

Heading Home Ramsey County Governing Board Ranking process

2016 CoC Program Review and Rank Process

On July 15, 2016 HUD released the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the FY 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition. The Priority listing must be submitted in E-Snaps by the CoC coordinator by the September 14, 2016 deadline.

This document outlines the funding and ranking process established by the Ramsey County Continuum of Care (CoC) for the 2016 Consolidated Continuum of Care Application.

Ramsey County CoC (MN-501) has adopted the following ranking and prioritization process will occur in the 2016 NOFA process. These conditions are designed to inform Ranking Committee deliberations and provide all applicants and renewing projects with clarity regarding how ranking and prioritization may occur.

Eligibility

To be eligible for ranking and prioritization process, all projects (new and renewal) must pass all facets of the CoC Application process including:

Projects must meet all HUD eligibility criteria, as outlined in the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year 2016 Continuum of Care Competition;

- Projects must submit the Intent to Apply and Threshold Assessment by July 22, 2016
- Projects must submit a complete Project Application for ranking in to the CoC Coordinator by August 15, 2016, and final Project Application in eSnaps by August 26, 2016.
- Project must complete the HUD threshold requirements. Projects with outstanding HUD audit findings, history of ineligible participants, evidence of untimely expenditures, or financial management concerns, may be eliminated from competition; and
- Project Applicants must have a DUNS # and complete or renew registration in SAM to compete.

Projects that do not meet all the criteria outlined above will be defunded via reallocation in the 2016 competition.

GUIDEANCE ON REQUIRED TIERS

HUD has made \$1.89 billion available in the FY16 CoC Competition and expects to have sufficient funding for all renewal projects. However, CoC's are still required to review and rank all projects, except Planning, into two tiers (Tier 1 and Tier 2). Tier 1 will equal 93% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). Tier 2 will equal 7% of the CoC's ARD plus eligible Bonus Project(s). The Planning Grant is not ranked.

- Tier 1 = \$6,300,400
- Tier 2 = 7% (\$474,223) + Potential Bonus (\$246,184) based on FPRN (5%)
- Planning Grant= tbd by August 2, 2016 per HUD
- Total Available request amount ARD = \$6,773,514

Projects will be able to straddle Tier 1 and Tier 2 in this year's competition. CoC score and project score will determine which projects from Tier 2 will be conditionally selected. HUD will award a point value to projects in Tier 2 using a 100 point scale as outlined below:

- CoC Score 60 points;
- Ranking 20 points based on HUD formula;
- Project type 10 points for PH (PSH & RRH) renewals, HMIS CES and TH Youth, 3 pts for TH (non-youth), and 1 pt for SSO; and
- Commitment to HUD Policies 10 points (low barrier, rapid placement, Housing First, CES – HMIS and CES projects automatically receive pts.)

Prioritization of New Projects

There are four different types of projects that can be funded as new projects in the 2016 NOFA. On July 15, 2016, the CoC Governing Board defined how these potential projects will be prioritized.

HMIS

Heading Home Ramsey will guarantee funding for the two current HMIS projects, totaling \$108,686. In order to increase the functionality of HMIS and provide crucial data for our community, it was agreed by the statewide HMIS Governing Board and the Institute Community Alliance (ICA) that all continuums will allocate 2% of their FY 2016 annual renewal demand (ARD) to fund HMIS projects. Thus, our community will assure an additional \$30,597 for an HMIS expansion project. In total **Heading Home Ramsey will ensure an allocation of \$139,283 (2% FY2016 ARD) for HMIS projects in the 2016 CoC program competition.**

Coordinated Entry

Identifying a need for increased support for Coordinated Entry within HHR, **the Governing Board guarantees \$203,238 (3% FY2016 ARD) allocation for the funding of existing and new Coordinated Entry projects within the 2016 program competition.** Current projects total \$122,047 (1.8% FY2016 ARD) and will be refunded. The remaining \$81,191 (1.2% FY2016 ARD) will be appropriate for new projects and expansions.

