Attachment H

Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care

2017 Project Review and Ranking Process

Background on 2017 NOFA and Ranking Requirements
On July 14, 2017 the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) published the *Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Program*.

This year, funding is available for eligible new and renewal projects. The Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County Continuum of Care (CoC) may also apply for new "bonus" permanent housing projects in the following categories:

- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) serving chronically homeless people;
- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) serving homeless single adults or families with children coming from streets or shelters (not transitional housing) or fleeing domestic violence or other like situations; or
- Joint component projects (TH-RRH), which combine transitional housing and rapid re-housing into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

In addition, the CoC may create new projects through the re-allocation of funds from lower performing renewal grants. These re-allocated funds may also be used by the CoC HMIS Lead Agency (Pierce County Human Services) for dedicated HMIS projects.

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 demonstrate the use of established objective criteria used to review project applications. Additionally, the CoC must place projects into Tier 1 and Tier 2, with all projects having to compete nationally for funding.

This document describes the CoC policies and process governing the review and ranking of projects in the 2017 competition, as well as the adopted policy for determining which projects are placed into Tier 2.

Rating and Ranking Process and Criteria
a. **Adoption of Performance Standards**
   On April 19, 2017, the CoC Oversight Committee adopted objective Project Performance Standards for all program types within the continuum (emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent housing, rapid re-housing, and services only with housing focus).

b. **Solicitation of CoC Applications**
   On or about July 26, 2017, the Collaborative Applicant (Pierce County Human Services) will release an announcement of available funding for both new and renewal CoC projects. These will be distributed broadly via email to the provider community. The announcement for new projects will also be posted to the Collaborative Applicant website and in the newspaper. The announcements explain the process for submitting application, as well as the review criteria and process.

c. **Application Process**
   On or about August 9, 2017 renewal applicants will receive a Project Performance Report from the Collaborative Applicant summarizing the progress of renewal projects in

meeting the established performance standards using data from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), the fiscal department of Pierce County Human Services, and other sources as appropriate, including comparable databases for victim service providers. This report will provide each renewal project applicant the opportunity to provide any narrative explanation or clarification regarding why they did not meet any of the standards.

On August 23, 2017, all applicants (new and renewal) must submit their completed Project Application(s). As part of their application, renewal applicants must also submit any clarifications and responses to their Project Performance Reports, as well as any supporting documentation.

d.   Review, Ranking and Tiering Process
1.   The Collaborative Applicant will convene an unbiased and non-conflicted Review Panel composed of representatives from neutral (non-applicant and non-homeless-housing/service-provider) organizations. No Panel member will have a current or recent relationship with any applicant through employment, board membership, or provision of consulting services. The Panel may include representatives from the CoC Oversight Committee, Pierce County, cities and towns within the CoC, funders, and nonprofit housing and social services organizations not engaged in the homeless response system. The Panel will consist of at least five members, but will not exceed seven members.
2.   The Review Panel will meet on or about September 12, 2017, to rank the projects and prepare recommendations for the CoC Oversight Committee.
3.   Prior to the Review Panel meeting, the Collaborative Applicant will calculate the preliminary score for all renewal applicants using the objective Scoring Factors below. The preliminary scores will be distributed to the Review Panel prior to the meeting.
4.   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 below.
5.   At the meeting, the Review Panel will hear Oral Presentations from all New Project applicants.
6.   At the meeting, the Review Panel will determine the final ranked order of projects in accordance with the Ranking and Tiering Policy below.
7.   The rankings will be brought to the CoC Oversight Committee for approval on or about September 12, 2017.
8.   All applicants will be notified no later than September 13, 2017 whether their project is being included in the application as well as their rank on the Project Priority listing.
9.   Applicants may appeal any of the following decisions of the CoC Oversight Committee:
    a.   Placement of project into Tier 2;
    b.   Reduction of renewal grant amount (i.e. renewal grant partially re-allocated to a new project); or
    c.   Elimination of renewal grant (i.e. entire grant re-allocated to a new project).

Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Collaborative Applicant no later than 4:30 p.m. on September 15, 2017. Appeals will be heard by a panel of three non-conflicted members of the CoC Oversight Committee who did not serve on the Review Panel. The decision of the appeal panel is final.

