1E. Project Capacity, Review, and Ranking–Local Competition

To help you complete the CoC Application, HUD published resources at
https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/comm_planning/coc/competition, including:
 - Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 Continuum of Care Program
Competition
 - FY 2021 CoC Application Detailed Instructions–essential in helping you maximize your CoC
Application score by giving specific guidance on how to respond to many questions and
providing specific information about attachments you must upload
 - 24 CFR part 578

1E-1.	**Announcement of 30-Day Local Competition Deadline–Advance Public Notice of How Your CoC Would Review, Rank, and Select Projects. You Must Upload an Attachment to the 4B. Attachments Screen.**	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.a. and 2.g.	

1.	**Enter the date your CoC published the 30-day submission deadline for project applications for your CoC's local competition.**	08/24/2021
2.	**Enter the date your CoC publicly posted its local scoring and rating criteria, including point values, in advance of the local review and ranking process.**	03/05/2021

1E-2.	**Project Review and Ranking Process Your CoC Used in Its Local Competition. You Must Upload an Attachment to the 4B. Attachments Screen. We use the response to this question as a factor when determining your CoC's eligibility for bonus funds and for other NOFO criteria listed below.**	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.a., 2.b., 2.c., and 2.d.	

	Select yes or no in the chart below to indicate how your CoC ranked and selected project applications during your local competition:	

1.	**Established total points available for each project application type.**	Yes
2.	**At least 33 percent of the total points were based on objective criteria for the project application (e.g., cost effectiveness, timely draws, utilization rate, match, leverage), performance data, type of population served (e.g., DV, youth, Veterans, chronic homelessness), or type of housing proposed (e.g., PSH, RRH).**	Yes
3.	**At least 20 percent of the total points were based on system performance criteria for the project application (e.g., exits to permanent housing destinations, retention of permanent housing, length of time homeless, returns to homelessness).**	Yes
4.	**Used data from a comparable database to score projects submitted by victim service providers.**	Yes
5.	**Used objective criteria to evaluate how projects submitted by victim service providers improved safety for the population they serve.**	Yes
6.	**Used a specific method for evaluating projects based on the CoC's analysis of rapid returns to permanent housing.**	Yes

1E-2a.	**Project Review and Ranking Process–Addressing Severity of Needs and Vulnerabilities.**	

	NOFO Section VII.B.2.d.

	Describe in the field below how your CoC reviewed, scored, and selected projects based on:
1.	the specific severity of needs and vulnerabilities your CoC considered when ranking and selecting projects; and
2.	considerations your CoC gave to projects that provide housing and services to the hardest to serve populations that could result in lower performance levels but are projects your CoC needs in its geographic area.

(limit 2,000 characters)

1. Applicants provide data on participants served; sub-populations, special needs; describe how they utilize Housing First principles so have few or no barriers to entry into the project, have high retention and exits to permanent housing, high percentage of persons connected to mainstream resources both cash and non-cash benefits. This data is validated using HMIS. The CoC develops a scoring rubric that is made available to all potential applicants during the local application process that is used to score applications. The renewal application completed for the local process includes a question on mitigating factors that the applicant would like reviewers to be aware of. There is also a question that allows applicants to discuss reasons why performance measures weren't met and whether serving the high needs population(s) they serve affected those outcomes or describe their participants in more detail, providing an opportunity for reviewers to increase their score.

2. The severity of needs and vulnerabilities served by a project is considered when reviewing and ranking projects. An application can earn up points based on the sub-populations and types of special needs served by the project and incorporating Housing First. Qualitative information is also shared on how the program operates in practice; i.e. - does a project reject Coordinated Entry referrals of very high need individuals, does a project terminate participants immediately upon a violation rather than trying to resolve the situation. For new project applications, reviewers also look at the services that are proposed for participants to ensure that they are sufficient to meet the special needs of the proposed sub-population(s).

1E-3.	Promoting Racial Equity in the Local Review and Ranking Process.	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.e.	

	Describe in the field below how your CoC:
1.	obtained input and included persons of different races, particularly those over-represented in the local homelessness population, when determining the rating factors used to review project applications;
2.	included persons of different races, particularly those over-represented in the local homelessness population, in the review, selection, and ranking process;
3.	rated and ranked projects based on the degree to which their program participants mirror the homeless population demographics (e.g., considers how a project promotes racial equity where individuals and families of different races are over-represented).

