

Greater Kansas City Coalition to End Homelessness

3200 Wayne Avenue, Suite 202 | Kansas City, MO 64109
Ph 816.924.7997 | Fax 816.924.7994
www.hscgkc.org



Review and Ranking Guidance, per Grants Committee, as discussed 8/16/16:

- Rank each of the 3 types of Project Applications Types separately.
The Project Application Types are:
 - Renewal Project *with* Contract - these projects have performance measure data
 - Renewal Project *without* Contract - these projects were approved for funding as New Bonus Projects in the FY2015 competition but have not received a contract and do not have performance measure data
 - New or Reallocation Projects – projects are scored primarily on capacity/program estimates.
- Scoring Matrix Forms are provided for each type of project application. We will label each project application with the Project Type.

Tier 1 - Score and rank HMIS project for MAAC as the #1 project (\$44,184); then score & rank “high performing” Renewal Projects *with* contracts at the top of Tier 1 (approximately \$10,276,882). Score and rank Renewal Projects *without* contracts at the bottom of Tier 1 (\$1,613,113). The last ranked project in Tier 1 will be the HMIS project for Mid America Regional Council – MARC (\$145,181).

Tier 1 ranked projects cannot exceed **\$12,079,360** in total grant funds (83% of Annual Renewal Demand, or ARD for the CoC). If the Tier 1 total surpasses \$12,079,360, the HMIS-MARC project must be split between Tier 1 & Tier 2.

Tier 1 Example

Rank	Project Name	Project Type	Score	\$ Amount
#1	HMIS - MAACLink	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	Not Scored	\$44,184
#2	Victoria’s Permanent Supportive Housing for Veteran’s Experiencing Chronic Homelessness	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	107 points	\$5,138,441
#3	Rapid Re-housing for Runaway Youth	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	98 points	\$5,138,441
#4	Tiny House Permanent Supportive Housing Project	Renewal <i>without</i> Contract	84 points	\$1,613,113
#5	HMIS – MARC	Renewal <i>without</i> Contract	Not Scored	\$145,181

Tier 2 - Rank the highest scoring New Bonus and/or Reallocation projects at the top of Tier 2; New Bonus/reallocation projects should be ranked above “lower performing” Renewal Projects). Tier 2 will fund the remaining funds available to the CoC through ARD (7%, \$909,199) and Bonus allocation (\$649,428).

Tier 2 Example “A”

#6	New Permanent Housing Bonus Project	New	100 points
#7	New Permanent Housing Bonus Project	New	95 points
#8	New Permanent Housing Bonus Project	New	90 points
#9	Capybara Supportive Housing	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	50 points
#10	Sumo Transitional Housing	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	45 points

**Review and Ranking Panel has the discretion to rank “higher performing” Renewal Projects *with* Contracts that fall below the Tier 1 funding limits at the Top of Tier 2 above the New Bonus and/or Reallocation Projects. Projects ranked higher in Tier 2 have a better chance of being funded than those ranked lower, per HUD NOFA guidelines.

Tier 2 Example “B”

#6	Sumo Transitional Housing	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	83 points
#7	New Permanent Housing Bonus Project	New	95 points
#8	New Permanent Housing Bonus Project	New	90 points
#9	Capybara Supportive Housing	Renewal <i>with</i> Contract	50 points

Notes/Things to Know:

- Tie-breaker for when 2 or more Renewal Project Applicants have the same score: Add the total points from the Score Sheet for each project’s Housing Performance, Income Performance & Housing First Checklist (minus the bonus points). Total points available is 62. Highest scoring project breaks the tie.
Housing Performance + Income Performance + Housing First = Tie Breaker Score
- \$649,428 is available for New Bonus projects providing Rapid Re-Housing or Permanent Supportive Housing projects. More applications for Bonus Project funding have been submitted than there are funds available. The Rank & Review panel has the discretion to recommend reductions in project budgets, to reject projects outright, and to rank bonus projects to meet the \$649,428 cap.
- The Rank & Review panel has the discretion to recommend to the Board of Directors that any project, including Renewals, be reallocated in part or in full, or for rejection.
- Our CoC has not conducted a Gaps Analysis to determine the type of housing most needed within our Continuum of Care (PSH, RRH or TH).
- HUD and the CoC have placed a high emphasis on Housing & Income performance measures, giving more points to applicants who meet or exceed performance expectations.
- Cost Effectiveness - There is a not a measure for Cost Effectiveness. The Grant Committee researched measures used by other CoC’s, gathered information from the NAEH conference, and discussed at length options for measuring cost effectiveness. However, the committee could not identify a measure that would take into account all of the factors impacting cost effectiveness (population served, cost effectiveness connection to high performance, type of housing, etc). The Grant Committee recommends that a measure be included for the 2017 competition.