

# **LOUISVILLE CONTINUUM OF CARE RATING AND REVIEW PROCEDURE FY2017**

On April 6, 2017 all CoC Members were notified of preliminary rating and review criteria. This notification gave all programs the opportunity to self-evaluate their performance and correct any data errors as needed.

Upon release of the Optional Rating and Ranking Tool by HUD the Louisville CoC opted to use this tool as it incorporated most of preliminary measures given to the CoC as well as some additional criteria important to performance. The Louisville CoC also added some additional criteria to the HUD tool based on local need. The original Rating and Ranking tool is available here:

<https://www.hudexchange.info/news/hud-releases-optional-rating-and-ranking-tool-for-continuum-of-care-coc-program-competition/>

In order to be considered for funding consideration all projects were required to submit the first draft of their application in eSnaps no later than August 28, 2017.

The review and ranking criteria assigned points based on positive housing outcomes by measuring exits to permanent housing. Five criteria were used to assess the severity of program participant needs. Points were awarded based on the percent of participants with zero income at entry, percent of participants with more than one disability type, percent of participants entering the project from a place not meant for human habitation, percent of participants reporting a substance abuse disorder at entry, and percent of participants reporting being a victim or domestic violence at entry.

The Louisville CoC did not receive any applications for projects from victim's service providers during the FY17 funding competition. If there had been any received, the CoC would have used data from a comparable database when available. If data was not available from a comparable database the victim service provider would have automatically received full points for that metric.

All CoC programs were notified of their project score on September 13, 2017 and given the opportunity to appeal any individual metrics or scores they felt were inaccurate.

The final project ranking was determined by the Continuum of Care Board of Directors. For more information on this see the 2017 Project Ranking Electronic Voting Procedure.

## **RATING AND REVIEW CRITERIA**

The following are the criteria used to rank programs, their source and calculation, and their possible scoring range. Unless otherwise noted, they were all taken from CoC APR reports run for the programs with a date range of March 1, 2016 – April 31, 2017.

Questions about rating and review criteria should be directed to Nick Kilby at [nkilby@louhomeless.org](mailto:nkilby@louhomeless.org).

## Performance Measures

**Length of Stay** (used for TH and RRH programs only). The data comes from question 22b and is the average length of stay for all program participants. The high score was 20 points. A TH program scored 20 points if their LOS was 30 days or less. They scored 0 points if their length of stay was 60 days or more. Those with LOS between 30 and 60 days had their scores prorated to correspond to that range so that a LOS of 40 days would receive 10 out of 20 points.

A RRH project scored 20 points if their LOS was 180 days or less. They scored 0 points if their length of stay was 366 days or more. Those with LOS between 180 and 366 days had their scores prorated to correspond to that range so that a LOS of 300 days would receive 7.02 out of 20 points.

**Exit to Permanent Housing.** The data came from question 23a. It is the total of participants who stayed in the program and those who left to a permanent destination divided by total participants and taken as a percentage. The total points were 25. Projects scored 25 if they had 95% and 0 points if they had 75%. Those between 95% and 75% were prorated so that a program with 80% received 6.25 out of 25 points.

**New or Increased Income and Earned Income.** This data came from question 19a1. It is the total number of participants with a change in income divided by the total number of stayers or leavers in the program, respectively, and taken as a percentage. The CoC measured changes in earned income and non-employee income for program stayers and program leavers for a total of 4 measures. Each was worth 2.5 points. Projects received full points in earned income change for stayers and leavers at 10% and in non-employee income at 15%. They received 0 points if 0% of stayers or leavers, respectively, had any change. Those in between were prorated so that a program that had 5% of stayers increase their earned income received 1.25 of 2.5 points and a program that had 10% of leavers increase their non-employee income received 1.66 of 2.5 points.

## Serve High Need Populations

**Participants with Zero Income at Entry.** This data came from question 16. It is the number of participants who had zero income and entry divided by the total number of participants and taken as a percentage. There were 10 possible points awarded. Projects received 10 points if there were 50% or more with zero income at entry and received 0 points if there were less than 25% at entry. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 6 of 10.