CoC Outcome Standards

	Outcome	Joint TH-RRH	RRH	PSH
1	**Coordinated Entry** a) **CE Utilization Rate** Percent of housing program vacancies filled by CE	100%	100%	100%
	b) **CE Acceptance Rate** Percent of accepted referrals from CE[1]	95%	95%	95%
2	**Exits to Permanent Housing or Retained Housing** Percent of participant exits to other Permanent Housing or those remaining in program at end of operating year	80%	80%	90%
3	**Average Length of Time to Move In** Average length of time for participants to move into permanent housing unit (days)	N/A	45	N/A
	Average Length of Time in Program Average length of time from program entry to program exit (days)	180 in TH	N/A	
4	**Returns to Homelessness** Percent of participants who have successfully exit funded programs and subsequently returned to homelessness within a twelve (12) month period	15%	15%	10%
5	**Increase Income** Percent of participants that increase their income through any source from program entry date to program exit	30%	30%	N/A
	Increase/Maintain Income (PSH only) Percent of participants that maintain or increase their income through any source from program entry date to program exit	N/A	N/A	70%
6	**Bed Utilization Rate** Percent of bed utilization	95%	N/A	95%
7	**Prioritizing Chronicity** Percent of vacant PSH beds made available for chronically homeless, either vacancies due to unit turnover or lease-up of units in new projects	N/A	N/A	100%
8	**Permanent Housing Stability (PSH only)** Percent of participants housed twelve (12) months or longer	N/A	N/A	80%
9	**HMIS Data** a) HMIS data quality[2]	95%	95%	95%
	b) HMIS data entry timeliness[3]	95%	95%	95%
10	**CoC Grant Spending** a) Percent expenditure of funds	95%	95%	95%
	b) Percent of Contract Payment Requests submitted on time	100%	100%	100%

---

[1] This measure will not include: (1) any referrals declined by the client; or (2) referrals made by CES that do not meet the program's funder-required eligibility criteria (see additional information in Program Eligibility Requirements)

[2] This measure will apply to both participant data and data on program vacancies.

[3] Same as 2, above.

Scoring Factors for Renewal CoC Applications

Scoring Factor (RENEWAL PROJECTS)		Maximum and Minimum Scores			
		RRH	**PSH**	RRH Target	PSH Target
1	a. CE Utilization Rate (up to 5 points)	Meets standard = 5 points Within 5% of standard = 3 points Within 10% of standard = 1 point Below 10% of standard = 0 points		100%	100%
	b. CE Acceptance Rate (up to 3 points)	Meets/Exceeds standard = 3 points Within 5% of standard = 2 points Within 10% of standard = 1 point Below 10% of standard = 0 points		95%	95%
2	Exits to Permanent Housing (up to 12 points)	Exceeds standard = 12 points Meets standard = 10 points Within 5% of standard = 6 points Within 10% of standard = 3 point Below 10% of standard = 0 points		80%	90%
3	Average Length of Time to Move In (up to 5 points)	Exceeds by > 10 = 5 pts Meets/Exceeds by < 10 = 4 pts Misses by < 10 days = 3 points Misses by > 10 days = 1 point	N/A	45	N/A
4	Returns to Homelessness (up to 4 points)	Meets/Exceeds standard = 4 points Within 5% of standard = 2 points Below 5% of standard = 0 points		15%	10%
5	Increase Income – RRH (up to 5 points) / Increase/Maintain Income – PSH (up to 5 points)	Exceeds standard = 5 points Meets standard = 4 points Within 5% of standard = 3 points Within 10% of standard = 2 points Within 20% of standard = 1 point		30%	70%
6	Permanent Housing Stability (up to 5 points)	N/A	Exceeds/Meets standard = 5 pts Within 5% of standard 3 pt Below 5% of standard = 0 pts	N/A	80%
7	a. HMIS Data Quality (up to 5 points)	Exceeds/Meets standard = 5 points Within 5% of standard = 2 points Below 5% of standard = 0 points		95%	95%
	b. HMIS Data Timeliness (up to 5 points)	Exceeds/Meets standard = 5 points Within 5% of standard = 2 points Below 5% of standard = 0 points		95%	95%
8	a. CoC Grant Spending (up to 6 points)	Exceeds/Meets standard = 6 points Within 5% of standard = 2 points Below 5% of standard = 0 points		95%	95%
	b. CoC Contract Payment Request Timeliness (up to 4 points)	Exceeds/Meets standard = 4 points Within 5% of standard = 2 points Below 5% of standard = 0 points		100%	100%
9	Staff Training (up to 5 bonus points)	.5 points for each opportunity completed by project staff	1 point for each opportunity completed by project staff	N/A	N/A
10	Match (up to 7 points)	Exceeds standard by more than 15% = 7 points Exceeds standard by 15% or less = 4 points Meets standard = 3 points Does not meet standard = 0 points		25%	25%

