



Final FY2016 Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Ranking Policies

Eligibility

In order to be submitted to HUD for renewal, projects seeking renewal funding must meet the following basic eligibility criteria:

- 1) Submit completed renewal application and additional required documents to HAND 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 HAND.
- 4) Projects that were required by the CoC to participate in technical assistance 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 FY2016 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 14, 2016** Detroit CoC grantee meeting, held at **1:30 PM** at 16130 Northland Dr, Southfield, MI (The Salvation Army Southeastern Michigan Division Headquarters).

Exclusion or Removal from Project Ranking List

The Detroit 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).

FY2016 Detroit CoC Project Ranking Policies

Projects seeking FY2016 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
 - 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 FY2016 in the following order:
 - a. PH-PSH project(s) in the following order:
 - i. Highest overall score received 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
 - b. PH-RRH project(s) in the following order:
 - i. Highest overall scored received 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
 - c. Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects dedicated for coordinated assessment/coordinated entry in descending order of budget amount.

3. New Permanent Housing Bonus Project(s) ranked in the following order:
 - a. Highest overall score received 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) in the following order:
 - i. Highest overall score received on the application
 - ii. 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) in the following order:
 - i. Highest overall score received on the application
 - ii. If needed as a tie breaker, in order of the time application was submitted to HAND, from first submitted to last
 - c. First time renewal SSO for Coordinated Entry/CAM

5. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects for which at least 50% of the clients served over the last year (Jan – Dec 2015) were chronically homeless ranked by project’s percentage on the first half (part A) of their project-specific housing performance in the local application;

6. All other Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects and all Rapid Rehousing (RRH) 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;

7. All remaining projects not being reallocated, including Transitional Housing (TH), Safe Haven (SH), Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects AND any Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) or Rapid Rehousing (RRH) projects that scored 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.

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 for Ranking Policies 5 through 7

Tie-breakers for ranking policies 5 through 7 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)

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 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.
3. 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.
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 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 102 point scale. The details on these scored components are given in FY2016 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 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 FY2016 Appeals Policy.

Preliminary vs Final Policies

The Detroit CoC Board approved the preliminary ranking policies on May 2, 2016, prior to the release of the FY2016 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 FY2016 NOFA to ensure the policies aligned with, and did not contradict, the NOFA. Following the release of the FY2016 NOFA on June 29, 2016, it was determined these policies do not contradict the NOFA. The Values & Funding Priorities Taskforce approved the final ranking policies on August 8, 2016. Following this approval, minor adjustments to the language in the policies were made to ensure the policies accurately accounted for the entire portfolio of projects being submitted for funding. The Values & Funding Priorities Taskforce affirmed these adjustments on August 30, 2016.