FY2021 CoC Program Competition

The CoC Program Competition NOFO (Notice of Funding Opportunity) has been released. The CoC Estimated Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) Report for Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC is as follows:

- Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN): $4,935,441
- Estimated ARD: $7,245,269
- CoC Bonus: $362,263
- DV Bonus: $740,376
- CoC Planning: $217,358

Local Applications

The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (Coalition) invites applications under HUD's FY 2021 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Competition for renewal, new, and bonus projects at this time. The opening of this local competition for projects serving Kent County is in accordance with the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the 2021 Continuum of Care Program by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Coalition will concurrently consider both renewal project applications as well as new and bonus projects (including permanent housing bonus projects and domestic violence bonus projects). The Coalition will submit one collaborative "Continuum of Care

Local Applications

The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (Coalition) invites applications under HUD's FY 2021 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Competition for renewal, new, and bonus projects at this time. The opening of this local competition for projects serving Kent County is in accordance with the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the 2021 Continuum of Care Program by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Coalition will concurrently consider both renewal project applications as well as new and bonus projects (including permanent housing bonus projects and domestic violence bonus projects). The Coalition will submit one collaborative "Continuum of Care Application" for 2021 that reflects community-wide planning and performance. The score received for this application will be applied to funding requested for FY 2021 funds.

For FY 2021 renewal projects, the Coalition is eligible to apply to HUD for a maximum of $7,245,269, which constitutes the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). The ARD is the total sum of all renewal projects eligible for renewal. This year, the Coalition is eligible to apply for a total of $362,263 in general CoC bonus projects and a total of $740,376 in domestic violence bonus projects. All interested and qualified parties are invited to submit a new project application that will be reviewed and scored along with renewal projects.

Below you will find a detailed instructional document, relevant CoC policy documents, and application forms and scorecards that will be utilized to score project applications. Agencies should review the instructional document carefully prior to submitting an application.

Application Documents

- 2021 Local Application Instructions
- 2021 Local Application for New/Bonus Projects – PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH Only
- 2021 Local Application for Renewal Projects
- 2021 Local Application for Infrastructure Projects – New and Renewal HMIS or SSO-CE Only
- Scorecard for 2021 Local Application for New/Bonus Projects – PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH Only
- Scorecard for 2021 Local Application for Renewal Projects
- 2021 Local Application Appeals Document

- Scorecard for 2021 Local Application for Renewal Projects
- 2021 Local Application Appeals Document

Instructional and Policy Documents

FY2021 Funding Process Timeline: CoC 2021 Funding Process Timeline

Due Date	Task	Responsible Party
9/16/21	Reallocation Meeting (for current CoC projects)	CoC Staff, CoC Providers
9/21/21	**Local Project Applications *for new projects* released**	**CoC Staff**
9/23/21	**Local Project Applications *for renewal projects* released**	**CoC Staff**
10/11/21	**Local and E-Snaps Applications Due**	**Applicants**
10/19/21	Funding Review Committee Recommendations Shared with Applicants	CoC Staff
10/15/21	CoC Application Draft Posted Publicly	CoC Staff, CoC Members
10/22/21	Appeals to Funding Review Recommendations Due	Applicants
10/26/21	Appeals Panel Meets (if required)	Appeals Panel
10/28/21	Funding and Ranking Recommendations Shared with Steering Council, Posted Publicly	CoC Staff
11/4/21	Public Feedback on Ranking and CoC Application Due to CoC Staff	CoC Staff
11/5/21	Steering Council Vote on Priority Listing Recommendations	Steering Council
11/11/21	CoC Consolidated App and Priority Listing posted to website	CoC Staff
11/16/21	CoC Application and Priority Listing Submitted to HUD	CoC Staff

Highlighted text was updated as of 9/20/2021

CoC Realloaction Policy: Reallocation Policy

CoC Appeals Policy: Funding_Appeal_Policy

View this email in your browser

Good morning, all -

Check out today's newsletter for the local CoC Program Competition funding announcement, data reports, community resources, upcoming events, and more!