11	Housing First (up to 12 points)	Does the project ensure participants are not screened out based on the following criteria? a) Having too little or no income b) Active or history of substance abuse c) Having a criminal record with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions d) History of domestic violence If yes, then 0.5 points for each (possible of 2 points) Does the project ensure that participants are not terminated from the program for the following reasons? a) Failure to participate in services b) Failure to make progress on service plan c) Loss of income or failure to improve income d) Being a victim of domestic violence If yes, then 0.5 points for each (possible total of 2 points) Does the program have these Housing First approaches documented in Program Manual or other program documentation? If yes, then 1 point for each approach documented in submitted documents (up to 8 points.)			
12	Grants Monitoring/Compliance (loss of up to 5 points)	Serious unresolved compliance finding from HUD would result in up to 5 points subtracted from project's score			
13	Cost Effectiveness for PH exits or PSH units (up to 6 points)	Cost per exit to PH is reasonable = 6 points Cost per exit to PH is not reasonable = 0 points	Cost per unit served is reasonable = 6 points Cost per unit served is not reasonable = 0 points		
14	HUD Policy Priorities (up to 16 points for RRH, up to 21 points for PSH)	RRH = 10 points	PSH = 15 points		
		Prioritizes a priority population or population needing more support (chronically homeless individuals, veterans, families, young adults, or DV survivors) = 6 points			
Maximum Score		**95 (+5 bonus points)**	**100 (+5 bonus points)**		

Methodology for Renewal Scoring Factors:

Factor 1 through 9 (Project Performance Standards): Data will be extracted from HMIS for each project for the period July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 to calculate these performance measures. For victim service providers, data will be collected from comparable databases, as appropriate.

Factor 10 (Grant Spending/CPR Timeliness): This measure will use data collected from project invoices, Contract Payment Requests, Pierce County Human Services fiscal department reports for the period July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

Factor 11 (Staff Training): This measure will use data collected from the Pierce County Homeless Provider Academy Learning Management System transcripts.

Factor 12 (Match): This information will be taken from the 2017 Project Application.

Factor 13 (Housing First): This will be based on how the applicant responds to the questions in Section 3B of the Project Application relating to Housing First, entry barriers, and service participations requirements. In addition, these items will be scored based on the project's documented program manual submitted as part of the application. The project with lower barriers and fewer service participations requirements will receive higher scores.

Factor 14 (Grants Monitoring/Compliance): Applicants will only lose points for having serious unresolved compliance findings, as noted in their most recent Pierce County monitoring visit. No points awarded for no findings.

Factor 15 (Cost Effectiveness): This measure will be calculated by dividing the total budget (as submitted by the project) by the number of units/households in the project to arrive at an average cost per unit.

Factor 16 (HUD Policy Priorities): This factor provides additional points for permanent housing projects (both PSH and RRH) as well as projects prioritizing chronically homeless people, homeless veterans, young adults, families or DV survivors as documented by program documents.