**Participants with more than one disability type.** This data came from question 13a2. It is the number of participants with 2 or more disability types at entry divided by the total number of adults and taken as a percentage. There were 10 possible points awarded. Projects received 10 points if there were 50% or more with more than one disability type and received 0 points if there were less than 25% at entry. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 6 of 10.

**Participants entering project from a place not meant for human habitation.** This data came from question 15. It is the total number of people who came from a place not meant for human habitation at entry divided by the total number of participants and taken as a percentage. There were 10 possible points awarded. Projects received 10 points if there were 50% or more entering project from a place not meant for human habitation and received 0 points if there were less than 25% entering project from a

place not meant for human habitation. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 6 of 10.

### **Project Effectiveness**

**Coordinated Entry Participation.** Projects were ranked on their participation in the coordinated entry system. Projects who participated were awarded 10 points. Those who do not were awarded 0 points. This data came from the project applications.

**Project commits to applying the housing first model.** Projects received 10 points for applying the housing first model, 5 of 10 points for being low barrier, and 0 points if they were neither. This data came from the project applications.

### **Other and Local Criteria**

**CoC Participation.** The CoC Monitoring Score was re-assigned so that projects were scored on their participation in the Continuum of Care. Points were awarded based on an internal assessment by CoC leadership and the CoC Board of Directors. There were 10 possible points.

**Returns to Homelessness.** The CoC elected to score projects on returns to homelessness for all three time frames rather than the one score in the original HUD Optional Rating and Ranking Tool. Each score was worth 5 points and data came from the ART 703 report. Projects were scored on returns in 0-180 days, 181-365 days, and 366-730 days looking back from March 1, 2017. A project scored 5 points if 15% or less of leavers returned to a CoC program. A project received zero points if 40% or more of leavers returned to a CoC program. Projects with between 15% and 40% returned were prorated so that a project with 25% returns received 3 of 5 points.

**Substance Abuse at Entry.** The CoC elected to add substance abuse as a “Serve High Need Populations” criteria. This data came from question 13a1. It is the total number of participants who had a history of alcohol, drug abuse, or both, at entry divided by the total number of adults and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more entering project with a history of substance abuse and received 0 points if there were less than 25%. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 5.

**Domestic Violence.** The CoC elected to add history of domestic violence as a “Serve High Need Populations” criteria. This data came from question 14a. It is the total number of participants who had a history of domestic violence at entry divided by the total number of adults and taken as a percentage. There were 5 possible points awarded. Projects received 5 points if there were 50% or more entering project with a history of domestic violence and received 0 points if there were less than 25%. Projects that fell between 50% and 25% were prorated so that a project with 40% at entry received 3 of 10.

**Funding Returned.** Projects were graded on the amount of their funding request they returned. This data came from their ELOCCS reports. Projects received 5 points if 0% of funding was returned and 0 points if 25% or more was returned. Projects with between 0% and 25% returned were prorated so that a project with 10% of funding returned earned 3 points out of 5.

Bonus Funding	\$550,812	Tier I Funding	\$8,629,380	Tier 2 (Rest of ARD + Bonus)	\$1,101,624	Projects Exceeding ARD + Bonus	
Allocated	\$550,812	Allocated	\$9,352,314	Allocated	\$1,101,623	Amount	\$0
% of Ceiling	100%	% of Ceiling	108%	% of Ceiling	100%		
Remaining	\$0	Remaining	-\$722,934	Remaining	\$1		