Populations and Project Types (PHS/RRH)

In accordance with HHR's recommendation to the Minnesota Housing and Finance Agency based off the 2016 HIC and PIT results, the Governing Board has prioritized populations and their respective project types for the 2016 CoC Program Competition as follows:

1. **Families**
 - a. **Permanent Supportive Housing Projects**
 - b. **Rapid Rehousing Projects**
2. **Youth**
 - a. **Transitional Housing Projects**
 - b. **Permanent Supportive Housing Projects**
3. **Singles**
 - a. **Rapid Rehousing Projects**
 - b. **Permanent Supportive Housing Projects**

Score tool approved by the Heading Home Ramsey Governing Board on July 15, 2016.

Heading Home Ramsey County CoC Project Evaluation

Qualifying Requirements: Projects must meet the Qualifying Criteria to be considered for funding.

Criterion	Ineligible	✓	Eligible	✓
Eligible applicant	Entity is <i>not</i> a nonprofit organization, state, local government, or instrumentality of a state and local government, or public housing agencies, as such term is defined in 24 CFR 5.100, without limitation or exclusion. (For-profit entities are not eligible to apply for grants or to be sub-recipients of grant funds.)		Nonprofit organizations, states, local governments, and instrumentalities of state and local governments, and public housing agencies, as such term is defined in 24 CFR 5.100, without limitation or exclusion.	
Eligible population	Does <i>not</i> meet HUD requirements		Meets HUD requirements	
Submission deadline¹	Project application is submitted to CoC coordinator <u>after</u> deadline.		Project application is submitted to CoC coordinator <u>by</u> deadline.	
HMIS and Coordinated Entry* <i>* CE is a comprehensive initial assessment of individual/family housing and service needs, and coordinates intake into appropriate housing and services</i>	Project <u>does not</u> have the capacity nor an acceptable plan to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Entry (CE) Renewal project <u>has not</u> demonstrated minimally acceptable participation in HMIS (future: CE system)		Project has the capacity and an acceptable plan to participate fully in HMIS and the CoC's Coordinated Entry (CE) Renewal project has demonstrated minimally acceptable participation in HMIS (future: CE system)	
Financial audit	Most recent audit and management letter is <u>not</u> provided or contains significant adverse or disclosures /findings that reviewers determine should preclude applicant from inclusion in application.		Most recent annual audited financial and year-to-date financial and management letter is provided and no significant findings are identified.	
Financial match	No plan or inadequate plan in place to meet match of 25% for categories required by HUD		Plan in place to meet HUD-required match of 25% or more for categories required by HUD	
Administrative Costs	Administrative costs equal 7% or more of total project budget.		Administrative costs equal less than 7% of total project budget.	
K-12 Education and Early Childhood Development	Serving families and have not adopted Ramsey County policy on Education and Early Childhood Development		Serving families and have adopted Ramsey County policy on Education and Early Childhood Development and have staff in place to ensure children are screened, have early intervention and/or enrolled in and attending school and/or Early Childhood Education Programs	

Criterion	Ineligible	✓	Eligible	✓
Organizational capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization does <u>not</u> have a mission/purpose statement and bylaws that govern operations • Organization <u>does not</u> have an active governing board (e. g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or plan to recruit someone) • Organization <u>does not</u> have clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members • Organization does not have adequate level & 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization has a mission/purpose statement and bylaws that govern operations • Organization has an active governing board (e. g. Board of Directors) that includes at least one member who is homeless or formerly homeless (or plan to recruit someone) • Organization has clear policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest for board members • Organization has adequate level & expertise in staffing 	

¹ Exceptions to this requirement will only be made to projects that have faced dire circumstance and have sought and gained permission from their local CoC coordinator to submit late.

	expertise in staffing		
Ability to administer HUD contract	No/Limited or poor prior experience with state/federal contracts.		Adequate prior experience with state/federal contracts.

