

San Mateo County Continuum of Care
2013 CoC Competition
PROJECT REVIEW AND RANKING PROCESS

Adopted 12.18.2013

I. Background on 2013 NOFA and Ranking Requirements

On November 22, 2013, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) published the *Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Assistance Program*. Applications are due to HUD by February 3, 2013.

The NOFA requires that each CoC conduct a transparent and objective process to review and rank all applications for renewal of existing projects and creation of new projects. Ranking of renewal projects must incorporate regularly collected data on project performance and effectiveness.

The final ranking of projects will be reflected on the CoC's Project Priority Listing and will impact the order and likelihood of funding. Due to federal funding cuts, all CoC's are required to place projects into Tier 1 or Tier 2. Tier 2 will be equal to 5% of the CoCs available funding amount (Annual Renewal Demand), which this year in San Mateo County is \$300,000 (5% of \$6 million). Projects in Tier 1 are guaranteed to be funded provided they meet HUD's threshold requirements. Projects in Tier 2 will be funded only if HUD has sufficient funds and if the CoC receives a high enough score on the Collaborative Application (Exhibit 1).

In addition, CoCs may take funds from existing grants to create new projects through re-allocation. Only two kinds of new re-allocation projects can be created:

- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) serving chronically homeless people;
- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) serving homeless families coming from streets or shelters

This document describes the San Mateo County CoC policies and process governing the review and ranking of projects in the 2013 competition, as well as the adopted policy for determining which projects are placed into Tier 2.

II. Rating and Ranking Process and Criteria

a. Adoption of Performance Standards

On July 12, 2013, the CoC Steering Committee adopted Project Performance Standards for all program types within the continuum (emergency shelter, short and long term transitional housing, permanent housing, rapid re-housing, services only with housing focus, services only with employment focus). These standards were developed by the Project Performance Subcommittee based on analysis of HMIS data and guided by HUD's standards as set forth in

HEARTH and the CoC Interim Regulation.

The Performance Standards are attached as **Attachment A**.

b. Solicitation of CoC Applications

On December 9, 2013, the CoC Lead Agency (Human Services Agency Center on Homelessness) held informational meetings to solicit applications for both new and renewal CoC projects. These meetings were broadly announced via email to the provider community. The announcement for new projects was also posted to the H.S.A. website. At the meeting, Center on Homelessness staff and consultant explained the application and review process and answered questions from potential applicants.

c. Application Process

- No later than December 16, renewal applicants will receive a Project Performance Report from the Center on Homelessness summarizing their progress in meeting the established performance standards as documented in their APR. This report provides each renewal project applicant the opportunity to provide any narrative explanation or clarification regarding why they did not meet any of the standards, as well as to identify any possible errors in the data. This document also includes supplemental narrative questions.
- By January 2, 2014, all applicants (new and renewal) must complete and submit their Project Application(s) (Exhibit 2) in e-snaps. Renewal applicants must also submit their completed Project Performance Reports including any clarifications and responses to the supplemental narrative.

d. Review, Ranking and Tiering Process

- The Center on Homelessness will convene an unbiased and non-conflicted Review Panel composed of representatives from neutral (non-applicant) organizations. The Panel may include staff from the County of San Mateo, San Mateo cities and towns, funders and non-profit housing and social services organizations.
- The Review Panel will meet on January 10, 2014 to determine final ranking of the projects.
- Prior to the meeting, the Center on Homelessness staff will calculate the preliminary score for all renewal applicants using the objective Scoring Factors in **Attachment B**. The preliminary scores will be distributed to the Review Panel prior to the meeting.
- Prior to the meeting, the Panel will receive copies of all new project applications for review and scoring. New project applications will be scored using the scoring factors in **Attachment C**.

