

August 30, 2016



Ben McAdams
Salt Lake County Mayor

Carlton J. Christensen
Office of Regional Development
Director

COMMUNITY
RESOURCES and
DEVELOPMENT

Michael R. Gallegos
Community Resources &
Development
Division Director
mgallegos@slco.org

Dear HUD Continuum of Care Applicant:

Thank you for submitting a project application(s) for consideration in FY2016 HUD CoC Competition for the Salt Lake City and County Continuum of Care. This year there were 27 project applications submitted for review by the Prioritization Committee.

Six members served on this year's Prioritization Committee representing various stakeholder groups. A list of committee members is included with this letter for the purpose of transparency. Applicants should note that any communication regarding the Committee processes or outcomes should be directed to Salt Lake County per approved policies and procedures. The committee worked diligently to thoroughly review all projects, support the creation of new resources, and minimize impact to existing programs. Salt Lake County, in its role as CoC Collaborative Applicant, provides staffing support to the Prioritization Committee.

The committee has completed their work for the FY2016 competition. Please find the following enclosed:

- 1) FY2016 Competition Final Ranking Recommendations - Prioritization Committee recommendations will be submitted to HUD. HUD is the ultimate funding authority and will make the final award decisions.
- 2) Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding process- An explanation of HUD's funding process for projects ranked in Tier 2 is included. Please note this process is different than previous years.
- 3) Application Review and Ranking Process – This provides an overview of the local review and ranking process. This information will also be posted to the [CoC website](#).

Salt Lake County will hold individual debriefings with each applicant agency in October. Recently, Dan Adams has been hired by Salt Lake County as the CoC Coordinator. If you have questions or concerns you would like addressed prior to the debriefing, please don't hesitate to contact me (801-923-3080) or Dan Adams (385-468-4890).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Tarra McFadden'.

Tarra McFadden
Monitoring and Compliance Analyst

2001 South State Street
Suite S2100
PO Box 144575
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4575
Phone: 385-468-4880

Salt Lake County Office of Regional Development
TTY 7-1-1 | www.slco.org/regional-development

Local Rank	Agency	Project Title	Type	Total Adjusted Score	Recc. Funding Amount	Running Total	Tier	Notes
1	HACSL	SPK FY2016	PSH - Renewal	71.28	87,100	87,100	Tier 1	
2	HACSL	SP3 FY2016	PSH - Renewal	70.50	496,441	583,541	Tier 1	
3	HACSL	SP FY2016	PSH - Renewal	64.86	976,195	1,559,736	Tier 1	
4	HACSL	SPR FY2016	PSH - Renewal	63.81	75,899	1,635,635	Tier 1	
5	HACSL	SPG FY2016	PSH - Renewal	62.86	181,746	1,817,381	Tier 1	
6	HASLC	Shelter Plus Care II, FY2016	PSH - Renewal	62.21	215,294	2,032,675	Tier 1	
7	HACSL	COCR FY2016	PSH - Renewal	61.93	757,894	2,790,569	Tier 1	
8	VOA	Rapid Rehousing for Youth FY2016	RRH - Renewal	61.57	247,862	3,038,431	Tier 1	
9	HACSL	COCB FY2016	PSH - Renewal	60.43	247,806	3,286,237	Tier 1	
10	UDWS	HMIS Salt Lake FY2016	HMIS - Renewal	N/A	223,151	3,526,103	Tier 1	Prioritization Committee voted to place in Tier 1 due to essential nature of project
11	TRH	Scattered Site Properties (formerly Second West) FY2016	PSH - Renewal	60.37	16,715	3,526,103	Tier 1	
12	HACSL	SPBB FY2016	PSH - Renewal	57.14	203,573	3,729,676	Tier 1	
13	TRH	CHSH Leasing FY2016	PSH - Renewal	56.50	449,292	4,178,968	Tier 1	
14	TRH	Rapid Re-Housing Expansion FY2016	RRH - Renewal	56.26	105,664	4,284,632	Tier 1	