Measures	Low	Mid	High
Service Model			
Low Barrier Program eligibility (-1, 0, 2)	Indicates that clients are not screened out from accessing program in 0 or 1 of the options listed in Section 3B.4.b of the Project Application.	Indicates that clients are not screened out from accessing program in 2 or 3 of the options listed in Section 3B.4.b of the Project Application.	Indicates that clients are not screened out from accessing program in all 4 options listed in Section 3B.4.b of the Project Application.
Housing First (-1/0/2)	No, as indicated by 3B.4.d of project application, and has 6 or fewer boxes checked in sections 3B.4.b & c	No, as indicated by 3B.4.d of project application, but has at least 7 boxes checked in sections 3B.4.b & c	Yes, as indicated by 3B.4.d of project application
Leverage <i>HUD awards the COC extra points if the sum of all project leverage is >= 150% (-1/0/1)</i>	Project leverages 0-139%	Project leverages 140-150%	Project leverages more than 150%
Reallocation			
Voluntary Reallocation (0, 1, 2)	Project does not or cannot reallocate funds voluntarily	Project with acceptable performance reallocates up to 1-3% to fund a new project voluntarily and without reducing housing units	Project with acceptable performance reallocates more than 3% to fund a new project voluntarily and without reducing housing units
Coordinated Entry Participation			
Active Participation in Coordinated Entry (0, 0, 0)	Attendance in CE planning meetings below 40% <u>OR</u> absence of any of the following: adoption of CE policies, referrals accepted only through CE, reports all openings to waitlist manager, CoC-approved published written standards	Occasional (40-74%) attendance in CE planning meetings, adoption of CE policies, referrals accepted only through CE, reports all openings to waitlist manager, CoC-approved published written standards	Regular (75% or greater) attendance in CE planning meetings, adoption of CE policies, referrals accepted only through CE, reports all openings to waitlist manager, CoC-approved published written standards
Timeliness of Referral to Housing (0, 0, 0)	Housed at higher than rate of current average (survey needed)	Housed at rate of current average (survey needed)	Housed in 30 days or less from time of referral
CE Referral denials (0, 0, 0)	More than 26% denials outside of Program's CoC-approved published written standards	11-25% denials outside of Program's CoC-approved published written standards	Less than 10% denials outside of Program's CoC-approved published written standards
Project Performance—Operations (renewal projects only)			
Bed utilization <i>No HUD stds; based on historical #s (0/1/2)</i>	74% or less project beds	75-89% of project beds	90% or more of project beds
Funding management: unspent funds (-1/0/1)	Spent 89% or less of grant award	Spent 90-97% of grant award	Spent 98% or more of grant award
Funding management: drawdowns (-1/0/1)	Drawdowns occur less than quarterly	Drawdowns occur at least quarterly	Drawdowns occur monthly
HMIS data quality (-1/0/1) <i>Based on MN HMIS minimal</i>	91% or less completed values for the Universal Data	92-97% completed values for the Universal Data Elements	98% or more completed values for the Universal Data

<i>targets and goals</i>	Elements		Elements
Measures	Low	Mid	High
Project Performance— Program, Permanent Only			
Chronic (-1/1/3)	None of CoC-funded units are prioritized to serve chronically homeless households.	1-74% of COC-funded units or services are prioritized to serve chronically homeless households.	75% or more of COC-funded units or services are prioritized to serve chronically homeless households.
Housing stability: 6 months (0/1/2)	79% or less	80-86% (2013 HUD target=80%)	87% or more (2013 HC target=87%)
Exits to permanent destinations (-1/1/2) <i>Low/minimum=2012 actuals</i>	79% or less ²	80-82	83% or more
Maintain or Increase Income from Employment (0/1/2)	0-9%	10-19%	20% or more
Maintain or Increase in Income (-1/1/2)	0-59%	60-65%	66% or more
Return to Homelessness (0, 0, 0)	More than 41% of clients served return to homelessness	21-40% of clients served return to homelessness	Less than 20% of clients served return to homelessness
Project Performance— Program, Rapid Re-Housing/Transitional Housing			
Exits to permanent housing on or before 24 months (-1/1/2)	0-79% ³ (HUD target=65%)	80-83% (HC target=75%)	84% or more
Maintain or Increase Income from Employment (-1/1/2)	0-39%	40-50%	51% or more
Maintain or Increase in Income (-1/1/2)	0-59%	60-65%	66% or more
Return to Homelessness (0, 0, 0)	More than 41% of clients served return to homelessness	21-40% of clients served return to homelessness	Less than 20% of clients served return to homelessness

