DUTCHESS COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE: 2026 RANK AND REVIEW PROCESS

Rationale

HUD's Continuum of Care (CoC) homeless assistance programs serves as a source of funding for homeless services in Dutchess County, and the planning body coordinating these services is the Dutchess County Continuum of Care (DCCoC). Working with the CoC (DCCoC) and providing support and technical assistance is CARES of NY, Inc., the UFA/Collaborative Applicant.

HUD requires that the CoC (DCCoC) prioritize programs which most effectively serve the community at the local level. To reach this goal, a Rank & Review Process has been implemented for applicants who wish to renew their project/s and for new and/or bonus projects, if bonus funding is available. The process of ranking and reviewing projects is designed to help the CoC (DCCoC) learn about each project's performance and effectiveness.

The Program Review Committee is charged with overseeing the Rank and Review Process. As stated in the Dutchess CoC bylaws, the Program Review Committee is responsible to design, operate, and follow a collaborative process for the development of funding applications, including funding priorities and the number and type of applications. Each year the Program Design Committee reviews the Rank and Review Written Process and Application and makes any changes necessary to reflect changing priorities. The Program Review Committee is also responsible for establishing a Review Team for the Rank and Review Application. The Written Process and Application Tools (Renewal and New/Bonus) are posted for public comment. Feedback is considered by the Program Review Committee and final documents are submitted to the Steering Committee for approval and posted on the CoC's website.

CoC Transparency

The CoC conducts this Rank and Review Process in a transparent manner to ensure a fair and consistent way to prioritize projects. Each year, feedback regarding the process and tools is solicited. The process is publicly announced by the CoC, distributed in writing to the CoC Membership, and posted publicly on the

FINAL

CARES Inc. website for all community members to review and comment.

FY 2026 Rank and Review Application

The DCCoC emphasizes the importance and impact of using the Rank & Review Application as the primary basis for determining the Project Listing submitted to HUD as part of the CoC Consolidated Application.
The Rank and Review Application is thoughtfully revised each year to meet both HUD and CoC standards, incorporate both national and local priorities, and balance objective performance measures with subjective narrative descriptions of project operations.

Review and Approval of the Rank & Review Application

Once the CoC Application has been submitted to HUD by the Collaborative Applicant, the Program Review Committee reviews the prior year's Rank and Review process, including reviewer feedback and DCCoC member comments. The Program Review Committee also develops a list of Review Team members.
The Program Review Committee presents the Written Process and Application Tools to the DCCoC Steering Committee and Membership for one-week public comment periods. The Program Review Committee considers submitted comments for inclusion. The Program Review Committee updates the Steering Committee on any edits, incorporates any additional changes from the Steering Committee, and secures a vote for approval. Finally, the Written Process and Application Tools are shared with Membership.

Renewal Projects

Each renewal project completes a Rank and Review Application. The 2026Renewal Rank and Review Application process will occur in two (2) parts, Parts 1 & 2 are distributed at the same time as one tool to all with the intent to allow agencies adequate time to complete the full Rank & Review Application. An application must include responses to all questions as well as required data and/or attachments from the most recent project application and Calendar Year Annual Performance Report (APR) in order to be considered completed. All completed applications will be shared with *CARES of NY, Inc. by the stated deadline to be considered complete and sent to the Review Team*. Late applications will receive a 5-point penalty reduction and one additional point penalty reduction every day the application is late. Applications that are

submitted four days passed the deadline will not be accepted or scored.

* Please Note: Coordinated Entry, Planning, HMIS, and renewal projects with less than one federal fiscal year's (Oct. 1-Sept. 30) worth of data projects are not required to fill out a renewal application.

