

CITY OF MADISON:
 Planning and Community and
 Economic Development Dept:
 CD Division

Memo

To: CDBG Committee
 From: Sue Wallinger, CDBG Office
 Date: May 29, 2013
 Re: Coordinated Intake and Assessment Request for Proposals

In accordance with the plan described to the Committee at its April 4, 2013 meeting, The Community Development Division issued a RFP on April 5, 2013 for services related to Coordinated Intake and Assessment - Providing Responses to Homeless or At-Risk Persons in Housing Crisis. Proposals were due May 6, 2013. The purpose of the RFP is for the City to identify a non-profit agency that will develop and operate a system designed to provide information and referrals to persons experiencing a housing crisis. In addition the selected vendor will provide additional assessments for persons in the pilot program's identified target population – families and individuals who have been homeless less than six months.

The goals for a locally designed coordinated assessment system were created with input from members of the Coordinated Intake and Assessment Committee of the Dane County Homeless Services Consortium. This group is comprised of local agencies and funders serving homeless and persons at-risk of homelessness.

The goals proposed to be met by the system include these:

1. Create an easier and more efficient way to serve persons in a housing crisis;
2. Prevent homelessness for persons at risk by providing resources to help them maintain their current housing;
3. Shorten the length of homelessness for households by early assessment of barriers and efficient use of resources to move households into permanent housing; and
4. Bridge any service gaps by providing advocacy as necessary and point of contact for individuals and families in a housing crisis.

Creating a centralized or coordinated intake and assessment system for the Dane County Continuum of Care (CoC) is now required by HUD under new legislation referred to as the HEARTH Act (24 CFR part 578). The City's 2013 budget for the CD Division, which plays a lead coordinative role for the CoC, provided \$74,997 for this purpose, \$57,728 from City funds and \$17,269 from Federal Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds.

The amount available for contracting is \$146,900 for the period July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2014. This total presumes the Common Council will approve the same amount of City funds in 2014 as was provided in 2013, however, funding from the federal government under the ESG Program is expected to decline in 2014. Accordingly, the 2014 ESG contribution for this contract is expected to decline to \$14,175

The City received three proposals in response to its RFP, from the following organizations:

- Community Action Coalition for South Central Wisconsin, Inc. (CACSCW)
- Employment and Training Association, Inc. (EATA)
- Shine608 and Tenant Resource Center (TRC)

Three agencies with experience in intake systems/ processes and homeless programs (MMSD Transitional Education Program, VA Homeless Program and Dane County Human Services) volunteered to hear presentations from applicant agencies, rank written proposals and offer their recommendations to CDD staff. Their evaluations considered the quality of the narrative presented in the application, demonstration of agency and staff experience, evidence of collaboration, and adequacy of budget information. Each reviewer assigned scores under these categories. A blank scoring sheet is attached.

CD staff sat in on the applicants' presentations but conducted an independent review and evaluation of the written proposals.

CD staff scores for the three proposals are as follows:

	Proposal Narrative (50 possible points)	Experience of Agency & Staff (15 possible points)	Collaboration Efforts (20 possible points)	Budget (15 possible points)	Local Preference (5 points)	Total Score
CACSCW	43	13.65	17.4	14.25	5	93.3
EATA	22	6.45	6	13.5	5	52.95
Shine 680 TRC	21.5	9.45	12	6.75	5	54.7

The average scores based on the review by the three volunteer reviewers are presented below:

	Proposal Narrative (50 possible points)	Experience of Agency & Staff (15 possible points)	Collaboration Efforts (20 possible points)	Budget (15 possible points)	Local Preference (5 points)	Total Score
CACSCW	45	15	18	14	5	97
EATA	36	10	11	10	5	72
Shine 680 TRC	36	12	16	11	5	81

The conclusions reached both by the three volunteer reviewers and CDD staff is that the Community Action Coalition of South Central Wisconsin (CACSCW) presents the strongest overall proposal. The CACSCW proposal is most responsive to the model sought through the RFP by presenting a design that separates intake and assessment functions, creates a unique identify apart from CACSCW for marketing the program to persons in need, and understands the role of the Coordinated Intake and Assessment provider to educate and coordinate with other housing and service providers. CACSCW has shown its ability to collect client data – the organization consistently receives high scores for its data quality under the State Wisconsin Service Point (WISP) system, has broad experience working with the homeless and at-risk populations, and has experience with compliance and documentation requirements that often accompany federal funding sources.

The other proposals also exhibited strengths in several areas. The Shine608 and Tenant Resource Center proposal is built on the abilities of key staff who were successful in their operations of the County-funded resource center operated during the recent winter months. However, the Shine608 proposal did not propose a model that delineated intake and assessment or clearly segregated the functions from previous programs operated by Shine608 key staff. The proposal submitted by Employment and Training Associates included their knowledge of the jobs and training network that could open up new resources for users of the Intake and Assessment system. However, their proposal did not demonstrate that they had a good knowledge or working relationships with Homeless Services Consortium housing and service providers.

Based upon consideration of all these factors, the recommendation by City staff to the CDBG Committee is that CACSCW be awarded the contract to develop and operate a coordinated intake and assessment system.

Coordinated Intake and Assessment RFP Scoring Sheet

Date Reviewed: _____

Reviewer: _____

Proposal (50 points)	Clear description of model for delivering services.	
	Clear description of how agency will meet the minimum requirements for hours of service OR realistic plan to exceed the minimum requirements for hours of service.	
	Description of model includes Key Design Decisions in the RFP.	
	Realistic timetable for implementing Pilot Program. Includes anticipated time between initial phone call and formalized intake and assessment.	
	Clear description of Marketing Plan to publicize Pilot Program.	
	Ability to create separate public identity for Pilot Program.	
	Realistic outcomes including at least one related to the length of homelessness.	
	Experience providing services county-wide or realistic plan to provide service county-wide.	
Proposal Subtotal:		
Experience of Agency and Staff (15 points)	Current staff has experience working with homeless and at-risk households.	
	If hiring new staff, demonstrates the ability to attract qualified staff with experience working with homeless and at-risk households.	
	Experience of agency and staff working with federal compliance issues including documenting homelessness and at-risk of homelessness.	
	Currently uses WISP or has capacity to become WISP licensed.	
	Experience collecting and analyzing data to evaluate Pilot Program	
	Agency has financial capability and capacity to fulfill the terms of the contract including past contracts with the City of Madison and/or Dane County.	
	Ability to work with Coordinated Intake and Assessment Committee and other HSC providers on implementing a uniform intake format.	
Experience Subtotal:		
Collaboration (20 points)	Demonstrated experience working with other homeless services.	
	Demonstrated experience connecting persons with mainstream resources.	
	Realistic timetable for increasing collaborative efforts with service providers.	
Collaboration Subtotal:		
Budget (15 points)	Clear description of how funds will be allocated including specific detail on staffing costs related to providing information and referral, intake and assessment, and supervision.	
	Reasonable budget with sufficient detail to describe operation costs.	
Budget Subtotal:		
Local Preference (5 points)		
Total:		

Additional Comments:

I am able to evaluate fairly and impartially all proposals given to me regardless of their authors. I do not have a conflict of interest which would prevent my participation in this process.

Signed: _____