	PSH		RRH		TH		TH/RRH	
	Allocated	% of Ceiling	Allocated	% of Ceiling	Allocated	% of Ceiling	Allocated	% of Ceiling
All Families	563 Beds \$5,257,822	- -	99 Beds \$618,499	- -	37 Beds \$230,605	- -	85 Beds \$550,812	- -
DV Families	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
Chronically Homeless Families	20 Beds \$1,264,953	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
Veteran Families	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
Parenting Youth	0 Beds \$0	- -	13 Beds \$446,066	- -	37 Beds \$230,605	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
All Individuals	672 Beds \$7,216,554	- -	20 Beds \$501,537	- -	9 Beds \$230,605	- -	6 Beds \$203,689	- -
DV Individuals	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
Chronically Homeless Individuals	190 Beds \$2,195,260	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
Veteran Individuals	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -	0 Beds \$0	- -
Single Youth	0 Beds \$0	- -	5 Beds \$446,066	- -	9 Beds \$230,605	- -	6 Beds \$203,689	- -

13

										MANUALLY EDIT!															
Ranking	Priority Level	Weighted Rating Score	Renewal, New, Expansion, Reallocate	Grant Number	Project Type	Organization Name	Project Name	CoC Funding Requested	CoC Amount Expended Last Operating Year	CoC Funding Recommendation (manual entry)	All Fam Beds	DV Fam Beds	CH Fam Beds	Vet Fam Beds	Par Youth Beds	All Ind Beds	DV Ind Beds	Total CH Ind Beds	Vet Ind Beds	Single Youth Beds	Is 100% CH Fam (Yes/No)	Is 100% CH Ind (Yes/No)	Met All HUD Threshold Requirements	Met All CoC Threshold Requirements	Project ID
1		NOT RATED	New		SSO - coordinated entry	Centerstone	Centerstone Outreach	\$ 94,824	\$ -	\$ 94,824	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No			89
2		NOT RATED	Renewal	KY0129L4I011602	SSO - coordinated entry	Family Health Center	Common Assessment I	\$ 188,168	\$ 188,168	\$ 188,168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No			81
3		NOT RATED	Renewal	KY0160L4I011601	SSO - coordinated entry	Family Health Center	Common Assessment II	\$ 111,488	\$ -	\$ 111,488	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No			82
4	High	100	Renewal	KY0173L4I011600	PSH	Coalition for the Homeless	RX Housing	\$ 447,059	\$ -	\$ 447,059	4	0	4	0	0	32	0	32	0	0			Yes	Yes	8
5	High	96	Renewal	KY0174L4I011600	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	PSH III CH	\$ 122,285	\$ -	\$ 122,285	2	0	2	0	0	10	0	10	0	0			Yes	Yes	26
6	High	96	Renewal	KY0158L4I011601	RRH	Home of the Innocents	Rapid Rehousing HOI	\$ 446,066	\$ -	\$ 446,066	13	0	0	0	13	5	0	0	0	5			Yes	Yes	12
7	High	96	Renewal	KY0147L4I011400	RRH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	Rapid Rehousing LMG	\$ 55,471	\$ -	\$ 55,471	57	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	29
8	High	86	Renewal	KY0050L4I011407	PSH	Coalition for the Homeless	CH2 (Collaborative Housing for Lou Alliance for Supp Housing (LASH)	\$ 695,609	\$ 602,641	\$ 695,609	14	0	14	0	0	56	0	56	0	0			Yes	Yes	4
9	High	83	Renewal	KY0124L4I011403	PSH	Coalition for the Homeless	PSH Chronically Homeless (SJ/PHC)	\$ 633,487	\$ 591,163	\$ 633,487	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	5
10	High	83	Renewal	KY0097L4I011406	PSH	Coalition for the Homeless	PSH Chronically Homeless (SJ/PHC)	\$ 507,229	\$ 466,600	\$ 507,229	0	0	0	0	0	48	0	48	0	0			Yes	Yes	6
11	High	82	Renewal	KY0095L4I011406	PSH	Society of St. Vincent de Paul	Collaborative Housing Initiative (CHI)	\$ 505,258	\$ 445,633	\$ 505,258	45	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	46
12	High	82	Renewal	KY0048L4I011405	PSH	Coalition for the Homeless	Supp Housing Chronically Homeless (Samaritan, SJ)	\$ 329,464	\$ 302,521	\$ 329,464	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	29	0	0			Yes	Yes	9
13	High	80	Renewal	KY0061L4I011407	PSH	Coalition for the Homeless	PSHYA	\$ 200,036	\$ 175,339	\$ 200,036	8	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	7
14	High	80	Renewal	KY0142L4I011401	PSH	Wayside Christian Mission	PSH for Women 2	\$ 93,614	\$ 86,536	\$ 93,614	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	15	0	0			Yes	Yes	74
15	High	76	Renewal	KY0111L4I011405	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	Simon Hall S+C (SSVdP)	\$ 42,382	\$ 37,453	\$ 42,382	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	31
16	High	76	Renewal	KY0130L4I011401	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	PSH Non CH #1	\$ 164,022	\$ 133,263	\$ 164,022	25	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	27
17	High	71	Renewal	KY0102L4I011406	PSH	Wayside Christian Missio	PSH for Women with Disabling	\$ 31,496	\$ 28,560	\$ 31,496	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	75
18	High	71	Renewal	KY0133L4I011402	PSH	Schizophrenia Foundation KY inc. dba	Journey House	\$ 240,718	\$ 223,244	\$ 240,718	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	43
19	High	70	Renewal	KY0053L4I011407	PSH	House of Ruth	Homes with Heart	\$ 156,178	\$ 147,606	\$ 156,178	15	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0			Yes	Yes	16

