

October 14, 2024

Jennifer Wilson
Mayor

Erin Litvack
Deputy Mayor /
Chief Administrative Officer

Katherine Fife
Associate Deputy Mayor

Anndrea Wild
Director

Alexandra Allen
Associate Director

Dear HUD Continuum of Care Applicant,

Congratulations! Your project application(s) that were submitted for consideration in the FY2024-25 HUD CoC Competition for the Salt Lake City and County Continuum of Care have been selected to be included in the CoC's Priority Listing and will be submitted to HUD for review and award.

Five members served on this year's Ranking Committee representing various stakeholder groups. A list of committee members is included with this letter, although applicants should note that any communication regarding the Committee processes or outcomes should be directed to Salt Lake County per approved policies and procedures. Salt Lake County, in its role as CoC Collaborative Applicant, provides staffing support to the Ranking Committee.

The committee worked diligently to thoroughly review all projects, support the creation of new resources, and consider impacts to existing programs. After reviewing all submitted applications, the committee considered a number of ranking strategies as they related to overall funding. Discussion centered on how particular projects contribute to overall system performance, accountability for currently funded programs, and the options to bring new resources to the community.

The committee has completed their work for the FY2024-25 competition. Please find the following enclosed:

1. Summary Application Scores - Overview of all submitted applications, scores, and funding status. Detailed scoring information specific to your agency is also included.
2. FY2024 Competition Final Ranking Recommendations - Ranking Committee recommendations will be submitted to HUD. HUD is the ultimate funding authority and will make the final award decisions.
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 Salt Lake Continuum of Care Competition site.

Salt Lake County may be reaching out to you and other grantees in the next week to fix minor technical edits prior to final grant submission. Please watch your email for further instructions.

Thank you for continued partnership,



Tarra McFadden
Program & Grants Manager

Summary Application Scores

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

Local Rank	Project Name	Total Committee Score	Total Admin Score	Points Possible	Final Score	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	Tier Placement
1	SLCO Coordinated Entry Project	95.33	n/a	100.00	95.33	\$266,800	\$266,800	Tier 1
2	TRH RRH for Domestic Violence Survivors	182.83	n/a	200.00	91.42	\$380,500	\$380,500	Tier 1
3	TRH Scattered Site Properties	93.17	56.25	167.50	89.20	\$20,563	\$20,563	Tier 1
4	HC SP3 New Chronic	89.17	88.75	200.00	88.96	\$1,521,208	\$1,521,208	Tier 1
5	HC COCR Reallocated	88.50	89.38	200.00	88.94	\$1,534,756	\$1,534,756	Tier 1
6	DWS Salt Lake HMIS	-	-	-	-	\$266,275	\$266,275	Tier 1
7	TRH S+C II Consolidated	91.00	83.75	200.00	87.38	\$2,838,220	\$2,838,220	Tier 1
8	HC SP Renewal	89.00	83.13	200.00	86.06	\$1,901,192	\$1,901,192	Tier 1
9	HC SPBB Bud Bailey	90.67	78.13	200.00	84.40	\$315,089	\$315,089	Tier 1
10	TRH RRH for Families Consolidated	88.17	80.00	200.00	84.08	\$658,041	\$658,041	Partially in Tier 1 and Tier 2
11	HC SPGK Grace Mary Kelly Benson	92.00	67.50	200.00	79.75	\$424,834	\$424,834	Tier 2
12	TRH Magnolia Supportive Services	86.33	56.88	200.00	71.60	\$220,000	\$220,000	Tier 2
13	TRH Shelter Plus Care II Expansion	75.50	-	80.00	94.38	\$854,704	\$854,704	Tier 2
14	YWCA Utah RRH for DV Survivors	80.67	-	90.00	89.63	\$708,021	\$708,021	Tier 2

