



CoC GRANT REVIEW and RANKING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Calvin Young, Community Member

Lana Lozano, Economic Development Department

Rajony Poy, San Joaquin County Neighborhood Preservation

STAFF TO COMMITTEE

Amy Wyatt, Consultant

Ash Ortiz-Richwimmer, Consultant

RANKING PROCESS

The San Joaquin Continuum of Care, CA-511, has completed its rating and ranking of the 2024 CoC Program Competition. Agencies interested in applying for funding were required to submit applications in eSNAPS by September 10, 2024 for renewal projects and September 13, 2024 for new projects. The Collaborative Applicant received fourteen (14) project applications, with five (5) new project applications applying for CoC Bonus Funds. The Collaborative Applicant did not receive any applications under the DV Bonus. All applications were reviewed for threshold and scored using board approved tools. The CoC Board is asked to approve the scores recommended by the Committee. Following board approval, letters will be emailed to all project applications with notification of the application status.

Below is the list of all project applications submitted in eSNAPS.

Organization	Project Name	Application Type	Housing Type	Amount Requested
Fresh Start Charities	Airport Way	New	Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry	\$600,000
Gospel Center Rescue Mission	New Life Program	New	Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry	\$2,092,618
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Shelter Plus Care - TCS	New	Permanent Supportive Housing	\$347,265
City of Manteca	Unsheltered Emergency Center	New	Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry	\$942,816

Tracy Community Connections Center, Inc.	CoC RRH	New	Rapid Rehousing	\$102,834
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Shelter Plus Care 5	Renewal	Permanent Supportive Housing	\$389,296
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Shelter Plus Care Combined	Renewal	Permanent Supportive Housing	\$3,645,299
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	SPICE	Renewal	Permanent Supportive Housing	\$217,595
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	CARE	Renewal	Rapid Rehousing	\$1,175,745
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	CHARM	Renewal	HMIS	\$98,540
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	From Homelessness to Homes II	Renewal	Rapid Rehousing	\$425,990
Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Hermanas I	Renewal	Rapid Rehousing	\$202,654
PREVAIL	PATHS	Renewal (1 st Year Renewal)	Rapid Rehousing	\$495,513
Lutheran Social Services	Project Hope	Renewal	Permanent Supportive Housing	\$497,988 (Could renew for \$500,488 as reported on the Grant Inventory Worksheet)
TOTAL				\$11,234,153

TIER RANKING

During the CoC Program Rating and Ranking Process, scored applicants must fall within 2 tiers, with the amounts being determined by HUD. HUD determines the amounts available within each tier using the annual Renewal Demand (ARD). The ARD for CA-511 is \$7,151,120. Applicants are placed in Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 depending on their application score. Tier 1 is equal to 90% of the ARD. Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the sum of CoC Bonus and DV Bonus funds. The total amount of funding

available is \$8,961,764, with \$6,436,008 allowed in Tier 1. HUD will conditionally approve projects placed in Tier 1. Projects in Tier 2 are awarded as funding allows. Projects “straddling” Tier 1 and Tier 1 may be conditionally awarded the Tier 1 amount if the project can operate the project using the specified amount of funding.

TIER 1:	\$6,436,008	<i>90% of the CoC’s Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)</i>
TIER 2:	+ \$2,525,756	<i>Difference between Tier 1 and max amount of renewal, reallocation, and CoC Bonus funds¹</i>
	<hr/> \$8,961,764	<i>Total Available Funding</i>

¹**Bonus Funding:** \$942,816 is available for CoC Bonus projects, and \$1,178,521 is available for DV Bonus projects

PROCESS OF REVIEW, REALLOCATION, SCORING, AND RANKING PROCESS

The Rating and Ranking Committee met on Monday, September 30, 2024. Project applications were reviewed to confirm each project met threshold requirements. Upon review, three (3) of the new projects did not meet threshold. Below is the list of projects not meeting threshold, along with the reasoning.

Organization	Project Name	Application Type	Reason for Not Meeting Threshold
Fresh Start Charities	Airport Way	Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry	Project application was described as an Emergency Shelter, not Supportive Services – Coordinated Entry. The CoC Program Competition does not allow for emergency shelter projects.
Gospel Center Rescue Mission	New Life Program	Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry	Project application was described as a residential addiction treatment program, not Supportive Services – Coordinated Entry. The CoC Program Competition does not allow for standalone treatment programs. However, with restructuring, this program could apply in future rounds as a Joint Transitional Housing Rapid Rehousing Project (Joint TH-RRH).
City of Manteca	Unsheltered Emergency Center	Supportive Services Only – Coordinated Entry	Project application was described as an Emergency Shelter, not Supportive Services – Coordinated Entry. The CoC Program Competition does not allow for emergency shelter projects. However, the description of the Navigation Center (in development)

			has potential in the future as a Coordinated Entry facility.
--	--	--	--

While scoring the remaining projects, a first-year renewal project titled *PATHS*, was scored using comparable data, as the agency was not yet required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR). This 1st year renewal project has history providing services as a subrecipient of a currently existing program. For the purpose of the rating and ranking, the committee members used the datapoints of the currently existing program. It was decided that if the project did not have similar historical data, it would be scored as a “new” project until the following year, allowing for its APR to be submitted. Once scoring was complete, the committee members provided their scores to Thurmond Consulting, with the consultants calculating the average score of each project. Renewal Projects were scored using a 49-point scale, and new projects were scored using a 54-point scale. In the instance of a tie, the agency with a higher capacity percentage received the higher rank. The HMIS project was scored number 1, due to the inability to compare the program to housing programs. The committee decided to rank the project as it has historically been ranked.

The Committee’s recommended rank and tier placement for the accepted projects are listed below.

Rank	Applicant	Project Name	Project Type	Score	Tier
1	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	CHARM	HMIS	Not Scored	1
2	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Shelter Plus Care 5	PSH	45.3	1
3	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Hermanas I	RRH	44	1
4	PREVAIL	PATHS	RRH	42	1
5	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Shelter Plus Care Combined	PSH	40.3	1
6	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	SPICE	PSH	40.3	1
7	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Homelessness to Homes II	RRH	39	1
8	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	CARE	RRH	38.7	1 (\$961,121) 2 (\$214,624)
9	Lutheran Social Services	Project Hope	PSH	38.7	2
10 (New Project)	Central Valley Low Income Housing Corporation	Shelter Plus Care – TCs	PSH	53.1	2
11 (New Project)	Tracy Community Connections Center	CoC RRH	RRH	48.2	2