Scoring Factors for New CoC Applications

	Rating Factor	Score
1	**Applicant Capacity & Experience** • Recent relevant experience in providing housing to the homeless population applicant proposes to serve • Relevant experience in operation of housing projects or programs similar to that proposed in the application, administering leasing or rental assistance funds, delivering services and entering data and ensuring high-quality data in a system (HMIS or similar data system) • If application has sub-recipients, applicant organizations have experience working together • Recent data submitted demonstrates strong performance for relevant service and/or housing provided • Organizational and finance capacity to track funds and meet all HUD reporting and fiscal requirements • Any outstanding monitoring or audit issues are explained	0-15
2	**Alignment with HEARTH Act and Opening Doors Objectives** The project articulates how it will advance the goals set forth in HEARTH and Opening Doors (the federal strategic plan to end homelessness) • Reduce new entries into homelessness • Reduce the length of time people are homeless • Reduce returns to homelessness • Increase participant income	0-5
3	**Targeting and Coordinated Entry Participation** • Project targets an eligible population • Project targets participants who are coming from the street or other locations not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, safe havens, or fleeing domestic violence • Agency either has experience participating in Coordinated Entry or demonstrates willingness to participate in Coordinated Entry	0-10
4	**Appropriateness of Housing** • Participants are assisted to secure housing as quickly as possible • Type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the program participants	0-5
5	**Housing First Model** • Project will have low barriers to entry and will not screen out applicants based on having no or low income, active or history of substance use, criminal record (except for State mandated requirements), history of domestic violence, or lack of willingness to participate in services • Project will not terminate participation for: failure to participate in services, failure to make progress on service plan, loss of income or failure to improve income, being a victim of domestic violence, or other activities not covered in the lease agreement • Project services are client-centered	0-15
6	**Service Plan** • There is a specific plan to ensure participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs • There is a specific plan to ensure participants are assisted to increase their incomes and live independently • Type, scale, location of supportive services fit the needs of the program participants and are readily accessible. This includes services funded by the CoC grant and other project funding sources • There is a specific plan to ensure participants are individually assisted to obtain the benefits of the mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible	0-15
7	**Timing** • Applicant has a clear plan to begin operations when the contract is executed:	0-5

	Rating Factor	Score
	○ Within six months of contract execution may be awarded up to 5 points ○ Within one year of contract execution may be awarded up to 2 points.	
8	**Financial Feasibility and Effectiveness** • Costs appear reasonable and adequate to support proposed program • Match requirement is met • Additional resources leveraged	0-10
9	**HUD Policy Priorities** • Additional points awarded for permanent housing projects (both PSH and RRH) • Additional points awarded for prioritizing chronically homeless people, homeless veterans, youth, families or DV survivors as documented by program documents.	0-10
10	**Oral Presentations**	0-10
	Maximum Score	**100**

Ranking and Tiering Policies for CoC Project Applications

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. Beginning with the highest ranked projects, projects will be placed in Tier 1 until the total allowable dollar amount of Tier 1 is filled;
   c. All remaining projects will be ranked and placed in Tier 2 according to the policies set forth below in Sections 3 and 4; and
   d. The following project types will not receive scores:
      i. Renewal projects that do not have any performance data (because they were only recently awarded) will be placed at the bottom of Tier 1 or into Tier 2, at the discretion of the Review Panel. The Review Panel will use the following NOFA priorities as a guide:
      i. Prioritizing PSH projects;
      ii. Prioritizing HUD Policy Priorities; and
      iii. Agency outcome performance for similar projects, if available.
      ii. Any dedicated HMIS projects will not receive scores. As critical infrastructure to the CoC, dedicated HMIS projects will be placed at the bottom of Tier 1.

2. Tier Two Project Scoring as Established in the HUD NOFA
   Each year, HUD has set forth a scoring system for Tier 2 Projects. The Review Panel will adopt this scoring system (and any relevant changes) each year.
   All projects in Tier 2 will compete nationally for funding based on this scoring system. Projects lower on the list are less likely to be funded.

3. Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County CoC Tier 2 Policy
   Once the rank order of projects has been determined (see Section 1), the Review Panel will make a recommendation as to whether to re-allocate Tier 2 renewal projects or leave them in their rank order.

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

   Renewal applicants may voluntarily reduce one or more of their grants, either in whole or in part. If reducing in part, the applicant's grant will be reduced by the amount requested and re-allocated to a new housing project. If an applicant wishes to voluntarily end the project, with the purpose of replacing their existing project with a new housing project, the new project will be ranked and scored according to the policies outlined in this document. There is no guarantee that voluntarily ending the project will result in the new project(s) being placed in Tier 1.

5. <u>Final Project Priority List</u>
   After following the process described above, the Review Panel may elect to make adjustments to the order of projects, if doing so will advance the goals of ensuring a more competitive overall funding application and maximizing the COC's ability to fund eligible renewals and new projects. These adjustments are limited to the following:

   - Adjustments to address any issues that arise from projects straddling the Tier 1 and Tier 2 line, in accordance with the policy outlined in the HUD NOFA;
   - Ranking of bonus projects(s); or
   - Ranking of renewal projects that do not yet have any performance data.

   Adjustments to rank order will NOT be made to protect low-performing projects from re-allocation or placement into Tier 2.