CoC Updates

CoC Program Competition: Local Funding Announcement

- The Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness (Coalition) invites applications under HUD's FY 2021 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Competition for renewal, new, and bonus projects at this time. The opening of this local competition for projects serving Kent County is in accordance with the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the 2021 Continuum of Care Program by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

- For FY 2021 renewal projects, the Coalition is eligible to apply to HUD for a maximum of $7,245,269, which constitutes the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). The ARD is the total sum of all renewal projects eligible for renewal. This year, the Coalition is also eligible to apply for a total of $362,263 in general CoC bonus projects and a total of $740,376 in domestic violence bonus projects. All interested and qualified parties are

invited to submit a new project application that will be reviewed and scored along with renewal projects. The Coalition will submit one collaborative "Continuum of Care Application" for 2021 that reflects community-wide planning and performance. The score received for this application will be applied to funding requested for FY 2021 funds.

- Below you will find a detailed instructional document and application forms and scorecards that will be utilized to score project applications. Agencies should review the instructional document carefully prior to submitting an application. Additional information is available on our website.
  - 2021 Local Application Instructions
  - 2021 Local Application for New/Bonus Projects – PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH only
  - 2021 Local Application for Renewal Projects
  - 2021 Local Application for Infrastructure Projects – for new and renewal HMIS or SSO-CE projects
  - Scorecard for 2021 Local Application for New/Bonus Projects – PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH Only
  - Scorecard for 2021 Local Application for Renewal Projects

2020 Annual Count and 2021 PIT Count Reports Now Available

- Final reports with data from our 2020 Annual Count and 2021 Point-In-Time count are now available for viewing on the coalition's website at: https://endhomelessnesskent.org/about/data/
  - The 2020 Annual Count Report data reflects an unduplicated count of those experiencing homelessness from HMIS for the period of January 1 to December 31, 2020. This report details who experiences homelessness each year in Kent County, but does not detail the experience of homelessness.
  - The 2021 Point-In-Time (PIT) Count Report details data collected during the PIT Count performed on Wednesday, January 27th, 2021. This count provides a snapshot of who was experiencing homelessness on one night in our community. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the unsheltered portion of the count was conducted as an observation-based count likely leading to an undercount of that population.

+ Add a Button

🔊 Promote

Create Post

🖼 Photo/Video   💬 Get Messages   😊 Feeling/Activity

Create 📹 Live   🎫 Event   💼 Job ...

Grand Rapids Area Coalition to End Homelessness
Published by Mailchimp ⊘ · September 24 at 11:02 AM · 🌐

Today's newsletter has the local CoC Program Competition Funding Announcement, CoC data reports, community resources, upcoming events, and more!
Check it out here! - https://mailchi.mp/.../coc-newsletter-program-competition...

MAILCHI.MP
CoC Newsletter: Program Competition Funding Announcement, Data Reports,...

59
People Reached

4
Engagements

Boost Post

1 Share

👍 Like   💬 Comment   ↗ Share

Comment as Grand Rapids Area Coalition t... 😊 📷 🖼 🎬

A better way to manage your Page

Facebook Business Suite helps you keep Page management separate from your profile, and gives you a dedicated space to get things done.

Go to Business Suite

Create Ad   See all
How would you like to grow your business?

📝
Create New Ad
Make an ad using text, photos or videos to promote your business

👍
Boost a Post

✨ **Automated Ads** ›
Get personalized ads that adjust over time to help you get better results.

Free Facebook Business Tools ✕

PROJECT REVIEW AND RANKING

All applicants/projects must meet basic eligibility and quality threshold requirements (see NOFO pages 44-50). The Coalition reserves the right to reject any application that is not consistent with the CoC Program Interim Rule and/or the FY 2021 NOFO.

PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA
Local project evaluation criteria are guided primarily by relevant HUD policy priorities and Criteria for Applicants identified in the FY 2021 NOFO. The specific criteria that will be used are reflected in the project applications and scorecards.

PROJECT RANKING
Once applications are reviewed and scored using the above-described criteria, projects will be ranked by score and HUD Policy Priorities and local priorities. Adjustments may be made to the rankings to:

- Maximize funds for projects identified in Tier I.
- Ensure adequate resources for system infrastructure by ranking HMIS and coordinated assessment/coordinated entry projects within Tier I.

If funded, domestic violence bonus projects will be pulled from the CoC's Priority Listing, and all projects ranked below them will move up one rank (as indicated in the NOFO on page 16). Consistent with last year's process, PH bonus projects will not be ranked higher than renewal projects.