Local Rank	Agency	Project Title	Type	Total Adjusted Score	Recc. Funding Amount	Running Total	Tier	Notes
15	YWCA	TH Kathleen Robison and Residential Self-Sufficiency Program FY2016	TH-DV-Renewal	55.24	124,648	4,409,280	Tier 1	
16	TRH	Rapid Re-Housing for Families FY2016	RRH - Renewal	54.14	121,921	4,531,201	Tier 1	
17	TRH	PSH Rental Assistance FY2016	PSH - Renewal	51.07	1,253,205	5,784,406	Tier 1	
18	VBH	HFFY2016	PSH - Renewal	49.48	157,115	5,941,521	Tier 1	
19	HASLC	Shelter Plus Care V, FY2016	PSH - Renewal	48.13	87,963	6,029,484	Tier 1	
20	HAME	Sunrise Metro FY 2016	PSH - Renewal	47.14	68,275	6,097,759	Tier 1	
21	TRH	Frontier Apartments FY2016	PSH - Renewal	45.93	123,866	6,221,625	Tier 1	
22	TRH	PSH Expansion FY2016	PSH - Renewal	44.25	143,208	6,364,833	Tier 1	
23	VOA	Supportive Housing for Youth FY2016	TH-Y-Renewal	36.71	130,053	6,494,886	Tier 1	Project straddles funding line. Project in Tier 1 and 2
23	VOA	Supportive Housing for Youth FY2016	TH-Y-Renewal	36.71	160,914	6,655,800	Tier 2	Project straddles funding line. Project in Tier 1 and 2
24	HASLC	Shelter Plus Care IV, FY2016	PSH - Renewal	35.90	218,654	6,874,454	Tier 2	
25	FSH	Rapid Rehousing Program FY2016 (Part I)	RRH-New-Reallocated	88.50	109,294	6,983,748	Tier 2	New project funded using reallocated dollars
26	FSH	Rapid Rehousing Program FY2016 (Part II)	RRH-New-Bonus	*	98,373	7,082,121	Tier 2	New project funded using bonus dollars
N/A	SVS	South Valley Services Singles and Families Rapid Re Housing	RRH-New	*	N/A	N/A	N/A	Did not meet Threshold Scoring, Project Unranked
N/A	UCAP	Coordinated Assessment, FY2016	Coordinated Assessment	*	N/A	N/A	N/A	Did not meet Threshold Scoring, Project Unranked

* Explanation of Scoring available in Application Rank and Review Process document sent with this notice and posted to <http://slco.org/homeless-services/fy2016-coc-competition>

Funding Availability

- \$6,983,748 (Total ARD)
 - Amount to fund all existing grants for 1 year
 - May be used to fund existing projects or new reallocated projects

1



Reallocation

- **CoCs should reallocate funds to new projects whenever reallocation would improve outcomes and reduce homelessness.** (Source: NOFA FY2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition)
 - New PSH for CH
 - New RRH
 - SSO for Coordinated Assessment
 - New HMIS projects
- South Valley Services made the decision not to renew their existing grant
 - \$109,294 available for reallocation



Bonus

5% Bonus = \$349,187

- New permanent supportive housing projects that will serve chronically homeless families and individuals
- New rapid rehousing projects homeless individuals and families

3



Bonus (cont.)

- Not all CoCs may be eligible to receive permanent housing bonus funding.
- CoC must demonstrate that all project applications are evaluated and ranked based on the degree to which they improve the CoC's system performance.
- HUD will prioritize funding to CoCs that have demonstrated a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects as demonstrated through the CoC's local selection process. (FY2013, FY2014, FY2015)
 - Benchmark of 20%-Our CoC=13%



Tiering Rules

- Tiers are financial thresholds
- Tier 1 (93%)
 - \$6,494,886
- Tier 2 (7%) + Bonus Dollars (5%)
 - \$488,862 + \$349,187
 - \$838,049



Tiering Rules

- Projects in Tier 1
 - will be conditionally selected from the highest scoring CoC to the lowest scoring CoC
- Projects in Tier 2
 - Compete Nationally
 - Receive a score based on:

Points	Based on
50	CoC Score
35	Project Ranking
5	Project Type
10	Policy Priorities

Final Funding Decision

- FSH Ranked last
 - Split into two projects
- HMIS ranked #10

Application	Amount	Rank	Tier
VOA, UT Supportive Housing for Youth	130,052	23a	Tier 1
VOA, UT Supportive Housing for Youth	160,915	23b	Tier 2
HASLC, Shelter Plus Care IV	218,654	24	Tier 2
FSH Rapid Rehousing Program FY2016	109,294	25	Tier 2
FSH Rapid Rehousing Program FY2016	98,373	26	Tier 2



Final Funding Decision

- Minimizes risk to current renewal projects
 - 1.5 renewal projects in Tier 2
- Utilizes all reallocated dollars
 - Collaborative application receives more points
- Reallocated dollars “safer” funding
 - CoC may not be eligible for Bonus funding



Application Rank and Review Process

Salt Lake City and County Continuum of Care

FY2016 CoC Competition

Table of Contents

Application Rank and Review Timeline	2
Prioritization Policies and Procedures	3
Policy for Appeals of Rating/Ranking.....	4
Prioritization Committee Members	5
Detailed Renewal Application Scores	9
Detailed New Application Scores	10
Final Scoring Explanation.....	11

