

FY2017 Cumberland/Allegany County Continuum of Care Competition Ranking Policies

Eligibility

In order to be submitted to HUD for renewal, projects in the Cumberland/Allegany County Continuum of Care seeking renewal funding must meet the following basic eligibility criteria:

- 1) Submit completed renewal application and additional required documents to HRDC as outlined in this document.
- 2) Meet the threshold score of at least 70% on their renewal project application or have been approved by the Appeals Committee to still be submitted for renewal if under threshold score.
- 3) Meet the HUD application deadlines (ie, entry into eSNAPS) set by the CoC.
- 4) Projects that were required by the CoC to participate in technical assistance in previous competition years must be compliant with all requirements in the projects' technical assistance plan.
- 5) Meet all HUD eligibility criteria, as outlined in the FY2017 CoC Program NOFA (to be released), the July 2012 CoC Program Interim HEARTH Regulations, and other official documents published by HUD.

Exclusion or Removal from Project Ranking List

The Cumberland/Allegany County CoC reserves the right to exclude or remove a renewal project from the project ranking list, and consequently not submit a project for renewal funding, in the event of written notification from the local HUD Field Office that the project has been out of compliance with regulatory or programmatic requirements and has made no progress on any corrective actions as required by HUD. Any renewal projects excluded or removed from the project ranking list will be reallocated to a new project(s).

FY2017 Cumberland/Allegany County CoC Project Ranking Policies

Projects seeking CoC funding in the FY2017 competition will be ranked in the following order:

- 1) **The CoC's renewal infrastructure projects will be ranked first, in the following order:**
 - a. HMIS renewal projects in by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest.
 - b. SSO projects dedicated to Coordinated Assessment Model (CAM) by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest.
- 2) **New project(s) created via reallocation in FY2017 in the following order:**
 - A. *PH-PSH project(s) in the following order:*
 - i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.
 - ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.
 - B. *PH-RRH project(s) in the following order:*
 - i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application
 - ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.

- C. *TH-RRH combination project(s) in the following order:*
- i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.
 - ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.

**NOTE: The CoC Board may determine it will not consider new applications for this project type.*

- D. *Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects dedicated for Coordinated Entry in the following order:*
- i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.
 - ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.

**NOTE: The CoC Board may determine it will not consider new applications for this project type.*

3) New Permanent Housing Bonus Project(s) ranked in the following order:

- i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.
- ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.

4) First time renewal projects ranked in the following order:

- i. First time renewal PH-PSH project(s) by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest.
- ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.
- iii. First time renewal PH-RRH project(s) by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest.
- iv. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time application was submitted to, from first submitted to last.

5) Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects for which at least 50% of the clients served over the last year (Jan – Dec 2016) were chronically homeless ranked by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

6) Remaining Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects and all Rapid Rehousing (RRH) by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

7) All Transitional Housing (TH) projects by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

8) All Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects not designated for Coordinated Entry (CAM) by the overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

Tie-Breaking Criteria for Ranking Policies 5 through 8

Tie-breakers for ranking policies 5 through 8 will be applied in the following order:

1. First tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 2A of the project-specific housing performance in the local application

2. Second tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 2B of the project-specific housing performance in the local application
3. Third tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 1A of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of cash income)
4. Fourth tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 1B of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of non-cash income)

Project-Specific Housing Performance

“Project-specific housing performance” refers to scored component #2 of the local application. This component is further divided into 2 sub-components (parts A and B). The specific performance criteria being measured depends upon the project type, as different project types have different housing-focused performance expectations.

Projects that Straddle Tier 1/Tier 2

If a project, once listed in ranked order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line, the following policy will apply: If a project is straddling the line – that is, a portion of the project budget falls within Tier 1 and a portion falls within Tier 2 – that project will be asked if the project would still be feasible if it was only funded for the amount in Tier 1.

1. If the project indicates that it would still be feasible at the reduced amount, it will be required to submit in writing how the project would remain feasible.
 2. The Values & Funding Priorities Committee will review the feasibility plan, and decide whether the project would be feasible at the reduced amount. If the Committee decides it will be feasible, the project will be submitted as is, straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line.
 3. If the Committee decides that the project would not be feasible at the reduced amount, or if the project itself indicates that it would not be feasible at the reduced amount, that project will be dropped down so that it wholly fits into Tier 2, and the next ranked project will have the same opportunity to show feasibility if straddling the line.
 4. This process will continue until the following are realized:
 - a. All Tier 1 funds are allocated; OR
- b. The amount of funds remaining in Tier 1 are a negligible amount.

If this occurs, the CoC retains the discretion to allocate the remaining funds to another project in Tier 1 that can accept additional funds. The Collaborative Applicant will make a recommendation on this allocation; this recommendation will be reviewed and approved by the CoC Board before implementing.

Renewal Project Threshold Score

All projects applying for renewal funding will be evaluated and scored on a given point scale which will be given in the FY2017 CoC Application Policies. Renewal projects must score at least 70% of the points possible in order to be placed on the project ranking list. Renewal projects that do not score at least 70% will be able to submit an appeal in accordance with the Appeals Policy.

Renewal Project Appeals

Renewal projects that score less than the amount of points required for passing threshold may submit an appeal to the Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee will review the appeal and make a recommendation to the CoC Board on whether or not the appeal should be granted. If the appeal is granted, the project will be submitted for funding and placed on the project ranking list in accordance

with the ranking policies given above. If an appeal is not granted, the project will be reallocated to a new project(s). The reallocated funds will be available for organizations to apply for via a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP). Details on the appeals policy may be found the Appeals Policy.

