BIG BEND CONTINUUM OF CARE

2024 HUD NOFO COC PROJECT

RANKING AND TIERING

SUMMARY:

Reviewers submitting score sheets and whose scores were calculated into the average project scores include:

- ***Jane Johnson, Community Member***
- ***Brad Clayton, Pastor***
- ***Sherena Strong, Non-Profit Executive Director, Community Member***

Nine total projects were reviewed and scored by Review Committee Members. An Average Project Score was calculated by combining all review committee scores and dividing by the number of reviewers (3).

AVERAGE PROJECT SCORES:	
BBCoC/ARPC HMIS Renewal	**98.0**
BBHC- Home Plate PSH Renewal	**94.3**
Ability 1st APCH Families PSH Renewal	**81.7**
Ability 1st APCH Individuals PSH Renewal	**84.0**
BBHC- Youth Launch RRH Renewal	**95.0**
Big Bend Cares RRH- New	**94.0**
CESC- RRH- New	**90.0**
CCYS- TH/RRH- New	**86.0**
CCYS- TH/RRH- New (DV)	**66.7**

APPROVAL:

The Review Committee and CoC staff recommendations are detailed below, be approved as the ranking and tiering to be submitted for the 2024 HUD CoC NOFO. Via electronic vote, the BBCoC Executive Committee of the Governance Board has approved these recommendations with no additional comments.

Tier	Suggested Ranking	Project	Funding Requested
Tier 1 $1,774,544.00	1	**ARPC/BBCoC HMIS Renewal**	$130,292.00
	2	**Family Promise Youth Launch RRH Renewal**	$191,832.00
	3	**Family Promise Home Plate PSH Renewal**	$765,417.00
	4	**Ability 1st APCH PSH Renewal**	$669,161.00
	5	**Ability 1st APCH Families PSH Renewal** ***(Portioned in Tiers 1 & 2)***	$17,842.00
Tier 2 CoC Bonus $417,485.00	5		$165,322.00
	6	**Big Bend Cares RRH- New Project**	$152,163.00 (reduced)
	7	**CESC RRH- New**	$100,000.00 (reduced)
DV Bonus $521,856.00	8	**CCYS TH/RRH**	$198,840.00

Notes:

- After extensive deliberation, the Project Review Committee (PRC) made the critical decision to prioritize two low-scoring renewal projects over higher-scoring new proposals, driven by concerns about losing essential programming that currently serves vulnerable clients. This marks the first year both *Ability 1st* Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects received low scores, raising significant concerns within the PRC regarding the quality of their applications and the overall presentation by the agency. In alignment with the Big Bend Continuum of Care (BBCoC) Renewal and Reallocation Policy and Procedures, projects application scores between 82 and 74 points are mandated to collaborate with Continuum of Care (CoC) staff and HUD Technical Assistance (TA) to receive additional support. CoC staff will work with agency staff and HUD to access the most appropriate focus of assistance needed. Notably, *Ability 1st*'s *A Place Called Home for Families Renewal* project is positioned precariously between Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding categories, further underscoring the urgency for improvement and assistance.

- The PRC also determined that including both the *Big Bend Cares* and *CESC Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)* programs in the current funding cycle would provide substantial benefits to the community. The committee noted that these two programs serve distinct client populations, and implementing both would maximize their collective impact by addressing varied community needs more effectively.

- *Capital City Youth Services (CCYS)* submitted a Transitional Housing/Rapid Re-Housing (TH/RRH) project that met the necessary scoring threshold for inclusion. However, the limited CoC Bonus funding available was not sufficient to support an additional new project this cycle, despite the project's eligibility.

- *CCYS* proposed a Domestic Violence (DV) TH/RRH project in collaboration with *Capital Tea*. While the PRC acknowledged the effort, they expressed concern that the application and presentation placed too much emphasis on serving the LGBTQ+ population and lacked sufficient focus on the specific needs of DV survivors, as reflected in the quality and scoring of the application. The proposal did not adequately outline how the project would effectively serve the DV population. While the committee recognized the correlation between domestic violence and certain vulnerable populations, they agreed that the project should only proceed if revised to more clearly address the direct needs of DV survivors, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. This revision would ensure that the program aligns more closely with the intended priorities of HUD and the CoC and maximizes its impact on survivors.