Part 1. focuses on project and system outcomes, using project data entered in HMIS and objective questions to "rate" projects. The HMIS data used in Part 1 is from the previous HUD Fiscal Year (Oct 1 - Sep 30). This HMIS data used in Part 1 has been cleaned and reviewed for data quality errors when submitted to HUD for the Longitudinal Systems Analysis (LSA) report. The tool will indicate where agencies can find data for relevant questions. Agencies will also receive a data attachment to assist in completing their application. Data on this attachment will be based on APRs submitted by agencies earlier in the year.
If errors are identified on the Data Attachment, the agency must contact CARES by the deadline noted when the data attachment is released. If the request is a calculation error, CARES staff will correct the error and resubmit the Data Attachments for the agency's review.

Part 2 focuses on qualitative project and system outcome data, which allows the project to explain unique circumstances that may affect project performance. Part 2 includes narratives questions to further evaluate the efficacy of each renewal project. Questions are derived from the Program Review Committee based on HUD priorities. . Questions on Part 2 will be scored by the external review team. Scores will be determined by averaging the scores provided by all of the reviewers and the Program Review Committee may request additional information from applicants on Part 2 Narrative question for clarity before scoring is finalized.

An Optional Part 3 form may be released following the release of the annual NOFO for the CoC to demonstrate the incorporation of HUD priorities into our annual Rank & Review process. If there are no significant HUD priorities identified or all major priorities are addressed in Part 1 and Part 2, this form will not be released.

The following renewal project types are exempt from the requirement to complete the Rank and Review Renewal Application: projects which fund only

FINAL

HMIS, Coordinated Entry, or Planning activities; as well as any newly created project without a full fiscal year of data. See Project Ranking below for more information on how these projects are included in the final tiering.

New Projects

New projects are created through bonus funds or reallocated funds. A separate application is required for Bonus and Reallocated project proposals. If, after the ranking process, additional money becomes available through reallocation after the ranking process, reallocation, and if all new projects have been approved, then a new project RFP will re-open for submission in efforts to utilize all available funding. RFPs submitted during the second application process will automatically be ranked below projects from the first round in Tier 2. The Review Team reviews and scores all New/Bonus project applications submitted. New project applications will be integrated into the ranking according to project type and the PH–TH–SSO rotational sequence (described below), then approved by the Steering Committee and Membership will receive notification. The community's goal is to apply for the maximum amount of available funds. The same appeals process that applies to Renewal applications applies to New/Bonus project applications.

In the event project applications initially receive the same score, it is the responsibility of the Review Team to reconsider scoring to break the tie.

Bonus Projects

Each year, HUD may offer bonus funding and the NOFA outlines how the funds may be spent. Bonus project proposals must fill an unmet need as noted within the locally determined priorities. Bonus applications will be scored by the Program Review Committee and project ranking will be approved by the Steering Committee and membership will be notified. The community's goal is to apply for the maximum amount of available funding. The same appeals process that applies to Renewal applications applies to New/Bonus project applications.

Reallocation

Reallocation is the process by which the CoC shifts funds, in whole or in part, from existing eligible renewal grants to create new projects to fill an unmet need within the community. Reallocating funds is one of the most important tools by

which communities can make strategic improvements to their homelessness system.

Projects that can be flagged for reallocation consideration include those which have demonstrated inadequate financial management, a history of expending funds on ineligible activities, a lack of full expenditure of funds, and those which consistently score low on the Rank & Review. Reallocation is recommended for any project not participating in Coordinated Entry, HMIS or the annual Point-in-Time. The Steering Committee may determine reallocation of a particular project as in the best interest of the CoC and essential to maintaining full funding. Further, agencies may voluntarily choose to reallocate funds from their own projects. New project proposals developed by agencies through reallocation of their own funds will be prioritized during the ranking process. All other proposed projects using reallocated funds will be ranked according to general ranking procedures.

Project proposals developed with reallocated funds must fill an unmet need and submit a New/Bonus application. Reallocated and Bonus applications will be evaluated alongside Renewal Projects within a unified competitive ranking process. Each project will be scored using the appropriate tool and placed in the overall PH–TH–SSO rotational sequence. Reallocated projects will receive additional points to support HUD's intent to incentivize reallocation. The final ranking will be approved by the Steering Committee and membership will be notified via CARES Website.