Scoring & Ranking Process:

² Percentages changed by ranking committee to match HUD's new standards.

³ Percentages changed by ranking committee to match HUD's new standards.

The following describes the process used by the ranking committee to score and rank projects for 2016 CoC funding. It should be noted that the Ranking Committee used “scoring” and “ranking” as two distinct steps. Scoring informed but did not dictate the final ranking decisions. Where ranking and scoring did not correlate, the Ranking Committee provided comments to indicate why the project was ranked in their position.

RANKING PROCESS

- The CoC Ranking Committee will thoroughly review each project during the ranking process utilizing the approved FY2016 CoC Scoring Tool. Projects will be assigned a score based on the following categories(examples):
 - a. Leverage
 - b. Project Quality Threshold
 - c. HUD Priorities
 - d. CoC Participation
 - e. Service Plan
 - f. Performance
 - g. HMIS
- The CoC Performance Evaluator will use the approved score tool and send each project applicant their CY2015 score on July 29, 2016. Project Applicants will be provided 2 weeks to provide dispute of the scores and invite feedback/narrative regarding the circumstances of their scores.
- Based on feedback (verified information either negative or positive affecting score) due by August 12, 2016, the Ranking committee will receive all narrative information for ranking purposes.
- Based on final score, projects will be ranked in order of priority, funding strategies, and other considerations. The CoC may reject projects due to limited funding, project eligibility, project score or significant concern for the projects inability to meet HUD thresholds. Any project applicant being rejected by the CoC for inclusion will be notified in writing outside of eSnaps 15 days prior to the application deadline and may submit a solo application to HUD by the August 30, 2016 deadline. Rejected applicants may submit a letter of appeals to the CoC within 2 business days of notification of rejection. The CoC anticipates notifying all projects of inclusion or rejection by 5 PM on August 26, 2016.
- The final Ranking Committee recommendation will go to the full CoC for vote by August 26, 2016 (outside GB meeting – will need e-mail vote)

Project Application Score tool:

Preliminary work took place to update the FY2016 Project Evaluation score tool and Ramsey County priority using 2015 PIT/HIC/Unmet need and Coordinated Entry data. On July 15, 2016 the Heading Home Ramsey Governance Board approved the Project Evaluation score tool and the 2016 Priority list. The score tool includes data from Project Applicants most recent Annual Progress Report (APR) data, Project pre-application, and Project Application reports. Once the NOFA was published the Heading Home Ramsey Governance Board assigned a task force to make final tweaks to the score tool based on additional recommendations and appointed a neutral Review and Rank process and committee. The final draft of the score tool and process was distributed to the Ramsey County CoC and posted on the Heading Home Ramsey website.

Pre-Application/Letter of Intent process:

New in 2016, a Pre-Application - Letter of Intent (LOI) is due on July 22, 2016 for all New and Renewal applicants. The pre-application will be used in a few ways:

1. Heading Home Ramsey approved Ranking committee members will use this as a Project Application overview document for each project, along with the Project Application itself once complete.
2. For new potential PH Bonus project applicants, this will be the starting point for the Review and Ranking committee to make a recommendation, based on priorities, for which projects will be selected move forward & complete the full New Project Applications for this potential new bonus fund opportunity.