TIER I

TIER II

FUNDING ANALYSIS + RANKING

20	High	69	Renewal	KY0107L4I011403	PSH	Society of St. Vincent de Paul	SVDP On Campus	\$	362,221	\$	331,517	\$	362,221	66	0	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	49		
21	High	69	Renewal	KY0131L4I011401	PSH	Society of St. Vincent de Paul	Homes with Hope PSH	\$	131,787	\$	119,428	\$	131,787	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	50		
22	High	67	Renewal	KY0059L4I011407	PSH	Schizophrenia Foundation KY inc. dba	Murray-McKinney Housing	\$	33,032	\$	30,624	\$	33,032	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	44		
23	High	67	Renewal	KY0071L4I011407	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	St. Vincent de Paul S+C	\$	103,396	\$	57,634	\$	103,396	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	32		
24	High	67	Renewal	KY0135L4I011401	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	PSH Non CH #2	\$	204,502	\$	154,327	\$	204,502	35	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	28		
25	High	64	Renewal	KY0057L4I011407	PSH	Wayside Christian Mission	Permanent Supported Housing Program - Men	\$	122,498	\$	113,224	\$	122,498	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	73		
26	High	64	Renewal	KY0132L4I011402	PSH	Choices	PSH	\$	78,300	\$	73,798	\$	78,300	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	3		
27	High	64	Renewal	KY0140L4I011401	RRH	Family and Children's Place	Rapid Rehousing FCP	\$	116,962	\$	-	\$	116,962	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	11		
28	High	100	New		TH/RRH	Volunteers of America	VOA Joint Comp	\$	550,812	\$	-	\$	550,812	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No	Yes	Yes	88	
29	High	61	Renewal	KY0069L4I011407	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services &	Kersey Condo S+C (HoR)	\$	32,961	\$	20,032	\$	32,961	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	24		
30	High	57	Renewal	KY0099L4I011406	TH	Coalition for the Homeless	Transitional Housing for Young Adults	\$	230,605	\$	218,855	\$	230,605	37	0	0	0	0	37	9	0	0	0	9		Yes	Yes	10		
31	High	55	Renewal	KY0077L4I011407	PSH	Schizophrenia Foundation KY inc. dba	Sober Living II/Baxter Ave.	\$	23,638	\$	22,425	\$	23,638	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	45		
32		NOT RATED	Renewal	KY0056L4I011609	HMIS	Coalition for the Homeless	HMIS I	\$	124,641	\$	124,641	\$	124,641	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No		83		
33		NOT RATED	Renewal	KY0125L4I011605	HMIS	Coalition for the Homeless	HMIS II	\$	5,434	\$	5,434	\$	5,434	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No		84		
34		NOT RATED	Renewal	KY0128L4I011604	HMIS	Coalition for the Homeless	HMIS III	\$	79,502	\$	79,502	\$	79,502	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No		85		
35	High	72	Renewal	KY0068L4I011407	PSH	Louisville Metro Dept. of Community Services & Revitalization	Louisville Tenant Based Rental Assistance (S+C)	\$	2,087,169	\$	1,777,310	\$	2,087,169	275	0	0	0	0	0	237	0	0	0	0		Yes	Yes	25		
1	High	100	New		TH/RRH	Centerstone	Centerstone Joint Comp	\$	203,689	\$	-	\$	203,689	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	No	No	Yes	Yes	87	
2		NOT RATED	New		SSO - coordinated entry	Coalition for the Homeless	Placeholder CE	\$	175,000	\$	-	\$	175,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No		90		
Projects Not Selected For Funding														MANUALLY EDIT!																
Ranking	Priority Level	Weighted Rating Score	Renewal, New, Expansion, Reallocate	Grant Number	Project Type	Organization Name	Project Name	CoC Funding Requested	CoC Amount Expended Last Operating Year	CoC Funding Recommendation (manual entry)	All Fam Beds	DV Fam Beds	CH Fam Beds	Vet Fam Beds	Par Youth Beds	All Ind Beds	DV Ind Beds	Total CH Ind Beds	Vet Ind Beds	Single Youth Beds	Is 100% CH Fam (Yes/No)	Is 100% CH Ind (Yes/No)	Met All HUD Threshold Requirements	Met All CoC Threshold Requirements	Project ID					
1		NOT RATED	Reallocate	KY0058L4I011609	SSO	Centerstone	MHOT	\$	94,824	\$	94,833	\$	94,824	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No	No			86				
2		NOT RATED	Reallocate	KY0080L4I011407	TH	Volunteers of America	Transitional Housing	\$	378,690	\$	356,631	\$	378,690	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					66				