- At the meeting, the Review Panel will determine the final order of ranking of projects in accordance with the Ranking and Tiering Policy in **Attachment D**.
- The rankings will be brought to the Continuum of Care Steering Committee for approval on January 17, 2014.
- All applicants will be notified on January 17, 2014 whether their project is being included in the application as well as their rank on the Project Priority listing.
- Applicants may appeal any of the following decisions of the CoC Steering Committee:
 - Placement of project into Tier 2
 - Reduction of renewal grant amount (i.e. renewal grant partially re-allocated to a new project)
 - Elimination of renewal grant (i.e. entire grant re-allocated to a new project)

Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Center on Homelessness no later than 5:00 p.m. on January 23, 2014. Appeals will be heard by a panel of three non-conflicted members of the CoC Steering Committee who did not serve on the review panel. The decision of the appeal panel is final.

ATTACHMENT A

Performance Standards as Adopted July 12, 2013

Measures		Emergency Shelter	Short-Term TH	Long-Term TH	Permanent Supportive Housing	Rapid Re-Housing	Services Only - Housing Related	Services Only – Employment
1	Exit to Permanent Housing Percent of all leavers who exited to a permanent destination	20%	40%	65%	NA	80%	65%	40%
2	Maintain PH > 6 Months Percent of all participants who stayed more than 6 months	NA	NA	NA	95%	60%	NA	NA
3	Exit with Employment Income Percent of adult leavers who exited with employment income	10%	20%	20%	NA	20%	20%	20%
4	Exit with Increased Income Percent of adult leavers who exited with increased income from all sources	10%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
5	Occupancy Average daily bed/unit/ or program slot utilization	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
6	CoC Grant Spending Percentage of CoC award spent in most recently completed yr	95%	95%	95%	90%	95%	95%	95%
7	HMIS Data Quality Percentage of null/missing and don't know/refused values	Less than 10%	Less than 10%	Less than 10%	Less than 10%	Less than 10%	Less than 10%	Less than 10%

**ATTACHMENT B
SCORING FACTORS FOR RENEWAL PROJECTS**

Scoring Factor		Maximum and Minimum Scores	
		TH and SSO	PSH
1	Exits to Permanent Housing	Meets Standard = 5 points Within 50% of Standard = 3 points Below 50% of Standard = 1 point	Not Applicable
2	Maintain Housing > 6 Months	Not Applicable	Meets Standard = 5 points Within 50% of Standard = 3 points Below 50% of Standard = 1 point
3	Exit With Employment Income	Meets Standard = 5 points Within 50% of Standard = 3 points Below 50% of Standard = 1 point	Not Applicable
4	Exit With Increased Income	Meets Standard = 5 points Within 50% of Standard = 3 points Below 50% of Standard = 1 point	
5	Occupancy	Meets Standard = 5 points Within 50% of Standard = 3 points Below 50% of Standard = 1 point	
6.	CoC Grant Spending	Meets Standard = 5 points Within 50% of Standard = 3 points Below 50% of Standard = 1 point	
7.	HMIS Data Quality	All Data Elements Less Than 10% Missing/Don't Now = 5 points 1-2 Data Elements More Than 10% Missing/Don't Know = 3 points More Than 2 Data Elements More Than 10% Missing/Don't Know = 1 point	
8.	Leverage	Greater than 300 % of HUD CoC request = 5 points Between 150% and 300% of HUD CoC request = 3 points Below 150% of HUD CoC request = 1 point	
9.	Match	Application documents required 25% match = 5 points Application does not document required match = 0 points	
10.	Cost Effectiveness	Cost per unit/person served is reasonable for project type = 5 points Cost per unit/person served is not reasonable for project type = 2 points	
11.	Plan to Meet HEARTH Objectives	Quality of plan to reduce length of homelessness and returns to homelessness High = 5 points Medium = 3 points Low = 1 point	
12.	HUD Findings	Project has no outstanding or unresolved HUD monitoring findings = 5 points Project has outstanding or unresolved HUD monitoring findings = 0 points	
13	APR Submission	Most Recent APR Submitted On Time = 5 points Most Recent APR not submitted on Time = 0 points	
14	HUD Policy Priorities	Not Applicable	Permanent Housing = 5 points
		Targets a Priority Population: Chronically Homeless, Youth or Veterans = 3 points	
Maximum Score		63	63