Local Rank	Project Name	Total Committee Score	Total Admin Score	Points Possible	Final Score	Project Type	Funding Requested	Funding Recommended	Tier Placement
1	SLCO Coordinated Entry Project	95.33	n/a	100.00	95.33	SSO-CE	\$266,800	\$266,800	Tier 1
2	TRH RRH for Domestic Violence Survivors	182.83	n/a	200.00	91.42	Renewal PH-RRH	\$380,500	\$380,500	Tier 1
3	TRH Scattered Site Properties	93.17	56.25	167.50	89.20	Renewal PH-PSH	\$20,563	\$20,563	Tier 1
4	HC SP3 New Chronic	89.17	88.75	200.00	88.96	Renewal PH-PSH	\$1,521,208	\$1,521,208	Tier 1
5	HC COCR Reallocated	88.50	89.38	200.00	88.94	Renewal PH-PSH	\$1,534,756	\$1,534,756	Tier 1
6	DWS Salt Lake HMIS	-	-	-	-	HMIS	\$266,275	\$266,275	Tier 1
7	TRH S+C II Consolidated	91.00	83.75	200.00	87.38	Renewal PH-PSH	\$2,838,220	\$2,838,220	Tier 1
8	HC SP Renewal	89.00	83.13	200.00	86.06	Renewal PH-PSH	\$1,901,192	\$1,901,192	Tier 1
9	HC SPBB Bud Bailey	90.67	78.13	200.00	84.40	Renewal PH-PSH	\$315,089	\$315,089	Tier 1
10	TRH RRH for Families Consolidated	88.17	80.00	200.00	84.08	Renewal PH-RRH	\$658,041	\$658,041	Partially in Tier 1 and Tier 2
11	HC SPGK Grace Mary Kelly Benson	92.00	67.50	200.00	79.75	Renewal PH-PSH	\$424,834	\$424,834	Tier 2
12	TRH Magnolia Supportive Services	86.33	56.88	200.00	71.60	Renewal PH-PSH	\$220,000	\$220,000	Tier 2
13	TRH Shelter Plus Care II Expansion	75.50	-	80.00	94.38	New PH-PSH	\$854,704	\$854,704	Tier 2
14	YWCA Utah RRH for DV Survivors	80.67	-	90.00	89.63	New PH-RRH	\$708,021	\$708,021	Tier 2



Application Rank and Review Process

Salt Lake City and County Continuum of Care

FY2024-25 CoC Competition

Table of Contents

Final Scoring Explanation	2
Renewal Application Scoring.....	2
First Time Renewals/Renewals without an APR.....	2
HMIS Application Scoring.....	2
New Application Scoring and First Time Renewals.....	2
Application Rank and Review Timeline.....	3
Rank and Review Policies and Procedures.....	4
Policy for Appeals of Rating/Ranking	5
Ranking Committee Members.....	6

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.
 - If the measure relied on data from exits, and the program had no leavers, agencies were directed to respond as “N/A”
 - Applications were not penalized but the total points possible for those applications were adjusted.
- Per the NOFO, If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 2. HUD may fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

First Time Renewals/Renewals without an APR

- Portions of the application that the committee scored were worth 200 points and due to the lack of performance data, they were scored completely by the committee.

HMIS Application Scoring

- The HMIS application was reviewed by the Ranking Committee and recommended for funding.
- They recommended that it be funded at the full amount and included in the Project Priority Listing in the middle of Tier 1.