**Louisville/Jefferson Co. KY Continuum of Care (KY-501)**  
**2017 Project Ranking Electronic Vote Procedure**

The CoC Board met on Tuesday September 14, 2017 at the Coalition for the Homeless. The agenda included discussion of four possible project ranking scenarios with the intention that the Board would choose one scenario as the ranking that would be used for the 2017 Application.

There were nine out of 17 members present although 3 of the members recused themselves due to the conflict of interest of their agency having a project in the mix of Tier 2 projects. With these three recusing, the board did not feel there was a quorum present. Therefore, it was decided that the members present would narrow the choices down to 2 scenarios and hold an electronic vote.

Mary Frances sent out the attached information along with a ballot to all board members. Three members of the board had projects in the mix of the 2 scenarios and therefore could not participate.

Voting took place from Sunday September 17, 2017 to midnight Wednesday September 20, 2017, with the following result: 6 members voted for Scenario 3 and 5 members voted for Scenario 6.

The final ranking of the 2017 Project Applications is:

**Louisville/Jefferson Co. Continuum of Care (KY-501)**  
**2017 Final Ranking**

Ranking	Agency	Project	Proj Type	Funding Request
1	Centerstone	Outreach	C/E SSO	\$94,825
2	Family Health Center	Common Assessment I	C/E SSO	\$188,168
3	Family Health Center	Common Assessment II	C/E SSO	\$111,488
4	Coalition for the Homeless	RX Housing	PSH	\$447,059
5	Louisville Metro Government	PSH III	PSH	\$122,285
6	Home of the Innocents	Rapid Rehousing	RRH	\$446,066
7	Louisville Metro Government	Rapid Rehousing	RRH	\$55,471
8	Coalition for the Homeless	CH2	PSH	\$695,609
9	Coalition for the Homeless	LASH	PSH	\$633,487
10	Coalition for the Homeless	PSHCH	PSH	\$507,229
11	St. Vincent de Paul	CHI	PSH	\$505,258
12	Coalition for the Homeless	SHCH	PSH	\$329,464
13	Coalition for the Homeless	PSHYA	PSH	\$200,036
14	Wayside	PSH Women II	PSH	\$93,614
15	Louisville Metro Government	Simon Hall	PSH	\$42,382
16	Louisville Metro Government	PSH Non CH I	PSH	\$164,022
17	Wayside	PSH Women I	PSH	\$31,496
18	Wellspring	Journey House	PSH	\$240,718
19	House of Ruth	Homes with Heart	PSH	\$156,178
20	St. Vincent de Paul	Homes on Campus	PSH	\$362,221
21	St. Vincent de Paul	Homes with Hope	PSH	\$131,787
22	Wellspring	Murray-McKinney	PSH	\$33,032

23	Louisville Metro Government	St. Vincent de Paul	PSH	\$103,396
24	Louisville Metro Government	PSH Non CH II	PSH	\$204,502
25	Wayside	PSH Men	PSH	\$122,498
26	Choices	PSH	PSH	\$78,300
27	Volunteers of America	Rapid Rehousing	RRH	\$116,962
28	Volunteers of America	Transitional Housing/Rapid Rehousing	TH/RRH	\$550,812
29	Louisville Metro Government	Kersey Condo	PSH	\$32,961