**ATTACHMENT C
SCORING FACTORS FOR NEW PROJECTS**

Factor	Maximum Score
1. Alignment with HUD and CoC Priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is aligned with HUD’s priorities as laid out in the 2013 NOFA • Project advances the goals established in the San Mateo County HOPE Plan and CoC Plan. 	6
2. Project Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate housing type and location for the target population is proposed • Appropriate outreach plan is proposed • Appropriate services are available and accessible • Project coordinates/collaborates with existing services and programs 	12
3. Project Impact: Project design advances the objectives set forth in HEARTH and in the 2013 CoC NOFA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces length of time people are homeless • Reduces returns to homelessness • Assists participants to increase income • Adopts a Housing First approach (if permanent housing) • Connects participants to mainstream programs and services 	15
4. Applicant Capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience serving target population • Experience managing federal grants • Experience administering programs similar to the one proposed 	15
5. Financial Feasibility and Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs appear reasonable and adequate to support proposed program • Match requirement is met • Additional resources leveraged 	15
TOTAL	63

**ATTACHMENT D
RANKING AND TIERING POLICIES**

1. Ranking Policy

In determining the rank order of projects, the Review Panel will adhere to the following policies:

- a. Projects will be ordered in accordance with their scores as set forth in Attachment B (for renewal projects) and Attachment C (for new projects).
- b. Projects falling into Tier 1 will be submitted on the Project Priority list in the order in which they are ranked.
- c. Projects falling into Tier 2 will be ranked according to the policies set forth in below in Section 3 and 4.

2. Tier Two Selection Priorities as Established in the NOFA

In this year's NOFA, HUD has set forth the selection priorities for Tier 2 projects as follows:

1. Permanent Housing (PH) renewal projects
2. New permanent housing projects created through re-allocation
3. New rapid re-housing projects created through re-allocation
4. Transitional Housing (TH) renewal projects
5. CoC planning grants
6. UFA costs (not applicable for San Mateo County)
7. Centralized intake and assessment renewal projects ((not applicable for San Mateo County)
8. HMIS renewal projects (not applicable for San Mateo County)
9. Support services only (SSO) renewal projects

If any Tier 2 funding is available, HUD will begin with the top scoring Continuum and fund all their category 1 projects (PH renewals), then move on to the next Continuum's priority 1 projects and so on. If any funding is left after all renewal PH projects for all CoCs have been funded, HUD will then start again with the top scoring Continuum and fund their category 2 projects (new PH created through re-allocation) and continue through the CoCs until funding has been exhausted. If all category 2 projects are funded, HUD will then move on to category 3, and so on.

While it is unknown how much funding HUD will have available for Tier 2, it is very unlikely that there will be enough to fund all projects for all CoCs in all selection priority categories. Projects in the lower categories (such as transitional housing and services only) are highly unlikely to receive funding, regardless of how well a CoC scores. Projects in the higher categories

(permanent housing renewals and new permanent housing created through re-allocation) are more likely to be funded, though there is no guarantee.

3. San Mateo County Tier 2 Policy

Once the rank order of projects has been determined (see Section 1), any TH or SSO projects falling into Tier 2 will be re-allocated to create new permanent housing or rapid-re-housing to be placed in Tier 2. This will provide San Mateo County with the greatest chance of preserving our CoC funding, since new PH projects will be much higher on the selection priority list.

4. Re-Allocation Policy

In addition to the above, the Review Panel will examine the spending history of ALL renewal projects placed in Tier 1 to determine if any grants should be reduced. Any grants that have significant under spending will be candidates to have their grant amount reduced. Funds captured from grants that are reduced will be used to fund new permanent housing or rapid-re-housing project(s), which can be placed either in Tier 1 or Tier 2.

Renewal applicants may request to voluntarily re-allocate one or more of their grants, either in whole or in part. If re-allocating in part, the applicant's grant will be reduced by the amount requested and re-allocated to a new PH or RRH project. If an applicant wishes to voluntarily re-allocate in whole, with the purpose of replacing their existing project with a new PH or RRH project, the new project will be ranked and scored according to the policies outlined in this document. There is no guarantee that voluntarily re-allocated projects will be placed in Tier 1.