New Application Scoring and First Time Renewals

- Portions of the application that the committee scored were worth 90 points for DV Bonus Projects and 80 points for non-DV Bonus Projects
 - The scoresheet originally indicated that applications were worth 100 points. Questions related to some of the scoring criteria were inadvertently left out of the application form. To account for this, without penalizing applicants, the points possible were adjusted accordingly.
- The following projects were recommended for funding:
 - TRH Shelter Plus Care II Expansion
 - YWCA Utah RRH for DV Survivors

Application Rank and Review Timeline

Ranking Committee - Approve Renewal Scoring Guidelines	4-Sep
Ranking Committee-New Scoring Guidelines approved	4-Sep
RFP for Renewal Applications released, Scoring Guidelines & Ranking Committee Procedures available as part of the application package and posted to CoC competition website	5-Sep
New scoring guidelines posted to CoC Competition Website	5-Sep
RFP for New Projects Released, Scoring Guidelines & Ranking Committee Procedures available as part of the application package and posted to CoC Competition Website	5-Sep
RFP for HMIS Application released	5-Sep
New Application Training held; materials posted to CoC Competition Website	12-Sep
Renewal Application Training held / materials posted to CoC Competition Website	12-Sep
Ranking Committee Meeting-Application Review Orientation	26-Sep
Ranking Committee Meeting-Final Ranking/Funding Decision	10-Oct
Applicants notified of Final Ranking/Funding Decision	11-Oct
Final Ranking/Funding Decision posted to CoC Competition Website	11-Oct

Salt Lake City & County Continuum of Care

Homeless Assistance Grants

Rank and Review Policies and Procedures

Eligible proposals will be prioritized for inclusion in the CoC's coordinated application by the Ranking 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).

Salt Lake County, as the designated Collaborative Applicant, recruits Ranking Committee members, prioritizing members who have served as members in the past or who have other relevant experience. The Ranking 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.

- Ranking 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.
- Ranking Committee members are given an orientation which includes:
 - Information regarding homeless activities, needs, services, definitions and other issues that are pertinent to the SLVCEH
 - A background of McKinney Vento and the local process
 - The role of the Ranking Committee
 - Review of the scoring tools, applications, and resources

Ranking Committee members receive eligible application proposals and scoring matrix.

Prior to the Ranking meeting, all Ranking 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 SLVCEH support agency staff have any knowledge that could lead HUD to deny granting funds to a project, they will share that information with the Ranking Committee. SLVCEH support agency staff will discuss this information with applicants as part of technical assistance provided to assist project development.

The Ranking Committee meets to review and discuss each application together and to individually score them. SLVCEH support agency staff is present at the Committee meeting to record decisions of the Committee and any comments/recommendations they have for applicants.

The Ranking Committee discusses the merits of each proposal, scores the applications, and turns in score sheets to staff.

- Overall raw scores are calculated by SLVCEH support agency 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, SLVCEH support agency 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 SLVCEH support agency staff. Applicants are asked to correct their applications and send them back to SLVCEH support agency staff before final submission to HUD.

- Applications which do not meet the threshold requirements will not be included in the Priority Listing as part of the Consolidated Application, and therefore will not be forwarded to HUD for consideration.
- If more applications are submitted than the SLVCEH has money to fund, the lowest-ranked applications will not be included in the Priority List as part of the Consolidated Application, and therefore will not be forwarded to HUD for consideration.

Penalties

Applicants may correct a curable deficiency with timely action. To be curable the deficiency must: not be an applicant eligibility requirement and be remedied within the time frame specified in the notice of deficiency.

If the corrections are remedied within the time frame specified, no loss of points will result.

If the Committee finds that an applicant has intentionally misrepresented information, the application may be rejected, or a penalty may be assessed.

Where there is a staff (SLCO or HUD) documented issue that impacts the ability of applicants to access electronic application systems (E-snaps, Smartsheets), the Committee reserves the right to adjust the penalty submission deadline 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 Ranking 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. Additional appeal information may be found in the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

Ranking Committee Members

FY2024-25 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
Heather Royall, Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City ESG	None
Liz Marie Santiago Otero, UDVC	DV Survivor Advocate	None
Michael Campbell, UHC	Housing Finance Organization	None
Mina Koplín, Youth Services Section Manager	Youth Services	None
Pete Caldwell, Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health	Behavioral Health Services	None
Meisha Jensen, V.A. Salt Lake City Healthcare System	Veterans Services	None