

Rhode Island Continuum of Care (RiCoC) FY2017 Project Competition Ranking and Re-Allocation Policies

Performance Scoring Policy

Applications for New and Renewal Projects will undergo a threshold review to ensure compliance with CoC regulations at 24 CFR 578 and the CoC Program NOFA and RiCoC Policies. Any new or renewal project not meeting the threshold requirement will not be further reviewed and will not be considered for inclusion in the Collaborative Application to HUD. Renewal projects have previously passed HUD threshold review and only in very exceptional cases of changed HUD policies or program changes will be at risk of not passing the threshold review.

Scoring of renewal projects is largely based on data obtained from the most recent, completed APR and HMIS and aligns with the HUD approved System Performance Measures.

A selection committee appointed by the CoC Board will review, rate and rank applications. No person who has an interest in an application may participate in this process. Renewals will be reviewed based on the renewal evaluation criteria. All New Projects will be reviewed based on the new project scoring criteria. The committee has the discretion to select one or more applications for the amount available for new projects. The committee also may give staff direction to negotiate with conditionally selected applicants.

The RiCoC will rank applications after scoring all New and Renewal Projects within the CoC based on the Renewal Project Scoring Rubric and the New Project Scoring Criteria.

Ranking Policy

HUD requires that CoCs rank projects in two Tiers. Tier 1 projects – provided that HUD has sufficient funding – are essentially assured of renewal funding. Tier 2 projects will be funded competitively on a national basis. Factors for awarding the Tier 2 projects include: the score that HUD gives to the overall Continuum of Care Application, whether the project follows Housing First, and a HUD determined ranking score.

Each CoC funded project that is not a first time renewal will be scored and ranked according to the Renewal Project Scoring Rubric. Renewal projects will be ranked solely on their scores, ahead of new project applications (with the exception of voluntarily reallocated new projects). First time renewal projects will be ranked after the renewal projects scored using the Scoring Rubric, and ahead of the new project applications. Should there be a need to place a first time renewal project(s) in Tier 2, the first time renewal projects will be ranked based on cost (number of households served / total grant award), with the highest ranked program being the one that provides assistance to the greatest number of homeless persons. New projects will be scored based on the New Project Scoring Criteria and ranked after renewal projects.

Projects that are 'voluntary reallocations' wherein an existing grantee is seeking to reallocate its current funding allocation to a new project will be ranked according to their New Project score among the pool of renewal grantees. New and renewal projects will be scored on the same one hundred point scale to facilitate this.

Projects that are deemed essential to the CoC but which would be at risk of loss of funding if placed in Tier 2, will be ranked at the bottom of Tier 1. These projects are not comparable to other new and renewal projects, can only be submitted by the entity designated by the CoC and therefore cannot be competitively evaluated. This includes HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects.

Tier 2: Project components will be ranked to best maximize the Tier 2 project scores.

Projects will be ranked in Tier 2 as follows:

- Renewal project applications ranked according to renewal score (including as appropriate voluntary reallocation new projects)
- First time renewal projects
- Reallocation and Bonus project applications ranked according to new project scores.

Planning Project: not ranked in accordance with the NOFA policy.

Re-Allocation Policy

Any funds reallocated as part of recapturing unspent funds, voluntary or involuntary reallocation will be made available for reallocation to create new projects during the local solicitation process.

Unspent Funds

Projects that are not fully expending or underspending their grant awards are subject to the re-allocation process. Projects that have underspent more than 10% of their award or \$50,000, whichever is less, may be reduced and those funds will go to reallocation for New Project(s). A one year grace period may be extended to providers who appeal proposed reallocation with a plan that demonstrates that the grant's expenditure will be improved in the current program year. Projects that have under-expended more than 10% of their award in two consecutive program years will have their funding reduced through reallocation in the next CoC NOFA competition.

Voluntary Re-Allocation

As part of the local solicitation for inclusion in the HUD CoC collaborative application, providers are asked whether they wish to voluntarily re-allocate some or all of their funding. Such re-allocated funds are pooled for re-allocation to New Projects. Grantees may retain their current funding and reallocate it to a new project of a type that is allowable under the 2017 NOFA. This includes permanent supportive housing primarily serving the chronically homeless, rapid rehousing serving families and individuals, and joint transitional housing - permanent housing/rapid rehousing projects.

Involuntary Re-Allocation (Unconditional v Conditional Renewal)

To be included in the Collaborative Application, renewal applications must either meet the threshold renewal score or submit a Performance Improvement Plan. To meet the renewal threshold, renewal projects must score at least 65% of the score of the highest scoring renewal project. For example, if the top score is 90, the minimum threshold will be set at 58.50.

Projects scoring below the threshold will be asked to develop a plan to address performance issues. Performance plans will be due to be submitted within 30 days of the request and will be reviewed at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Recipient Approval and Evaluation Committee (RAEC). The Plan must be accepted by the RAEC. If the RAEC does not approve the Plan, the funds may be subject to future reallocation. If a plan is not submitted the project may be subject to future reallocation. Any decisions by the RAEC are subject to appeal through the CoC Grievance process and, if unresolved, to HUD.