Review & Ranking Overview

- After the NOFA is released, the scoring document is updated to address any new priority elements of the NOFA. All changes are approved by the Heading Home Ramsey Governing Board at the June meeting. The Governing Board has may give approval authority to the Heading Home Ramsey Ranking Committee for changes to the scoring tool if timelines don't allow waiting until the next Governing Board meeting.
- A notice will be sent via email to all project applicants when the NOFA is released with initial timelines, due dates and the updated scoring tool.
- All projects will submit applications to the Ramsey County Coordinator, including a HUD project application and all required attachments (as detailed in e-mail correspondence). All documents should be submitted electronically to Laura DeRosier at laura.derosier@co.ramsey.mn.us Projects may be allowed to submit after the due date without penalty only with the written permission of the Ramsey Coordinator.
- Ramsey County CoC Coordinator and State CoC Team conduct technical review of Project Applications and conduct initial scoring. In addition to project applications, the following items are used to inform scoring:
 - Project APR data from HMIS
 - Organizational Audit
 - Recent HUD audits and findings
 - LOCCS Drawdown and unspent funds
 - Project Educational and Early Childhood documents (families/youth)
- Projects are invited to amend applications based upon initial scoring. After the applications have been scored, the Performance Evaluator, Zachary Hylton will send to each project applicant to review their score. Amended applications are reviewed and scoring is adjusted. Where scoring is not adjusted, Zachary will add narrative to the Applicant scoring sheet to explain underperformance and low scoring, as needed. Applicants will be reminded of the appeals process and the deadline for submitting an appeal.

- The Ramsey County Ranking Committee meets together to rank projects into Tier 1 and Tier 2 based on score, historical performance, and other information gathered from meetings with the project applicant. It should be noted that the Ranking Committee uses “scoring” and “ranking” as two distinct steps. Scoring informs but does not dictate the final ranking decisions. Where ranking and scoring do not correlate, the Ranking Committee will provide comments to indicate why the project was ranked in their position.
- The Ramsey Ranking Committee may identify projects that should be reallocated, in whole or in part, in favor of a new project. Before making a reallocation decision, the Committee will review the project’s past performance and grant spending history for the prior three years.
- Projects facing reallocation will have additional appeal rights. (See separate Appeals Policy for more detail.) In addition, full comments from the Ramsey Ranking Committee will be made available upon written request after the competition closes on September 14, 2016. Projects can also report any discrepancies in their score sheet, although this is not considered an official appeal.
- The Ramsey County Ranking Committee will publish their final ranking on the Heading Home Ramsey website no later than 15 days prior to CoC Application submission to HUD.
- Projects will submit their copies of letters or documentation for all match/leverage resources listed in their final Project Application submission to HUD. The Ramsey Coordinator will be responsible for approving all Project Applications. Projects will be expected to provide quick response to fix missing information or errors in their Project Application at the Ramsey Coordinator’s request prior to final submission.
- Applications will be submitted with the Ramsey County Collaborative Application.

Ranking Committee Meeting #1 – July 29, 2016

New and Bonus fund Pre-applications scored, ranked, and selected

New Pre-applicants notified by August 1, 2016 whether project will be considered for funds in FY2016.

Ranking Committee meeting #2 – August 16, 2016 from 8:30-4:00

Ramsey County staff conducted technical review of Project Applications and conducted initial scoring. In addition to project applications, the following items were used to inform scoring (examples):

- Project APR’s (CY 2015) + CY 2012/2013/2014 – all confirmed by Project Applicants
- Project Applicant narrative if applicable to explain nuances of outcomes or population
- Organizational audit
- Recent HUD audits and findings
- LOCCS Drawdown and unspent funds

- Project Education and Early Childhood documents (for family/youth projects)

TIMELINE:

5/20/2016	2016 Point in Time Count (sheltered/unsheltered)/ Housing Inventory Count/Unmet Need calculation presented at the HHR GB for 2016 Priority development recommendation
7/15/16	Heading Home Ramsey Governing Board develops 2016 Priority for NOFA
7/15/16	FY2016 Ranking tool finalized – sent to CoC & posted on website
7/22/16	Project Pre-application Letter of Intent Deadline for all New and Renewal projects.
8/1/16	New Project notification for submission of Project Application
8/15/16	ALL PROJECT APPLICATIONS and attachments due to CoC Coordinator by 4:00 pm
8/16/16	Provide contact for questions regarding the Project Application Ranking between 8:00-4:30
8/26/16	Notification of Ranking Recommendations (Priority List) posted on Heading Home Ramsey website and sent to HHR Governance Board & CoC listserv.
8/19/16	Heading Home Ramsey County Governing Board meeting - Preliminary Ranking approval – overview of rationale will be provided
8/22-23	Appeals due to CoC Coordinator
8/24	Appeal committee meet to deliberate appeals
8/24	Final decision sent to HHR GB for approval FY 2016 final Ranking posted on HHR website & sent to CoC listserv
8/26	ALL PROJECT APPLICANTS MUST BE SUBMITTED INTO E-SNAPS BY 4:00 pm

Ranking Committee schedule:

Meeting 1 July 29, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Ranking process doc – finalize • Overview of FY 2016 Ramsey County priorities – approved by HHR GB • New Project Application overview • Voluntary reallocation review
-----------------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated Entry Application process
Meeting 2 August 16-17?	The Review and Ranking Committee will meet 1 full day to determine the initial project ranking and rationale based on score and priorities. Applicants should be available to respond to questions of the committee (via telephone), should questions arise on this date between 8:00-4:30. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Project applicant narrative (provided by Ramsey County) • Review Project applicant scores (verified with Project Applicants) • Review last 3 years performance (HMIS) • Develop ranking recommendation
Meeting 3 August 22-23	Potential Appeal meeting: 1 must be original Ranking committee member 3 Heading Home Ramsey Governing Board – voting members

Policy for Appeals:

Eligible Appeals

- The application of any applicant agency which a) is unranked, or b) receives less funding than they applied for may appeal
- Applicants that have been found not to meet the threshold requirements are not eligible for an appeal

All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed. The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final.

The Appeal Committee

- The Appeal Committee will be made up of three (3) voting members of the Governance Board.
- Two members will not have participated on the original Rating & Ranking Committee
- One committee member must be a member of the original Review & Ranking Committee
- No member of the Appeal Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney funding and must sign a conflict of interest statement
- The role of the Appeal Committee is to read and review only those areas of the application that are being appealed

The Appeal Process

- Any and all appeals must be received in writing within two (2) business days of the notification of ranking to projects. The written appeal can be scanned & e-mailed to the CoC Coordinator: Laura DeRosier – laura.derosier@co.ramsey.mn.us
- The notice of appeal must include a written statement specifying in detail the grounds asserted for the appeal, must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency (i.e., Executive Director)
- The notice of appeal is limited to one single spaced page in 12-point font
- The appeal must include a copy of the application and all accompanying materials submitted to the Review & Ranking Committee; no additional information can be submitted
- All valid appeals will be read, reviewed and evaluated by the Appeal Committee

The Appeal Committee will meet to deliberate based on the following:

- Applicants will be invited to make a time limited statement regarding the appeal
- The panel will review the rankings made by the Review & Ranking Committee only on the basis of the submitted project application, the one page appeal, any statements made during the appeal process, and the material used by the Review & Ranking Committee; no new information can be submitted by the applicant or reviewed by the Appeal Committee
- The decision of the appellate panel must be supported by a simple majority vote
- The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final
- The Heading Home Ramsey Governance Board will approve the final rank order to new projects and submission of renewal projects.

DRAFT