30	Coalition for the Homeless	THYA	TH	\$230,605
31	Wellspring	Baxter	PSH	\$23,638
32	Coalition for the Homeless	HMIS I	HMIS	\$124,641
33	Coalition for the Homeless	HMIS II	HMIS	\$5,434
34	Coalition for the Homeless	HMIS III	HMIS	\$79,502
35	Louisville Metro Government	TBRA	PSH	\$1,364,235
<b>Tier 2 Funding Line</b>				<b>\$8,629,381</b>
	Louisville Metro Government	TBRA	PSH	\$722,934
36	Centerstone	Transitional Housing/Rapid Rehousing	TH/RRH	\$203,689
37	Coalition for the Homeless	Coordinated Entry Prevention/Diversion	C/E SSO	\$175,000

**\$9,731,004**

Planning Grant:

**\$275,406**

**\$10,006,410**

As President of the CoC Board I verify that this is the process used to determine the final ranking and that this is the final result.

Rosemary Lockett

Date

# MEMO

To: CoC Board Members  
From: Mary Frances Schafer  
Date: September 17, 2017  
Re: 2017 CoC Ranking Vote

At the September Board meeting on September 14, 2017 we talked about four different scenarios for ranking the 2017 projects for funding through the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development's 2017 CoC Application. As you know it is the board's responsibility to make the final decision as to how the CoC will rank the projects being submitted. While we did have enough board members present to have a quorum, three of the members were required to recuse themselves from the vote because they were part of agencies that had a project that would be directly affected by the vote. Therefore, we did not have the needed number of members to actually make a final decision. We decided to narrow the options down to two scenarios and ask the whole board to vote to accept one.

I am attaching the two scenarios for your review. The ballot is attached to this memo. I do need your signature on your ballot so I can make sure all the votes are eligible to be counted. Laura Albovias, Eric Friedlander and Michelle Newhauser have been identified as needing to recuse themselves do to the appearance of conflict of interest. If you feel you should not be voting, please go ahead and submit your vote, tell me why you should be excluded and I will discard your vote if your concerns are indeed considered a conflict of interest. I will let you know the results, including the names of those who meet the conflict of interest concerns as soon as possible. Individual votes will NOT be revealed. Please do not share these scenarios with ANYONE outside the Board. The ranking you choose will be given to the CoC community as soon as possible. Please return your ballot electronically if possible by **Wednesday, September 20<sup>th</sup> at noon.**

---

2017 CoC Application  
CoC Board Final Ranking Vote

## Choose ONE Scenario

### Scenario 3

### Scenario 6

Please indicate in box before your choice.

