in measures PSH.4, PSH.6, SH.6 for clarity and accuracy.
3. Suzanne Wagner (Housing Innovations) reviewed the measures and made several suggestions. At this point, we are incorporating her suggestions for measures A.7, SH.3 and SH.4.