**2019 HUD CoC NOFA Application**

**HALS CoC Ranking Subcommittee Review and Ranking of Renewal and New CoC Funded Projects**

**September 4, 2019 Meeting & Emails after meeting on September 5 and final vote by CoC on September 12, 2019**

Members are composed of CoC members who do not manage a CoC Funded Project. The group was facilitated by Greta Rolland, HMIS System Administrator/CoC Staff with primary responsibility for completing the CoC Application each year. Members were selected to ensure that each of the 3 counties in our CoC were covered with a wide range of responsibilities.

**Members include:**

Jennifer Trager, Program Manager, Diakonia, Inc., Governance Committee, receives HSP/ESG funds for shelter, outreach prevention and rapid rehousing for Wicomico & Worcester Counties, manages a SSVF grant for Veterans and receives funding for VA contract beds. Representing Worcester County

Shelly Daniels, Executive Director, Samaritan Ministries, Governance Committee member, receives HSP/ESG funds for shelter services and operates a food pantry. Representing Worcester County

Christine Chestnut, Co-Chair of CoC, Governance Committee, City of Salisbury, Con Plan jurisdiction representative, HSP/ESG recipient for Wicomico County and Manager of the City of Salisbury Homeless Housing Program which provides PATH and HSP/ESG Outreach, Rapid Rehousing and locally funded permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals and families in the City of Salisbury. Representing Wicomico County

Kathy Mutzberg, Wicomico County Department of Social Services, member of the HALS CoC Governance Committee who manages and distributes funds for Emergency Assistance Program and Emergency Assistance for Families with Children, TANF & Medicaid through Maryland Department of Human Services. Representing Wicomico County

Carey Kelly, Somerset County Department of Social Services who manages and distributes funds for Emergency Assistance Program and Emergency Assistance for Families with Children, TANF & Medicaid

through Maryland Department of Human Services. Representing Somerset County

Joyce Cottman, Executive Director, Lower Shore Shelter, Governance Committee member, receives HSP/ESG funds for shelter services. Representing Somerset County

**Review of Documents and work completed prior to September 4, 2019 meeting**

Greta Rolland reviewed the new CoC Rating and Ranking tool version 4.0.2, read the instructions to determine changes and watched webinars documenting how to use the HUD CoC Review and Ranking Tool. The CoC was sent copies of the new Rating and Ranking tool as well as the spreadsheet used last year to prepare the tool and the rubric which contained a new scoring method for % of expenditures spent of budgeted amount. Separate emails were sent to the Project Applicants to ensure they had full information on how their projects were being ranked.

All projects were received by the September 27, 2019 deadline and forwarded to the Rating and Ranking Committee. The following projects were received: RENEWALS: Wicomico/Somerset S+C, Worcester S+C, Project 1, Project 23, Somerset Chronic, Wicomico Chronic 1, and Wicomico Chronic 2 and NEW EXPANSION PROJECT: P23 Expansion

She then forwarded to the Subcommittee and Project Applicant Staff the following documents: (1)HUD CoC Review and Ranking Tool filled out so that all Renewal and New projects appeared after following the instructions on the tool. Greta had the document on her computer and planned on showing the tool on the large projector at the meeting space but brought along paper copies for all Subcommittee members; (2) She informed all Review Subcommittee members and Project Applicants that all Projects being requested for renewal met the HUD threshold goals, so all were marked yes meaning each can be reviewed and ranking at the September 4 meeting. (3) Detailed Spreadsheet that documents program performance in areas that will be reviewed for the goals in the HUD CoC Review and Ranking Tool as well as other areas that were reviewed in the past (4) All Renewal Project Applications; and (5)Grant Inventory Worksheet.

**CoC Project Application Evaluation Criteria review:**

Based on last year’s Rating and Ranking, the Subcommittee members reviewed the HUD Review and Ranking tool and used the rubric created last year for 4 of the goals (1) Exits to Permanent Housing, (2) Severe High Need in Projects over 95% (3) Project has reasonable cost which looked at rental assistance costs per client, and (4) % of expenditures compared to budget amount. The last goal was added last year as one project had consistently left significant funds unspent. The goal was assigned 20 points as the Subcommittee removed the lst goal on the tool – Participants are placed in housing less than 180 days after referral to PSH. This goal had 20 points, so the points were used for the % of expenditures compared to budgeted amount.

On the Date of the Project Review – September 4, Greta displayed the projects contained in the CoC rating and ranking tool on the large projector in the conference room. Each project, including the new expansion project was rated by the subcommittee members and the final total scores and weighted scores were noted on a paper copy. When Greta tried to finish the ranking, the tool froze and would not complete the rating and ranking. The Subcommittee decided to use the total scores to score the project which is detailed in the attachment as Option 1. In this option, the expansion project was placed last. Greta told the Subcommittee she would work to finalize the rating results on the tool and if necessary, submit a question to the AAQ. At closing, the Subcommittee agreed to meet during the year and adjust some of the goals being used in the ranking as many results in the same scoring in 5 goals.

On September 5, Greta was able to get the HUD rating and ranking tool to rank the projects, however, it ranked them based on weighted score, not the total score. Greta sent out an email to the subcommittee asking for their vote to use Option 1 or use Option 2 which used the HUD weighted score. By Friday, September 6, Greta received votes from all Subcommittee members to use Option 2. Greta then sent the results to all Project Applicants on Friday. Option 2 ranked the projects much the same as Option 1, however, the expansion project was ranked #4 which resulted in the largest project serving the most clients deeper in Tier 2.

The Somerset County Health Department which manages 6 of the 8 renewal projects expressed concern about the placement of the expansion project above Project 23 and asked for options to address. A major factor in the low score of Project 23 was the high cost per client given the supportive services that are also funded by HUD (including our only HMIS funds) which is worth 20 points in the ranking and ranking. The approval of the expansion will make the average cost per client even higher in future NOFA CoC applications. The SCHD wanted to know if they could remove the project or if the CoC had to reject the project to protect Project 23. An AAQ was submitted on Tuesday, September 10, 2019 to determine how to proceed; however, as of Friday, September 13, 2019, so answer was received. Greta prepared an Option 3 which removed P23 expansion.

At the HALS CoC September 12 meeting, the rating and ranking options were presented to the CoC and all of the above was explained to the CoC. CoC members asked a few questions before the vote and expressed concern with leaving the expansion project when it placed Project 23 so far into Tier 2. The CoC wanted information on what this grant provides and we explained that it was the largest CoC funded grant with 39 units, supportive services for case management and the only HUD funded HMIS grant funding. The CoC felt Project 23 was too important to risk as it was already in Tier 2. By rejecting the expansion project, the amount of funding in Tier 2 for Project 23 would be decreased. Therefore, the final vote was unanimous to go with Option 3 and reject the P23 Expansion.

On Friday, Greta Rolland prepared the rejection letter to the Health Officer for the Somerset County Health Department (project applicant) and received confirmation that it was received. She also sent out to all project applicants the results of the CoC vote on projects approved or rejected and their rating and ranking results.

**Scoring Results (see attached forms for each project in order from highest to lowest):**

Wicomico Chronic 1 – 95

Bonus Project 2016 – 92

Project 1 – 92

Wicomico/Somerset S+C - 88

Worcester S+C – 87

Project 23 – 86

Wicomico Chronic 2 – 79

Somerset Chronic - 79

Greta prepared the Project Priority also on Friday, September 13 and will be submitting a question to the AAQ as Project 23 is still being submitted as an expansion project. She is seeking guidance to determine if the project needs to be amended prior to submission to HUD.