	• Lou Metro Government: Tenant Based Rental Assistance	X		• Lou Metro Government: Tenant Based Rental Assistance
	• Centerstone Transitional Housing/Rapid Rehousing	X		• Lou Metro Government/House of Ruth Kersey Condo
	• Coalition for the Homeless Prevention/Diversion	X		• Coalition for the Homeless/Home of the Innocents Transitional Housing for Young Adults
		X		• Wellspring Sober Living II/Baxter
		X		• Centerstone Transitional Housing/Rapid Rehousing
		X		• Coalition for the Homeless Prevention/Diversion
		X		

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Board ranking vote



## Ranking Information

HUD requires that after the preliminary pro-rata need amount is determined, (for Louisville: \$9,180,192) CoCs must identify the dollar amount that represents 94% of that total. This amount of funding is considered in Tier 1. Projects in this tier are generally considered safe to be funded. Projects that fall in Tier 2 are considered to be at risk of NOT being funded. Projects that have some funding in Tier 1 and some in Tier 2 risk the amount of funding that falls in Tier 2.

It was decided that all completely new projects would be ranked below the Tier 2 funding line. The Coalition for the Homeless Prevention/Diversion voluntarily chose to be placed at the very bottom of the ranking.

### Scenario 3

This scenario ranks the Louisville Metro Government Tenant Based Rental Assistance grant directly on the funding line between Tier 1 and Tier 2. The total amount of the grant is \$2,087,169. \$722,934 or 35% of the grant falls into Tier 2. This puts at risk approximately 81 units of permanent supported housing that is able to serve all population types. (Singles, Families, Male, Female, Young Adults, Chronic and Non-chronic homeless)

The next project to fall below the funding line is Centerstone's new project that will provide young adults access to rapid rehousing (9 slots at any one time with temporary subsidy) with temporary shelter in the form of transitional housing (3 slots at any one time) during the housing search and the process necessary to actually obtain the keys to a permanent unit. This project seeks to serve approximately 12 households, singles and families, at any one time during the year. The transitional housing is anticipated to last no more than 90 days and the temporary subsidy to rapidly rehouse would be targeted to 6 months. This is a brand-new project so no housing units would be lost. Rather we would not be able to increase our housing opportunities for young adults.

The last project is the Coalition for the Homeless' Prevention/Diversion project that is to complete the third phase of the community's coordinated entry process. Those who seek assistance through the Single Point of Entry and either cannot be served because there is no appropriate emergency shelter available or the household is not quite HUD homeless would be referred to the Prevention/Diversion team to receive support in accessing services that could help them prevent homelessness or prevent them from ever having to enter the shelter system. This project does not include any shelter or permanent housing units but does provide the prevention/diversion services that make a coordinated entry process work optimally and effectively.

This scenario puts at risk 3 transitional housing units not currently available, 81 permanent supported housing units currently available and 9 rapid rehousing units not currently available.

### Scenario 6

This scenario also ranks the Louisville Metro Government Tenant Based Rental Assistance grant directly on the funding line between Tier 1 and Tier 2. The total amount of the grant is \$2,087,169. \$435,730 or 21% of the grant falls into Tier 2. This puts at risk approximately 49 units of permanent supported housing that is able to serve all population types. (Singles, Families, Male, Female, Young Adults, Chronic and Non-chronic homeless)

The next project to fall below the funding line is Louisville Metro Government/House of Ruth Kersey Condo project (\$32,961). This is a permanent supported housing project for those with HIV/AIDs. It is a project with 4 units. The community risks losing all 4 units.

The Coalition for the Homeless/Home of the Innocents Transitional Housing for Young Adults (\$230,605) is ranked third below the line. This project provides 21 units of scattered site transitional housing for young adults age 18 – 24. The community risks losing all 21 units.