Application Rank and Review Timeline

Pre-Meeting on FY2016 CoC Ranking Process	30-Mar
Prioritization Committee Meeting-Review draft Renewal Scoring Guidelines	10-May
Prioritization Committee Meeting-Renewal Scoring Guidelines approved	23-May
RFP for Renewal TH & PH Application released, Scoring Guidelines & Prioritization Committee Policies and Procedures available as part of the application package	6-Jun
RFP for HMIS Application released	13-Jun
Prioritization Committee Meeting-Application review orientation	30-Jun
Prioritization Committee-New Scoring Guidelines approved (via e-mail)	12-Jul
RFP for New Projects Released, Scoring Guidelines & Prioritization Committee Policies and Procedures available as part of the application package	15-Jul
Prioritization Committee Meeting-Review preliminary renewal scores, new applications	11-Aug
New and Renewal Scoring Guidelines, Prioritization Committee Policies and Procedures posted	19-Aug
Planning Application draft posted for Public Comment	19-Aug
Prioritization Committee Meeting-Final Ranking/Funding Decision	26-Aug
Applicants notified of Final Ranking/Funding Decision	30-Aug

Salt Lake County and Tooele Continuum of Care

Homeless Assistance Grants

Prioritization Policies and Procedures

Eligible proposals will be prioritized for inclusion in the CoC's coordinated application by the Prioritization Committee acting as the rank and review group. Applications not scoring high enough will not be placed on the project funding request as part of the Consolidated Application (Formerly Exhibit 1).

SL County CRD recruits Prioritization Committee members, prioritizing members who have served as members in the past or who have other relevant experience. The Prioritization Committee will be composed of representatives from a cross-section of groups which might include: Faith-based and non-profit providers of homeless services and housing; city representatives; county employees; mental health; substance abuse; veteran's services; and consumers.

- Prioritization Committee members must declare that they have no conflict of interest.
- Members must be appointed every year and their eligibility verified.
- Members must be able to dedicate time for application review and committee meetings.
- Prioritization Committee members are given an orientation which includes:
 - Information regarding homeless activities, needs, services, definitions and other issues that are pertinent to the CoC
 - A background of McKinney Vento and the local process
 - The role of the Prioritization Committee
 - Review of the scoring tools, applications, and resources
- Prioritization Committee members receive eligible application proposals and scoring materials.
- Prior to the Ranking meeting, all Prioritization Committee members review all applications over an appointed period. Members read projects, preliminarily score them, and note any questions/comments to follow-up with applicants.
- If the CoC staff have any knowledge that could lead HUD to deny granting funds to a project, they will share that information with the Prioritization Committee. CoC staff will discuss this information with applicants as part of technical assistance provided to assist project development.
- The Prioritization Committee meets to review and discuss each application together and to individually score them. CoC staff is present at the Committee meeting to record decisions of the Committee and any comments/ recommendations they have for applicants.
 - The Prioritization Committee discusses the merits of each proposal, scores the applications, and turns in score sheets to staff.
 - Overall raw scores are calculated by CoC Staff.
 - The Committee considers adjustments for such issues HUD incentives or requirements.
 - The Committee considers proposal changes or project budget adjustments that may be required to meet community needs.
 - The Committee determines the rank and funding levels of all projects considering all available information.
 - During deliberation, CoC staff will provide technical assistance by responding to questions of the Committee members, correcting technical inaccuracies if they arise in conversation, and reminding the Committee members of their responsibilities if they step outside their purview.
- Scoring results are delivered to applicants with a reminder about the appellate process.
 - Each applicant receives copies of their proposals with technical edits made by CoC staff. Applicants are asked to correct their applications and send them back to CoC staff before final submission to HUD.
 - Applications which do not meet the threshold requirements will not be included in the Priority Listing in the Consolidated Application, and therefore will not be forwarded to HUD for consideration.

- If more applications are submitted than the CoC has money to fund, the lowest-scoring applications will not be included in the Priority List in Exhibit 1, and therefore will not be forwarded to HUD for consideration.

Penalties

Staff will contact agencies if an application is expected, but not received by the deadline. Applications submitted up to 24 hours late will be assessed a penalty as detailed in the scoring documentation.

Staff will contact agencies if applications are incomplete or inaccurate. A penalty will be assessed, but agencies will be given 24 hours from staff contact to fix the error. If the error is not corrected, the application will not be scored.

Applications submitted more than 24 hours after the deadline will not be scored.

