

FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Project Reallocation, Ranking and Selection Process Adopted August 4, 2017

PROJECT SELECTION SUBCOMMITTEE

During the FY 2017 CoC competition HPAC will establish an objective Project Selection Subcommittee to develop a recommendation regarding which project applications should be sent to HUD for funding in the FY17 CoC competition. The Subcommittee will include:

- Representatives from non-conflicted CoC member agencies and stakeholders
- A minimum of 5 members, maximum of 10 members
- Membership representing both public and private agencies
- Membership representing all geographic areas within the HPAC jurisdiction
- No more than one representative from each member agency

The Homeless Coordinator will act as staff to committee, but will not participate in ranking or voting.

PROJECT REALLOCATION, RANKING AND SELECTION PROCEDURE

SUBMISSION OF PROJECT APPLICATIONS

All project applications must be submitted in e-snaps by August 23, 2017 at 11:59pm.

- Applications received late, but within 8 hours of the due date/time will receive a 5-point score reduction.
- Projects received after 7:59am on 8/24/17 may receive an additional point reduction, to be determined by the Ranking Subcommittee.
- It is recommended that applicants take a screenshot of their Submissions List and Project Summaries after submitting. In the event that the e-snaps system has issues, this can be used as evidence that the project was submitted on-time.
- If an applicant is having issues with submitting the application in e-snaps by the deadline due to system error they may submit a PDF version of the application, along with evidence that the e-snaps system was not working.

For renewal projects, the Annual Performance Report (APR) from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) should be submitted directly to the Homeless Coordinator by **August 23**, **2017 at 11:59pm.** Victim service providers should submit APR data from a comparable database to HMIS.

In addition to the application in e-snaps, project applicants may submit a supplementary response (no longer than 5 pages) directly to the Homeless Coordinator to address any areas where they believe members of the Project Selection Subcommittee may require additional information or explanations. These responses will be distributed to Subcommittee members along with the project applications. Project applicants may also participate in a brief in-person interview with the Project Selection Subcommittee prior to their cumulative ranking process to answer questions and address any areas of concern.

PREPARATION FOR REVIEW PROCESS

Minimum Threshold Review



FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Project Reallocation, Ranking and Selection Process Adopted August 4, 2017

8/24-8/25: Homeless Coordinator conducts a minimal threshold review on new projects to ensure that projects meet minimum requirements as described below. Per guidance from HUD, all renewal projects will be assumed to meet the threshold requirements.

- Project type is eligible for CoC funding
- Project serves CoC service area
- Project meets 25% match requirements
- Project meets HUD project quality threshold (as described on page 24 of the Notice of Funding Availability)

If a project does not meet the threshold requirements the Project Selection Subcommittee will be notified. Depending on the severity of the issue, the Subcommittee may reject the project for funding, or work with the applicant on addressing the issue.

Distribution of Application Scoring Packets

8/25: Homeless Coordinator prepares and distributes application packets to the members of the Project Selection Subcommittee.

SCORING

8/26-9/1: Members of the Project Selection Subcommittee independently review and score all renewal projects ¹ and new projects² (out of 75 possible points). Separate scoring sheets will be used for renewal and new projects. Renewal projects that have been in operation for less than 1 year, and have not completed an Annual Performance Report (APR), will be scored using the new project rubric. Victim service providers will be evaluated using the same scoring sheets as other projects, but should submit APR data from a database comparable to HMIS.

REALLOCATION, RANKING AND PROJECT SELECTION

9/1: Members of the Project Selection Subcommittee meet to complete the following tasks:

- Interview project applicants to address any outstanding questions
- Assign a cumulative score to each new and renewal project
- Consider reallocation of under-performing projects
- Select new projects
- Assign a rank to each project application

• Any new project proposal for a:

- Permanent supportive housing projects dedicated to chronically homeless
- o Permanent supportive housing projects meeting the definition of DedicatedPLUS
- Rapid re-housing projects
- Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid Re-Housing projects
- Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects for coordinated entry
- HMIS project (only HMIS lead can apply)
- Permanent Housing Bonus projects

¹ Renewal Projects: Projects currently funded by the CoC program with an expiration date in 2018

² New Projects:



FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Project Reallocation, Ranking and Selection Process Adopted August 4, 2017

Minutes will be recorded at the meeting, provided at the subsequent HPAC meeting with the ranking results, and made available to the public.