(limit 2,000 characters)

1.The Review and Ranking (R&R) Committee, a standing CoC Board Committee are responsible to approve the rating factors used to review project applications. Both the Committee and the CoC Board are developing recruitment strategies to increase the participation of persons of color, as well as persons who represent different ethnicities, persons with disabilities and persons with lived experience. Currently, 23% of the membership of the R&R

Committee are people of color. 19% of the general population are persons of color; however nearly 64% of the homeless population are persons of color.
2.The R&R Committee is also responsible for reviewing applications, application scoring and ranking of projects. Efforts are in progress to increase the diversity of the R&R Committee as well as the Board and all other CoC Committees and activities. A Racial Equity Leadership Committee has been formed and is actively recruiting members with a focus on BIPOC populations to ensure our approaches within the homeless system are equitable and accessible to all. This would include the review and ranking processes for the CoC.
3.Project APR data is used as part of project monitoring and the review and ranking process. Demographic data in the APR is examined to ensure that their program participants reflect the demographics of the entire homeless population. Disparities identified would be part of the discussion during project presentations. There are currently no points given to projects based on the diversity of their participants, but anticipate doing that in the future.

1E-4.	Reallocation–Reviewing Performance of Existing Projects. We use the response to this question as a factor when determining your CoC's eligibility for bonus funds and for other NOFO criterion below.	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.f.	

	Describe in the field below:	
1.	your CoC's reallocation process, including how your CoC determined which projects are candidates for reallocation because they are low performing or less needed;	
2.	whether your CoC identified any projects through this process during your local competition this year;	
3.	whether your CoC reallocated any low performing or less needed projects during its local competition this year;	
4.	why your CoC did not reallocate low performing or less needed projects during its local competition this year, if applicable; and	
5.	how your CoC communicated the reallocation process to project applicants.	

(limit 2,000 characters)

1. The written reallocation policy is made available to applicants at the beginning of the local application process. Possible reasons for reallocation include: history of unspent HUD funds; project voluntarily decides not to renew or requests to be reallocated to create a new project; history of not meeting performance measures; project has deficiencies in the on-going operation of their program. The Reallocation process is approved prior to releasing the local application RFP by the Review and Ranking Committee which is composed of non-conflicted CoC Board and community members who have knowledge of the homeless system, expertise in program management, etc.   Projects are identified as low performing or no longer meeting a priority need in the CoC based on the scoring of their local application. All project applications are reviewed and scored based on scoring matrix that is available to applicants at the start of the local application process. The matrix sets uniform criteria for scoring in areas of performance, utilization, cost per household, severity of needs of participants, participation in Coordinated Entry and HMIS; adherence to Housing First principles; and involvement in CoC, HSN and other community efforts addressing homelessness.
2. Three renewal projects were initially identified through the review and ranking process as being potential candidates for reallocation.
3. Two of those projects were reallocated during the local competition this year.
4. N/A

5. The reallocation process was publicly posted on the CoC website on 3/5/2021. All projects that were reallocated were notified in writing. The notification gave the reason(s) for the decision to reallocate and their right to appeal the reallocation if they chose to.

1E-4a.	**Reallocation Between FY 2016 and FY 2021. We use the response to this question as a factor when determining your CoC's eligibility for bonus funds and for other NOFO criterion below.**	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.f.	

Did your CoC cumulatively reallocate at least 20 percent of its ARD between FY 2016 and FY 2021?	Yes	

1E-5.	**Projects Rejected/Reduced–Public Posting. You Must Upload an Attachment to the 4B. Attachments Screen if You Select Yes.**	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.g.	

1.	**Did your CoC reject or reduce any project application(s)?**	Yes
2.	**If you selected yes, enter the date your CoC notified applicants that their project applications were being rejected or reduced, in writing, outside of e-snaps.**	10/08/2021

1E-5a.	**Projects Accepted–Public Posting. You Must Upload an Attachment to the 4B. Attachments Screen.**	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.g.	

Enter the date your CoC notified project applicants that their project applications were accepted and ranked on the New and Renewal Priority Listings in writing, outside of e-snaps.	10/27/2021	

1E-6.	**Web Posting of CoC-Approved Consolidated Application. You Must Upload an Attachment to the 4B. Attachments Screen.**	
	NOFO Section VII.B.2.g.	

Enter the date your CoC's Consolidated Application was posted on the CoC's website or affiliate's website–which included: **1. the CoC Application;** **2. Priority Listings; and** **3. all projects accepted, ranked where required, or rejected.**	11/12/2021	