APPEALS
Applicants may appeal the scoring decision made by the Funding Review Committee. Appeals will be reviewed by an Appeals Panel, comprised of one member of the Funding Review Committee, one Steering Council member, CoC staff (non-voting), and recruited members from Continuums of Care outside of Kent County. For completing an appeal, applicants should use the Appeals Application and closely follow the guidelines outlined in the CoC's Funding Decision Appeal Policy; both documents are available on the Coalition's website. Appeals must be received by 5:00 PM, Friday, October 22, 2021 for consideration.

FY2021 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION
NEW/BONUS PROJECT SCORECARD

Applicant and Project Name: _____

Rater Name: _____ Date Reviewed: _____

Project Quality Requirements			
All new and bonus projects must pass threshold requirements before being considered for funding on the merit of the project. Threshold requirements are pass/fail rather than scored. Does the project meet all eligibility and quality threshold requirements? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Maximum Score Possible		162
	Total Project Score		
	Weighted Rating Score **(Total Project Score / Maximum Score Possible x 100)**		

Section I: Project Overview	Possible Points: **30**	Section Score:
1.a. Description of project: Does it meet the needs of the community and persons experiencing homelessness? Score according to how well the project design demonstrates the following criteria (3 pts = Well-demonstrated, 2 pts = Fairly-demonstrated, 1 pt = Poorly-demonstrated; 0 pts = Not at all demonstrated):		
The project serves a HUD-defined high priority population	3	
Understanding of the needs of the focus population to be served	3	
Type, scale, and location of housing fits the needs of those to be served	3	
Type and scale of supportive services, regardless of funding source	3	
How assistance in obtaining mainstream benefits is provided	3	
1.b. Description of the plan to assist participants in securing and maintaining PH that is safe, affordable, accessible, and acceptable to their needs. (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan; 1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No plan)	5	
1.c. Description of how participants will be assisted to obtain the benefits of mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible to apply to maximize their ability to live independently. (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan; 1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No plan)	5	
2. Describe how the project aligns with the objectives and goals outlined in the CoC Compass. (5 pts = Thorough Alignment; 3 pts = Some Alignment; 1 pt = Little Alignment; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Section II: Experience	Possible Points: **42**	Section Score:
3. Experience of the applicant (and any sub-recipients) in working with the proposed population and in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application		
(15 pts = Extensive Experience; 10 pts = Moderate Experience; 5 pts = Limited Experience; 0 pts = No Experience)	15	
4. Description of experience with utilizing a Housing First approach. Score given based on how project design incorporates a complete description of the following criteria (2 pts = Complete description; 1 pt = Incomplete description; 0 pts = No description)		
Eligibility criteria	2	
Process for accepting new participants	2	
Process and criteria for exiting participants	2	
Demonstration that there are no preconditions to entry (substance use, income, criminal records, marital status, familial status, actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity)	2	
How project addresses situations that may jeopardize housing or project assistance to ensure that project participation is terminated only in most severe cases	2	
5. Description of applicant experience in utilizing federal funds.		
Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate past proficiency in utilizing federal funds. (5 pts = Extensive Past Proficiency; 3 pts = Moderate Past Proficiency; 1 pt = Limited Past Proficiency; 0 pts = No Past Proficiency)	5	
6. Description of the determination of type, amount, and duration of rental assistance for participants. Score according to how well the response describes the use of the following philosophies and plans to prevent homelessness:		
Use of the progressive engagement philosophy (2 = Complete description; 1 = Incomplete description; 0 = No description)	3	
Use of the strength-based philosophy (2 = Complete description; 1 = Incomplete description; 0 = No description)	3	
Plans to prevent persons from exiting into homelessness (3 = Well-described plan; 2 = Fairly-described plan; 1 = Poorly-described plan; 0 = No plan described)	3	
Plans to prevent persons from becoming homeless post-project exit (3 = Well-described plan; 2 = Fairly-described plan; 1 = Poorly-described plan; 0 = No plan described)	3	

Section III: Project Effectiveness	Possible Points: **30**	Section Score:
7. What would be the prioritization process for households referred to this project? How will it be determined who is most vulnerable and the best fit for any referrals to this project? Provide detail from policy established by the CoC.		
Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate understanding of prioritization and pairing households based on project eligibility. (5 pts = Extensive Process; 3 pts = Adequate Process; 1 pt = Poor Process; 0 pts = No Process)	5	

