

Southern Nevada CoC Evaluation Working Group

2015 Ranking Methodology

The Southern Nevada Continuum of Care (CoC) Evaluation Working Group (EWG) used the following criteria in determining recommended projects to the Southern Nevada Homelessness CoC Board for inclusion in the CoC Consolidated application:

- Guidance provided by HUD, United States Interagency Council on Homelessness and National Alliance to End Homelessness
- Local application scores;
- Program outcomes as demonstrated in the Annual Performance Report (APR);
- Alignment with HUD's policies and procedures;
- Alignment with Opening Doors: The Federal Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness and local priorities.

With the above criteria, the EWG followed proceeded with the following ranking process:

1) **Considerations for Reallocation**

- a. There was discussion about reallocation of funds and the EWG considered project outcomes, utilization and adherence to HUD policies and procedures. Based on these criteria, the EWG elected to defund three programs and reallocate these resources: Catholic Charities St. Vincent Apartments; Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health (SNAMHS) Pathways; and Nevada Community Associates (NCA) Project HOPE.
- b. There was a discussion about remaining transitional housing projects to ensure they serve populations or needs allowed by HUD. It was determined that they all do meet these criteria as they serve youth or people with treatment needs. All are needed in the community and remained on the list of projects to be funded.

2) **Bonus Projects**

- a. The new NCA application for Project EIGHT was denied as the EWG chose to defund NCA Project HOPE.
- b. It was determined, through discussion with applicants of new projects that three would have the ability to meet the leverage and support service requirements set forth by HUD: Clark County Social Service (CCSS) FUSE, CCSS/Department of Family Service Keeping Families Together and a new U.S. Vets Rapid Rehousing project. The applicants for Keeping Families Together and U.S. Vets RRH verified they also have the capacity to expand if additional monies are allocated. The EWG chose to fund bonus projects as follows: CCSS FUSE to be funded at the originally requested amount; CCSS/DFS Keeping Families Together to be funded at the originally requested amount plus \$78,606.70 of reallocated funds; and

Southern Nevada CoC Evaluation Working Group 2015 Ranking Methodology

U.S. Vets RRH to be funded at the originally requested amount plus \$78,605 of reallocation funds.

- 3) **Allocation of Remaining Funds** - At this point, if all remaining projects are to be funded an additional amount of approximately \$340,000 would be left and there was discussion about how to utilize these funds. Several ideas were discussed and it was decided by the EWG that additional monies will be allocated to projects that fill capacity gaps for RRH for transitional age youth and adults without children. SafeNest and all youth providers were asked about their capacity to bring on new projects or to increase new applications already submitted for this NOFA. All agencies also verbally agreed to commit to the Housing First Model. The EWG agreed to increase new applications for SafeNest Operation Fresh Start and Southern Nevada Children's First Expansion by \$50,000 each. The EWG requested that Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth (NPHY) and St. Jude's submit applications for new RRH projects for transition age youth for approximately \$120,000 each. Both agencies agreed they would be able to meet the leverage and match requirements and submit applications within two weeks.
- 4) **Considerations for Tier placement:**
- a. It was determined that HMIS and Safe Haven are needed and were placed in Tier 1 to protect this funding.
 - b. The EWG decided that if a project has a lower HUD project type score but is needed in the community, it will be placed in Tier 1.
 - c. The EWG considered that many projects with less favorable outcomes are those that serve the most vulnerable, hard-to-serve populations (severely mentally ill, for example) and should not automatically be shifted to Tier 2.
 - d. Most new projects were placed in Tier 2 to avoid risking current programs and displacing clients. The new CCSS/DFS Keeping Families Together project was placed in Tier 1 as it fills an unmet need in the community.
 - e. Additional projects in Tier 2 are existing programs with good chances at being funded based on strong applications and maximum HUD population points. CCSS VIVO straddles Tiers 1 and 2; the SNAMHS HUD Expansion was placed in Tier 2.
 - f. Projects in Tier 1 were ranked based on their application scores and outcomes, with the exception of HMIS which was prioritized in the first spot. Projects placed in Tier 2 were also ranked based on their application scores and outcomes. Pending new applications from NPHY and St. Jude's were ranked according to application scores and outcomes from their similar existing projects.