Final Ranking List and Recommendation

Following the submission, review, and scoring of all renewal and new project applications, a preliminary project ranking list will be developed in accordance with the above policies. This ranking list, with projects identified by name and type, will be reviewed by the Values & Funding Priorities Committee. The Values & Funding Priority Committee may recommend to the CoC board that a project(s) that would have been in Tier 2 because of the ranking policies instead be placed into Tier 1. If the Committee chooses to move a Tier 2 project up to Tier 1, it will need to provide rationale for the recommendation. The Committee will present its final recommended project ranking list to the CoC board in accordance with the timeframe required by HUD. The CoC board will make the final decision on the project ranking list.

Placement of Permanent Housing Bonus Project(s)

Following the submission, review, and scoring of all renewal and new project applications, a preliminary project ranking list will be developed in accordance with the above policies. This ranking list, with projects identified by name and type, will be reviewed by the Rating and Ranking Committee. The Rating & Ranking Priorities may recommend to the CoC Board that some or all of the new Permanent Housing Bonus project(s) that would have been placed in Tier 1 (ranking policy #3) instead be placed into Tier 2. If the Committee chooses to recommend this action, it will need to provide rationale for the recommendation. The Committee will present this recommendation to the CoC Board. The CoC Board will make the final decision.

- ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.
-
- c. TH-RRH combination project(s) in the following order: i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.
- ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.
- • *NOTE: The CoC Board may determine it will not consider new applications for this project type.*
-
- d. Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects dedicated for Coordinated Entry in the following order: i. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.
- ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.
- • *NOTE: The CoC Board may determine it will not consider new applications for this project type.*
-
-

3. New Permanent Housing Bonus Project(s) ranked in the following order: a. Highest overall percentage scored on the application.

b. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time the application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.

- 4. First time renewal projects in in the following order: a. First time renewal PH-PSH project(s) by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest. i. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.
-
- b. First time renewal PH-RRH project(s) by overall percentage scored on the application, from highest to lowest. i. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last.
-
-

5. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects for which at least 50% of the clients served over the last year (Jan – Dec 2016) were chronically homeless ranked by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

6. Remaining Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects and all Rapid Rehousing (RRH) by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

7. All Transitional Housing (TH) projects by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

8. All Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects not designated for Coordinated Entry (CAM) by the overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.

Tie-Breaking Criteria for Ranking Policies 5 through 8

Tie-breakers for ranking policies 5 through 8 will be applied in the following order:

1. First tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 2A of the project-specific housing performance in the local application
2. Second tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 2B of the project-specific housing performance in the local application
3. Third tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 1A of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of cash income)

3

4. Fourth tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 1B of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of non-cash income)

Project-Specific Housing Performance

“Project-specific housing performance” refers to scored component #2 of the local application. This component is further divided into 2 sub-components (parts A and B). The specific performance criteria being measured depends upon the project type, as different project types have different housing-focused performance expectations.

Projects that Straddle Tier 1/Tier 2

If a project, once listed in ranked order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line, the following policy will apply: If a project is straddling the line – that is, a portion of the project budget falls within Tier 1 and a portion falls within Tier 2 – that project will be asked if the project would still be feasible if it was only funded for the amount in Tier 1.

1. If the project indicates that it would still be feasible at the reduced amount, it will be required to submit in writing how the project would remain feasible.
2. The Values & Funding Priorities Committee will review the feasibility plan, and decide whether the project would be feasible at the reduced amount. If the Committee decides it will be feasible, the project will be submitted as is, straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line.
3. If the Committee decides that the project would not be feasible at the reduced amount, or if the project itself indicates that it would not be feasible at the reduced amount, that project will be dropped down so that it wholly fits into Tier 2, and the next ranked project will have the same opportunity to show feasibility if straddling the line.
 4. This process will continue until the following are realized: a. All Tier 1 funds are allocated; OR
 - b. The amount of funds remaining in Tier 1 are a negligible amount. If this occurs, the CoC retains the discretion to allocate the remaining funds to another project in Tier 1 that can accept additional funds. The Collaborative Applicant will make a recommendation on this allocation; this recommendation will be reviewed and approved by the CoC Board before implementing.

Renewal Project Threshold Score

All projects applying for renewal funding will be evaluated and scored on a given point scale which will be given in the FY2017 CoC Application Policies. Renewal projects must score at least 70% of the points possible in order to be placed on the project ranking list. Renewal projects that do not score at least 70% will be able to submit an appeal in accordance with the Appeals Policy.

Renewal Project Appeals

Renewal projects that score less than the amount of points required for passing threshold may submit an appeal to the Appeals Committee. The Appeals Committee will review the appeal and make a recommendation to the CoC Board on whether or not the appeal should be granted. If the appeal is granted, the project will be submitted for funding and placed on the project ranking list in accordance with the ranking policies given above. If an appeal is not granted, the project will be reallocated to a new project(s). The reallocated funds will be available for organizations to apply for via a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP). Details on the appeals policy may be found the Appeals Policy.

Policy Review Post NOFA Release

The Cumberland/Allegany County CoC Board approved the preliminary ranking policies on June 5, 2017 , prior to the release of the FY2017 CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). The preliminary policies were approved noting that adjustments may need to be made following the release of the FY2017 NOFA to ensure the policies aligned with, and did not contradict, the NOFA.