Where there is a staff (SLCO or HUD) documented issue that impacts the ability of applicants to access electronic application systems (E-snaps, ZoomGrants), the Committee reserves the right to adjust the penalty accordingly.

Policy for Appeals of Rating/Ranking

Eligible Appeals

- The application of any applicant agency which a) is unranked, or b) receives decreased funding may appeal.
- Applicants that have been found not to meet the threshold requirements are not eligible for an appeal.
- Appeals cannot be based upon the judgment of the Prioritization Committee.

Applicants may appeal if they can:

- prove their score is not reflective of the application information provided; or
- describe bias or unfairness in the process, which warrants the appeal.

All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

Per 24 CFR 578.35(b), project applicants that believe they were not allowed to participate in a fair and open process and that were rejected by the CoC may appeal the rejection directly to HUD by submitting as a Solo Application prior to the application deadline.

Prioritization Committee Members

FY2016 HUD CoC competition for Salt Lake City and County Continuum of Care

Committee members documented conflicts of interest and recused themselves from scoring per policy.

Member	Stakeholder Group	Disclosed Conflict w/ Agency	Recused Self from Scoring
Claudia O'Grady	Housing Finance	None	None
Dan Adams	Banking – CRA	Post-renewal review Dan became an employee of Salt Lake County	New proposals: Utah CAP, First Step House, South Valley Services
Elizabeth Buehler	Salt Lake City ESG	None	None
Karen Wiley	Salt Lake County ESG	None	None
Robert Snarr	Behavioral Health Services	Valley Behavioral Health	Valley Behavioral Health
Tamera Kohler	State of Utah ESG	HMIS	HMIS
Tara Rollins	Housing Advocacy	Utah CAP	Utah CAP

Prioritization Committee Core Values

Impartiality – Committee member conflicts of interest must be declared and reviewed in order to avoid inappropriate, or the perception of inappropriate, influence in the review process.

Transparency – Applications will be evaluated using an established scoring guideline which is shared with applicants. Rankings and final scores will be provided to all applicants. Committee process information and will be released after the completion of the prioritization process.

Fairness – All applications are scored using an agreed upon point system. A standardized review criteria is used.

Confidentiality – Information gained by committee members during the prioritization process will be used only for the purposes of ranking and tiering the applications. Dissemination of post- competition information will be coordinated by committee support staff.

Commitment—Members of the Prioritization Committee will commit to attend meetings and submit scores for all non-conflicted applications.

I agree to participate on the Prioritization Committee and respect the above core values.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Certification (Renewal Projects)

This Conflict and Interest form should indicate whether the committee members has an actual or perceived conflict of interest in reviewing applications from the following organizations.

_____ I have no conflicts of interest to report.

_____ I have the following conflict of interests to report.

Please use the following table to list your conflict of interests. Please describe any relationships, transactions or positions you hold, or circumstances that you believe could contribute to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Housing Authority of Salt Lake City	
Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake	
The Road Home	
South Valley Sanctuary	
Utah Department of Workforce Services – SCSSO	
Valley Behavioral Health	
Volunteers of America – Utah	
YWCA Salt Lake	

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Conflict of Interest and Disclosure Certification (New Projects)

This Conflict and Interest form should indicate whether the committee members has an actual or perceived conflict of interest in reviewing applications from the following organizations.

_____ I have no conflicts of interest to report.

_____ I have the following conflict of interests to report.

Please use the following table to list your conflict of interests. Please describe any relationships, transactions or positions you hold, or circumstances that you believe could contribute to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

South Valley Services	
First Step House	
Salt Lake Community Action Program dba Utah Community Action	

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Detailed Renewal Application Scores

(Scores are presented here in alphabetical order by Agency acronym)