8. Will all participating households served in this project be recorded in HMIS or an equivalent database for domestic violence, in accordance with the community's Data Quality Standards? **(Pass/Fail)**	5/0	
9. Description of a plan for rapid implementation of the project, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.		
Score according to how extensive the project plan is (5 pts = Extensive Plan; 3 pts = Adequate Plan; 1 pt = Poor Plan; 0 pts = No Plan)	5	
Score according to how detailed the schedules for proposed activities are (5 pts = Very Detailed; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
10. Describe the training applicant and sub-applicant staff have undergone or will undergo as well as agency policies or procedures related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as it pertains to service provision.		
Score according to the variety and range of training opportunities (5 pts = Numerous Opportunities; 3 pts = Some Varied Opportunities; 1 pt = Few Opportunities; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
Score according to how detailed the policies and procedures are (5 pts = Very Detailed Policies; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed Policies; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed Policies; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Section IV: Organizational Capacity	Possible Points: **20**	Section Score:
11. Describe agency key staff positions and qualifications of individuals who will carry out the project		
Score according to how detailed key staff descriptions are (5 pts = Very Detailed; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
Score according to how qualified staff are to executive project (5 pts = Very Qualified; 3 pts = Moderately Qualified; 1 pt = Poorly Qualified; 0 pts = Not at all qualified)	5	
12. Describe the agency's financial management system, including financial reporting, record keeping, accounting systems, payment procedures, procurement processes, and audit requirements.		
Score based on completeness of financial management system with respect to each identified component (10 pts = Complete System; 5 pts = Partially-Complete System; 0 pts = None of financial management system components are described)	10	
Section V: Project Budget	Possible Points: **40**	Section Score:
13. Do project costs appear reasonable when compared to project costs of similar project types?		
(5 pts = Very Reasonable; 3 pts = Somewhat Reasonable; 1 pt = Not Reasonable; 0 pts = Completely Unreasonable)	5	
14. Audit		
a. Most recent audit found no exceptions to standard practices **(Pass/Fail)**	3/0	
b. Most recent audit identified agency as "low risk" **(Pass/Fail)**	3/0	
c. Most recent audit indicates no findings **(Pass/Fail)**	4/0	
15. Documented match amount **(Pass/Fail)**	5/0	

16. Budgeted costs are reasonable, allocable, and allowable.		
Reasonable (6 pts = Very Reasonable; 3 pts = Somewhat Reasonable; 1 pt = Not Reasonable; 0 pts = Completely Unreasonable)	6	
Allocable (6 pts= All costs are allocable; 3 pts = Costs are 50/50 allocable and not allocable; 0 pts = Costs are not at all allocable)	6	
Allowable (8 pts = All costs are allowable; 4 pts = Costs are 50/50 allowable and not-allowable; 0 pts = Costs are not at all allowable)	8	

Completion of Application		Possible Points: **0** Deductions: **-15**	Section Score:
Are all required attachments provided?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	
Is the application complete and accurate?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	
Was the application submitted by the deadline?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	

FY2021 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION
RENEWAL PROJECT SCORECARD

Applicant and Project Name: _____

Rater Name: _____   Date Reviewed: _____

Project Quality Requirements		
Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding.	Maximum Score Possible	145
	Total Project Score	
	Weighted Rating Score **(Total Project Score / Maximum Score Possible x 100)**	

Please note at the numbered questions on the application correspond with the numbered scoring areas below.

Section I: Project Effectiveness	Possible Points: **90**	Section Score:
3. How many beds are dedicated/prioritized for priority population(s)?		
Veterans		
Chronically Homeless		
Families		
Youth		
Domestic Violence		
4a. Does the project qualify as low barrier? **(Must meet all criteria listed in application.)**		
Yes	4	
No	0	
4b. Does the project meet all Housing First criteria? **(Must meet all criteria listed in application.)**		
Yes	6	
No	0	
5. Does the project provide supportive service activities?		
4 activities provided	5	
2-3 activities provided	3	
1 activity provided	1	
0 activities provided	0	
6. Describe how the project aligns with the objectives and goals outlined in the CoC Compass.		
Not scored	Not scored	Not scored
7. Did the project take 100% of all referrals from Coordinated Entry in the past grant year?		
Yes	5	
No	0	
8. Describe the training applicant and sub-applicant staff have undergone or will undergo as well as agency policies or procedures related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as it pertains to service provision.		
Score according to the variety and range of training opportunities (5 pts = Numerous Opportunities; 3 pts = Some Varied Opportunities; 1 pt = Few Opportunities; 0 pts = No Details)	5	
Score according to how detailed the policies and procedures are (5 pts = Very Detailed Policies; 3 pts = Moderately Detailed Policies; 1 pt = Poorly Detailed Policies; 0 pts = No Details)	5	