Cumulative Scoring of Renewal and New Projects

The Subcommittee's first task will be to develop a cumulative score for each project by aggregating the scores assigned to each project by each individual member of the Subcommittee.

Reallocation of Under-Performing Projects

Next, the Subcommittee will consider whether reallocation³ of under-performing renewal projects is necessary.

- The Subcommittee will recommend reallocation of any projects not meeting a minimum scoring threshold of 45 points (60% of total available points).
- The Subcommittee will recommend development of a Corrective Action Plan for any projects scoring between 45 to 55 points (60-73% of total available points).
 - ✓ Projects recommended for corrective action must develop and share a Corrective Action Plan with HPAC by November 1, 2017. The Homeless Coordinator will assist projects with development of the Plan, and will provide technical assistance as needed. Additionally, HPAC will continually monitor the Plan and provide ongoing assistance with improvement efforts. If project has not demonstrated improvement before FY18 CoC process (as demonstrated by improved score), the project may be recommended for reallocation.

Selection of Renewal and New Projects

After considering all renewal projects and determining the need for reallocation of under-performing projects the Project Selection Subcommittee will recommend all remaining renewal projects for funding in the FY17 CoC competition. After renewals have been reviewed and recommended for funding, the Subcommittee will determine the amount of funding available for new projects using the formula provided below.

STEP 1:		\$458,394	Annual Renewal Demand
	+	\$24,085	Permanent Housing Bonus
	=	\$482,479	Total Available Funds
STEP 2:		\$482,479	Total Available Funds
SIEP Z.			
	-	\$xxx,xxx	Cost of Recommended Renewals
	=	\$ххх,ххх	Balance Available for New Projects

The Subcommittee will review the new project proposals, giving consideration to the score of each project, the geographic disbursement of projects, and whether the project addresses a critical community need that is currently unmet. The Subcommittee will select projects for funding until the available funding runs out. All remaining new projects will be rejected for funding.⁴

³ Reallocation: When funds are shifted from an existing renewal project to create new projects

⁴ Projects **selected for funding** will be recommended to HUD for funding in the FY17 CoC competition. Projects **rejected for funding** will not be recommended to HUD for funding in the FY17 COC competition.



FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Project Reallocation, Ranking and Selection Process Adopted August 4, 2017

Ranking of New and Renewal Projects

Once the Subcommittee has selected all new and renewal projects that will be recommended for funding, the Subcommittee will assign a rank⁵ and tier⁶ to each project. Projects will be placed in order from highest to lowest based on cumulative score, and assigned a rank in that order.

TIER 1: \$445,004 *94% of Annual Renewal Demand*

TIER 2: + \$57,878 6% of Annual Renewal Demand, and Permanent Housing Bonus

\$531,287 Total Available Funding

The Subcommittee retains the right to alter the initial ranking and tier placement for strategic reasons, if initial scoring is likely to result in any critical services gaps, including lack of services in a community or lack of services for a priority population.

PUBLIC MEETING AND HPAC ADOPTION

9/7: The Project Selection Subcommittee will bring its final recommendation regarding project reallocation, selection, rejection, and rank/tier to the full HPAC membership at a special public meeting on September 7, 2017. The draft recommendation will be posted on the HPAC website and emailed to the membership a minimum of 48-hours prior to the public meeting. The meeting will be publicly advertised on the HPAC website and through a press release to local media organizations. All members of the public and local agencies will be invited to provide public comment during the meeting.

Following public comment, the HPAC membership will make a final determination regarding which projects will be recommended to HUD for funding, and will hold a vote of all non-conflicted member organizations.

NOTIFICATION TO APPLICANTS

9/8: The Homeless Coordinator will send an email to each project applicant explaining whether their project was accepted or rejected. If rejected, the letter will explain the reason for the rejection. If accepted, the letter will explain the rank and tier assignment. In addition, all applicants may request copies of the scoring materials associated with their project, or a debrief with the Homeless Coordinator.

SOLO APPLICATIONS TO HUD

Eligible project applicants that attempted to participate in the CoC planning process in the CA-521 Davis/Woodland/Yolo County Continuum of Care, that believe they were denied the right to participate in a reasonable manner may submit an application to HUD and may be awarded a grant from HUD by following the procedure found in 24 CFR 578.35. Solo applicants must submit their project application to HUD by 7:59:59 p.m. eastern time, September 28,2017 which must include notification of rejection of the project in the local competition as attachment to the Solo Application's project application.