Agency	Project Title	Total Committee Score	Admin Total Score	Penalty Score	Total Score	Total Adjusted Score	Amount Requested
HACSL	HACSL SPK FY2016	74.00	65.00		139.00	71.28	87,100
HACSL	HACSL SP3 FY2016	73.00	68.00		141.00	70.50	496,441
HACSL	HACSL SP FY2016	73.71	56.00		129.71	64.86	976,195
HACSL	HACSL SPG FY2016	75.71	50.00		125.71	62.86	181,746
HACSL	HACSL COCR FY2016	73.86	50.00		123.86	61.93	757,894
HACSL	HACSL COCB FY2016	73.86	47.00		120.86	60.43	247,806
HACSL	HACSL SPR FY2016	76.86	38.00		114.86	63.81	75,899
HACSL	HACSL SPBB FY2016	76.29	38.00		114.29	57.14	203,573
HAME	HAME- Sunrise Metro FY 2016	74.29	45.00	-25	94.29	47.14	68,275
HASLC	HASLC, Shelter Plus Care II, FY2016	83.43	66.00	-25	124.43	62.21	215,294
HASLC	HASLC, Shelter Plus Care V, FY2016	83.86	35.00	-25	93.86	48.13	87,963
HASLC	HASLC, Shelter Plus Care IV, FY2016	82.00	13.00	-25	70.00	35.90	218,654
HMIS	UDWS HMIS Salt Lake FY2016						223,151
TRH	TRH Scattered Site Properties (formerly Second West) FY2016	74.71	68.00	-25	117.71	60.37	16,715
TRH	TRH CHSH Leasing FY2016	78.00	60.00	-25	113.00	56.50	449,292
TRH	TRH Rapid Re-Housing Expansion FY2016	76.71	58.00	-25	109.71	56.26	105,664
TRH	TRH Rapid Re-Housing for Families FY2016	78.29	55.00	-25	108.29	54.14	121,921
TRH	TRH PSH Rental Assistance FY2016	77.14	50.00	-25	102.14	51.07	1,253,205
TRH	TRH Frontier Apartments FY2016	73.86	43.00	-25	91.86	45.93	123,866
TRH	TRH PSH Expansion FY2016	76.29	35.00	-25	86.29	44.25	143,208
VBH	HFFY2016 (Consolidated App.)	78.23	43.24	-25	96.48	49.48	157,115
VOA	VOA, UT Rapid Rehousing for Youth FY2016	78.14	70.00	-25	123.14	61.57	247,862
VOA	VOA, UT Supportive Housing for Youth FY2016	67.43	31.00	-25	73.43	36.71	290,967
YWCA	YWCA TH Kathleen Robison and Residential Self-Sufficiency Program FY2016	76.71	56.00	-25	107.71	55.24	124,648

Detailed New Application Scores

(Scores are presented here in alphabetical order by Agency acronym)

Agency	Project Title	Need Score (Threshold: 48)	Capacity Score (Threshold: 112)	Penalty Score	Total Score	Total Adjusted Score*	Amount Requested
FSH	FSH Rapid Rehousing Program FY2016 (Part I)	50.33	126.67		177.00	88.50	207,667
FSH	FSH Rapid Rehousing Program FY2016 (Part II)			See final scoring explanation			
SVS	South Valley Services Singles and Families Rapid Re Housing	42.33	91.33	Did not meet threshold scoring; project unranked			
UCAP	Coordinated Assessment, FY2016	53.6	109.6	Did not meet threshold scoring; project unranked			

Final Scoring Explanation

Renewal Application Scoring

- Portions of the application that the committee scored were worth 100 points.
- Portions of the application scored by SLCO using need and performance data from HMIS/Reports were worth 100 points.
 - For the Returns to Homelessness question agencies were directed to respond as “N/A” if there was no data on the Measure 2 report.
 - Applications were not penalized but the total points possible for those applications was adjusted to 195 rather than 200.
 - Similarly, if applicants also responded N/A to the Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown question, the total points possible for those applications was adjusted to 180 rather than 200.
- Total Adjusted score was derived in the following manner:
 - $100 * ((\text{Committee Score} + \text{Admin Score} + \text{Penalty}) / (\text{Total Points Possible}))$

HMIS Application Scoring

- Committee members completed a review of the HMIS Renewal application and voted to approve the application and include it in the funding recommendation to HUD.
- The Committee ranked the project 10 to ensure that it was placed in Tier 1 due to the essential nature of the project.

Valley Behavioral Health Application Scoring

- Valley Behavioral Health received notice of a grant consolidation approval after scoring had completed. The prioritization committee agreed to use a weighted average (based on funding request amount) to arrive at a final score.

Application	Committee Score	Admin Score	Penalty	Total Score	Total Adjusted Score
VBH_Homefront II_FY2016/UT0058L8T001506	77.67	65	-25	117.67	60.34
VBH_Safe Haven I_FY2016/UT0004L8T001505	78.50	33	-25	86.50	43.25
Average applied to Consolidated Application	78.23	43.24	-25	96.48	49.48

New Application Scoring

- Portions of the application that the committee scored were worth 200 points.
- Per the RFP, new applications needed to score 80% in both the need and capacity section to pass threshold and be considered for ranking.
 - Need: $80\% = 48/60$
 - Capacity: $80\% = 112/140$
- First Step House submitted one application for consideration.
 - In order to take advantage of reallocated dollars, the Committee recommended that the application be split into two projects.
 - To minimize risk to existing projects, the Committee recommended that the application be ranked last.