The fourth project below the line is Wellspring's Sober Living II/Baxter (\$23,638). This is permanent supported housing for those with severe mental illness. It provides 5 units for singles. The community risks losing all 5 units.

The fifth project to fall below the funding line is Centerstone's new project that will provide young adults access to rapid rehousing (9 slots at any one time with temporary subsidy) with temporary shelter in the form of transitional housing (3 slots at any one time) during the housing search and the process necessary to actually obtain the keys to a permanent unit. This project seeks to serve approximately 12 households, singles and families, at any one time during the year. The transitional housing is anticipated to last no more than 90 days and the temporary subsidy to rapidly rehouse would be targeted to 6 months. This is a brand-new project so no housing units would be lost. Rather we would not be able to increase our housing opportunities for young adults.

The last project is the Coalition for the Homeless' Prevention/Diversion project that is to complete the third phase of the community's coordinated entry process. Those who seek assistance through the Single Point of Entry and either cannot be served because there is no appropriate emergency shelter available or the household is not quite HUD homeless would be referred to the Prevention/Diversion team to receive support in accessing services that could help them prevent homelessness or prevent them from ever having to enter the shelter system. This project does not include any shelter or permanent housing units but does provide the prevention/diversion services that make a coordinated entry process work optimally and effectively.

This scenario puts at risk 21 transitional housing units currently available and 3 transitional housing units not currently available (total: 24), 58 permanent supported housing units currently available and 9 rapid rehousing units not currently available.

**Louisville Metro Continuum of Care  
2017 Tier 2 Scenarios**

				% of 40	b1-a2	Average	House	Total	TH	PH	RRH	Mix	Sing	Fam	Youth	Fam	Youth
					40.000000		1st	Score				PH	PH	PH	PH	TH	TH
<b>Scenario 3</b>																	
LMG TBRA. 35% of grant	\$ 722,934	66%	\$1,101,624	26.2497549	13.75024509	26.88	10	36.88		81		81					
Centerstone TH/RRH	\$ 203,689	18%	\$1,101,624	7.39595361	6.35429148	10.05	10	20.05	3		3				3		3
CFH Prevention/Diversion	\$ 175,000	16%	\$1,101,624	6.35425517	0.00003631	3.18	10	13.18									
		0%	\$1,101,624	0	0.00003631	0.00											
		0%	\$1,101,624	0	0.00003631	0.00											
				39.9999637		<b>Lose</b>	<b>87</b>		3	81	3	81	0	0	3	0	3
\$ 1,101,623 100%								<b>23.37</b>									
				% of 40	b1-a2	Average	House	Total	TH	PH	RRH	Mix	Sing	Fam	Youth	Fam	Youth
					40.000000		1st	Score				PH	PH	PH	PH	TH	TH
<b>Scenario 4</b>																	
VOA TH/RRH. 79% of grant	\$ 435,730	40%	\$1,101,624	15.8213692	24.17863082	32.09	10	42.09	15		9			9		15	
HoR Kersey	\$ 32,961	3%	\$1,101,624	1.19681488	22.98181594	23.58	10	33.58		4			4				
CFH/HOTI THYA	\$ 230,605	21%	\$1,101,624	8.37327437	14.60854157	18.80	5	23.80	21								21
Wellspring Baxter	\$ 23,638	2%	\$1,101,624	0.85829648	13.75024509	14.18	10	24.18		5			5				
Centerstone TH/RRH	\$ 203,689	18%	\$1,101,624	7.39595361	6.35429148	10.05	10	20.05	3		3				3		3
CFH Prevention/Diversion	\$ 175,000	16%	\$1,101,624	6.35425517	0.00003631	3.18	10	13.18									
		0%	\$1,101,624	0	0.00003631	0.00											
		0%	\$1,101,624	0	0.00003631	0.00											
				39.9999637		<b>Lose</b>	<b>60</b>		39	9	12	0	9	9	3	15	24
\$ 1,101,623 100%								<b>26.15</b>									