_

⁵ Project Rank: Once selected for funding, all projects must be placed in order of preference or "ranked".

⁶ **Project Tier:** Once ranked, projects must be placed in two tiers. Projects in tier 1 will be conditionally selected by HUD for funding. Projects in tier 2 will be selected by HUD in order of CoC score and project score until no more funds are available.



FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition

Project Reallocation, Ranking and Selection Process
Adopted August 4, 2017

Yolo CoC Scoring Rubric: Renewal Projects				
PROGRAM DESIG	iN			
Type of Project	Does the type of project (PSH, RRH, TH, SSO, HMIS) meet HUD priorities and demonstrate the ability to meet a local community need?	10	10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
Low Barriers	Does the project plan to operate using a low barriers model, by minimizing service participation requirements and preconditions (meaning that they do not screen out potential participants based on clients possessing (1) too little income, (2) active or history of substance use, (3) criminal record, with exception of state mandated restrictions, and (4) history of domestic violence)?	10	10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
Serving Priority and Vulnerable Populations	If PSH, does project serve exclusively the chronically homeless ⁷ , or prioritize the chronically homeless for beds as they turn over?	5	5 Pts: Prioritizes chronically homeless with bed turnover 3Pts: Demonstrates in recent APR that a minimum of 50% of clients were chronically homeless 0 Pts: Does not prioritize chronically homeless	
	If not PSH, does the project serve high rates of highly vulnerable populations (including veterans, people with a history of victimization or abuse, people with mental illness or substance use disorder, people with a criminal history, unaccompanied minors and/or transition aged-youth)?	_	Consider rates of each population served according to HMIS data. Also consider plan for outreach and engagement with vulnerable populations. 5 Pts: Excellent 4Pts: Strong 3Pts: Fair 2 Pts: Needs Work 1 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
			Points Sub-Total: 25	
	ORMANCE (Answers should be based on FY 1			
Housing Stability and Exits	If permanent supportive housing, do at least 80% of participants remain housed or exit to another permanent housing destination?	10	Consider HMIS data, as compared to other local projects. For victim service providers, consider data for a comparable database. May also consider supplemental responses from applicant regarding	

⁷ A person or household who is "chronically homeless" according to HUD includes an unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has either (1) been homeless continuously for a year or more, or (2) has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years. A disabling condition may include (1) a diagnosis of substance use disorder, (2) a serious mental illness, (3) a development disability, (4) a chronic physical illness, and (5) the co-occurrence of two or more of the previously mentioned conditions.



	If transitional housing, do at least 80% of homeless persons exit to permanent housing?	•	performance issues, Yolo County housing market, affordable housing availability and local vacancy rates. 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
Income	Does project demonstrate that at least 20% of participants experience an increase in financial resources at project exit, or from project entry to end of period measured?	10	Consider HMIS data, as compared to other local projects. For victim service providers, consider data for a comparable database. May also consider supplemental responses from applicant regarding performance issues. 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
Mainstream Benefits	Does the project demonstrate success in connecting participants with and ensuring participants mainstream resources (including Food Stamps, General Assistance, SSI, TANF, Unemployment, Veterans Benefits, Veterans Healthcare and Workforce Investment Act)?	10	Consider HMIS data, as compared to other local projects. For victim service providers, consider data for a comparable database. May also consider supplemental responses from applicant regarding performance issues. 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
Bed Utilization	Does the project routinely operate at 85% capacity according to quarterly bed utilization reports from previous funding year?	5	Consider HMIS data, as compared to other local projects. For victim service providers, consider data for a comparable database. May also consider supplemental responses from applicant regarding performance issues. 5 Pts: Excellent 4Pts: Strong 3Pts: Fair 2 Pts: Needs Work 1 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
			Points Sub-Total: 35
GRANT MANAGE	MENT (20 Points)		



FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Project Reallocation, Ranking and Selection Process