Efficient Use of Funding:		
9. What is the project's utilization rate?		
95% or higher	5	
80%-94%	0	
79% or lower	-5	
10. Percent of funding recaptured in last completed grant year		
7% or less	5	
8% or more	0	
11. Were drawdowns made at least quarterly?		
Yes	5	
No	0	
HMIS Participation (or alternate database for domestic violence projects)		
12. Percentage of APR Data Quality Elements (6a.-6d.) with 5% or less null or missing values		
85% or greater	5	
Less than 84%	0	
HUD Monitoring Findings		
13. Does the recipient have any HUD monitoring findings in any of the agency's projects? If yes, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of Funding Review for the application to meet standards.	Standard Met:	☐ Yes ☐ No
Impact on Homelessness		
14. Is this project the only CoC funded project with dedicated beds to a particular target population? (Answered based on all applications submitted for this NOFO.)		
Yes	☐	Not Scored, Taken into consideration in a tie score situation
No	☐	
Serving High Need Populations		
15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined as having zero income at Start/entry? (APR 18)		
PSH		
80% or more	10	
70-%79%	8	
50%-69%	5	
Less than 50%	0	
RRH & TH		
50% or more	10	
40%-49%	8	
30%-39%	5	
Less than 30%	0	
16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as having two or more physical or mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2)		
PSH		
More than 50%	10	
30%-49%	8	
10%-29%	5	
Less than 10%	0	
RRH & TH		
More than 10%	10	
5%-10%	5	
Less Than 5%	0	

17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? (APR Q26a.)			
PSH			
	80% or more	10	
	70-%79%	8	
	50%-69%	5	
	Less than 50%	0	
RRH & TH			
	15% or more	10	
	10%-14%	8	
	5%-9%	5	
	1%-4%	2	
	Less than 1%	0	
18. What percentage of the households served were families experiencing homelessness? (APR Q8a.)			
PSH			
	15% or more	10	
	10%-14%	8	
	5%-9%	5	
	1%-4%	0	
RRH & TH			
	More than 50%	10	
	30%-49%	8	
	10%-29%	5	
	Less than 10%	2	
	More than 50%	0	
Section II: Project Performance		Possible Points: **55**	Section Score:
Performance Data			
19. Length of Stay			
PSH—Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days (APR 22a.1)			
	95% and more	20	
	85%-94%	15	
	75%-84%	10	
	65%-74%	5	
	55%-64%	0	
RRH—Percentage of participants that took 60 days or less from project entry to lease up (APR 22C)			
	80%-100%	20	
	60%-79%	15	
	40%-59%	10	
	20%-39%	5	
	0%-19%	0	
TH – Average length of project stay in days (APR 22b)			
	180 or less	20	
	181-270	15	
	271-390	10	
	391-728	5	
	More than 728 days	0	

20. Exits to Permanent Housing			
PSH - Percent who remain in PH or move to positive housing destinations	([APR23c+APR5a9]/[APR5a1-APR23c])		
	95% or higher	25	
	90%-94%	20	
	85%-89%	15	
	80%-84%	10	
	75%-79%	5	
	Less than 75%	0	
RRH & TH - Percent who exit to positive housing destinations (APR 23c)			
	95% or higher	25	
	90%-94%	20	
	85%-89%	15	
	80%-84%	10	
	75%-79%	5	
	Less than 75%	0	
21. New or Increased Income and Earned Income			
a. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.1)			
	8% and higher	2.5	
	5%-7%	1.5	
	Less than 5%	0	
b. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased other (non-employment) income (APR 19a.1)			
	50% and higher	2.5	
	25%-49%	1.5	
	Less than 25%	0	
c. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
	8% and higher	2.5	
	5%-7%	1.5	
	Less than 5%	0	
c. RRH and TH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)			
	30% and higher	5	
	20%-29%	2.5	
	Less than 20%	0	
d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
	50% and higher	2.5	
	25%-49%	1.5	
	Less than 25%	0	
d. RRH and TH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)			
	10% and higher	5	
	5%-9%	2.5	
	Less than 5%	0	
Section III: Completion of Application	Possible Points: **0** Deductions: **-20** Minimum: **-10**		Section Score:
Is the application complete and accurate?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	
Are all required attachments provided?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	
Was the application submitted by the deadline?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-10	