



## **Final FY2015 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Ranking Policies**

### **Eligibility**

To be eligible to be placed on the project ranking list by the Detroit CoC in the FY2015 competition, all projects must meet the following criteria:

1. Submit completed renewal application and any additional required documents to HAND as outlined in renewal application policies.
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 HAND.
4. Projects that were required by HAND to participate in technical assistance processes in previous competition years must be in compliance with all requirements in the projects' technical assistance plan.
5. Meet all HUD eligibility criteria, as outlined in the FY2015 CoC Program NOFA (to be released), the July 2012 CoC Program Interim HEARTH Regulations, and other official documents published by HUD.
6. A representative from the organization must be in attendance at the June 8, 2015 Detroit CoC grantee meeting, held at 1:30 PM at The Salvation Army Southeastern Michigan Division Headquarters 16130 Northland Dr, Southfield, MI.

### **Exclusion or Removal from Project Ranking List**

In the event that the Detroit CoC receives written documentation from HUD that a project has been out of compliance with the regulations and has made no progress on any corrective actions as required by HUD, that project will be excluded or removed from the project ranking list, and consequently not submitted for renewal funding in FY2015. The funds from this project will then be reallocated to a new project.

### **FY2015 Detroit CoC Project Ranking Policies**

Projects seeking FY2015 CoC funding will be ranked in the following order:

1. The CoC's infrastructure projects will be ranked first, in the following order:
  - a. HMIS Renewal Projects in descending order of budget amount
  - b. SSO projects dedicated to Coordinated Assessment Model (CAM) in the following order:
    - i. Renewal SSO project originally designed for CAM (renewing for 2<sup>nd</sup> time in FY2015)
    - ii. Renewal SSO project(s) that were redesigned in FY2014 support CAM in descending order of budget amount
  - c. Collaborative Applicant CoC Planning New grant

2. New project(s) created via reallocation in FY2015 in the following order:
  - a. PH-PSH project(s) in descending order of budget amount
  - b. PH-RRH project(s) in descending order of budget amount
  - c. Supportive Services Only (SSO) project dedicated for coordinated assessment
3. First time renewal Permanent Housing (PH) projects in in the following order:
  - a. First time renewal PH-PSH project(s) in descending order of budget amount
  - b. First time renewal PH-RRH project(s) in descending order of budget amount
4. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects for which at least 50% of the clients served over the last year (Jan – Dec 2014) were chronically homeless ranked by project’s percentage on the first half (part A) of their project-specific housing performance in the local application;
5. All other Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects by project’s percentage on the first half (part A) of their project-specific housing performance in the local application, unless the project did not score at least a 90% on the part A performance;
6. All remaining projects not being reallocated, including Transitional Housing (TH), Safe Haven (SH), Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects AND any Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects that scores less than 90% on the part A performance will be ranked together, by project’s percentage on the first half (part A) of their project-specific housing performance in the local application.
7. New Permanent Housing Bonus Project(s) ranked in descending order by the total score received.

### **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.

### **Tie-Breaking Criteria**

Tie-breakers for the above ranking policies will be applied in the following order:

1. First tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 2B of the project-specific housing performance in the local application
2. Second tie-breaker: the *percentage* on component 1A of the project performance in the local application (leaving with source of cash income)
3. Third tie-breaker: the project’s *total* application score (all components combined)
4. Fourth tie-breaker: a project with a larger budget will be ranked above a project with a lower budget

### **Projects that Straddle Tier 1/Tier 2**

In the FY2015 competition, HUD is allowing projects to straddle the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line. HUD has stated they will conditionally fund the portion of the project in Tier 1 as long as the amount funded would result in a viable project. Therefore, the following policy will apply:

1. 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.
2. 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.

3. The Values & Funding Priorities Taskforce will review the feasibility plan, and make a decision whether or not the project would be feasible at the reduced amount. If the Taskforce decides it will be feasible, the project will be submitted as is, straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line.
4. If the Taskforce 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.
5. 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 offer these remaining funds to another project in Tier 1 that is able to accept additional funds. The CoC Lead agency will make a recommendation on how these remaining funds should be allocated; 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 100 point scale. The details on these scored components are given in FY2015 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.

### **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, with the funds from the project being added to the pool of funding available from Transitional Housing projects being reallocated in the FY2015 competition. All of these 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 FY2015 Appeals Policy.