Adopted August 4, 2017

TOTAL AVAILABLE POINTS: 75

	Adopted Adgust 4, 2017			
HPAC Participation	Did agency (or sub recipient) staff participate in HPAC meetings (all HPAC and technical) and HPAC subcommittees during the past year? If new to the community, has the agency demonstrated a commitment to HPAC participation and partner engagement in the future?	10	Consider HPAC participation levels and supplemental responses. 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
Drawdown Rates and Fund Utilization	In the previous funding year, did the project draw down at least 95% of funds within 90 days of the project's expiration date? (determined using supplemental information from HUD)	5	Consider data from HUD. Also consider supplemental responses from applicant regarding any performance issues. 5 Pts: Excellent 4Pts: Strong 3Pts: Fair 2 Pts: Needs Work 1 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
			Points Sub-Total: 15	



Yolo CoC Scoring Rubric: New Projects				
PROGRAM DE		· tub.		
Type of Project	Does the type of project (PSH, RRH, TH, SSO, HMIS) meet HUD priorities and demonstrate the ability to meet a local community need?	10	10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
Low Barriers	Does the project plan to operate using a low barriers model, by minimizing service participation requirements and preconditions (meaning that they do not screen out potential participants based on clients possessing (1) too little income, (2) active or history of substance use, (3) criminal record, with exception of state mandated restrictions, and (4) history of domestic violence)?	10	10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
Serving Priority and Vulnerable Populations	If PSH, will project serve exclusively the chronically homeless, or prioritize the chronically homeless for beds as they turn over? If not PSH, does the project serve high rates of highly vulnerable populations (including veterans, people with a history of victimization or abuse, people with mental illness or substance use disorder, people with a criminal history, unaccompanied minors and/or	5	5 Pts: Serves exclusively chronically homeless 3Pts: Prioritizes chronically homeless with bed turnover 0 Pts: Does not prioritize chronically homeless Consider rates of each population served according to HMIS data. Also consider plan for outreach and engagement with vulnerable populations. 5 Pts: Excellent 4Pts: Strong 3Pts: Fair 2 Pts: Needs Work 1 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible	
	transition aged-youth)?		Points Sub-Total: 25	
PROGRAM PE	RFORMANCE		Tomics Sub-Total. 23	
Housing Stability and Exits	If permanent supportive housing, how does the project plan to retain participants or ensure that they exit to permanent housing? HUD Standard: 80% of participants remain housed or exit to another	10	Consider the information provided in the application to determine the likelihood that the project will meet the HUD standard: 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong	



2 noit-	<u> </u>	aopte	d August 4, 2017
	permanent housing destination		6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
	If rapid re-housing, how does the project plan to rapidly move participants into permanent housing? HUD Standard: 80% of participants remain housed or exit to permanent housing		
Income	How does the project plan to increase income for participants? HUD Standard: At least 20% of participants experience an increase in financial resources at project exit, or from project entry to end of period measured	10	Consider the information provided in the application to determine the likelihood that the project will meet the HUD standard: 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
Mainstream Benefits	How does the project plan to assist participants in accessing mainstream benefits (including Food Stamps, General Assistance, SSI, TANF, Unemployment, Veterans Benefits, Veterans Healthcare and Workforce Investment Act)? HUD Standard: At least 20% of participants experience an increase in financial resources at project exit, or from project entry to end of period measured	10	Consider the information provided in the application to determine the likelihood that the project will meet the HUD standard: 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
Bed Utilization	How does the project plan to quickly fill vacancies? HUD Standard: Projects operate at 85% capacity	5	Consider the information provided in the application to determine the likelihood that the project will meet the HUD standard: 5 Pts: Excellent 4Pts: Strong 3Pts: Fair 2 Pts: Needs Work 1 Pts: Poor
			0.00 = 11.1
			0 Pts: Terrible Points Sub-Total: 35



	• • •		.a , lagust 1, 2027
HPAC Participation	Did agency (or sub recipient) staff participate in HPAC meetings (all HPAC and technical) and HPAC subcommittees during the past year? If new to the community, has the agency demonstrated a commitment to HPAC participation and partner engagement in the future?	10	Consider HPAC participation levels and supplemental responses. 10 Pts: Excellent 8 Pts: Strong 6 Pts: Fair 4 Pts: Needs Work 2 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
Experience & Readiness	Does the applicant have experience with managing similar projects and with successful grant administration for federal funds? Will the project be able to begin drawing funds in a timely manner?	5	5 Pts: Excellent 4Pts: Strong 3Pts: Fair 2 Pts: Needs Work 1 Pts: Poor 0 Pts: Terrible
			Points Sub-Total: 75
			TOTAL AVAILABLE POINTS: 75