Reviewer Team

Members of the Review Team are individuals from the community who are not CoC funded or neighboring communities and are knowledgeable about the CoC process, services and providers. Reviewers are considered by the Program Review Committee and invited by the Collaborative Applicant (CARES) to participate. After reviewers agree to participate, they are given project applications and scorecards and instructed to score applications with an objective lens. Three reviewers are recruited each year to score the narrative portion of each application.

Reviewers are provided with a copy of each project's full application for review and scorecards to complete. Scores for each application are averaged between the 3 reviewer scores to create the final score. In the event project applications initially receive the same score, it is the responsibility of the Review Team to

FINAL

reconsider scoring to break the tie. The Review Team also considers any submitted appeals (see **Appeals Process** outlined below) and provides any final comments to be shared with agencies. Final scores result in the project ranking.

Threshold Review

To ensure CoC projects are high performing, all project applications are expected to also meet a minimum scoring threshold of 50% of total possible application points. The Threshold Review will be conducted by the CA and the Review Team after the Rank and Review process is complete and final project scores determined. If the pre-determined threshold is not met, the Review Team may recommend the DCCoC Steering Committee consider the possibility of technical assistance, reallocation or amendments to the project application/s with said agency. Projects that have underperformed for three consecutive years may be recommended for reallocation to the Steering Committee during that year's NOFA submission.

Project Ranking and Tiering

HUD requires that the CoC conduct a transparent and objective process to review and rank all Renewal and New/Bonus projects. Tiering prioritizes projects for funding. Tier 1 is considered "safe" for continued funding and HUD specifies the percentage of the ARD amount that will make up Tier 1 each year when the NOFO is released. Tier 2 is the percentage of CoC funding that is at risk each year, per HUD's announcement in the NOFO. Being in Tier 2 does not guarantee that funding will be lost, but it does place projects at risk if the CoC is low performing in the national competition. Using CoC approved Rank and Review tools, all projects; Renewal, Reallocated, and Bonus, will be scored using within a unified competitive ranking process, using tools with the same total possible points. After scoring, projects will be grouped and ranked within their project type (PH, TH, SSO). These ranked lists will then be combined into the final ranking using a rotational sequence (PH - TH -SSO - Infrastructure) starting with renewals.

When the NOFA is released, priorities outlined in the application may be strategically applied by the CoC to project tiering. Final tiering results are presented to the Board for approval and membership is informed of the results.

FINAL

Debriefings

All agencies receive their project scores and are offered the opportunity to debrief with the Collaborative Applicant. Debriefing allows agencies the opportunity to request clarification regarding how/why Application question/s received certain scores. Debriefings are required if agencies are considering an appeal. Agencies may choose to appeal project score/s within the allotted time frame (see the **Appeals Process** outlined below).

After all debriefings with the Collaborative Applicant are completed and appeals considered by the Review Team, projects projected to fall into Tier 2 are contacted and notified of their ranking and offered the opportunity to go over the projects scores. Next, the project ranking is shared with the Program Review Committee, presented to the Steering Committee for review/approval. If the Steering Committee determines that changes to project ranking or tiering should be made on behalf of the CoC, based upon local community need and impact, the Steering Committee must make those determinations unanimously. Agencies whose ranking may be impacted by the changes will be notified. Once finalized, Ranking is shared with Membership via the CoC's website.

Appeal Process

1. Who May Appeal?

   An agency may appeal a decision concerning a Renewal or New/Bonus project application submitted by that agency. If a project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be submitted.

2. What May or May Not Be Appealed?

   The appeals process applies to project scoring and ranking ***only***. *There is no appeal for project tiering*. An appeal may ***not*** be based on the following:

   - Failure to answer any question/s on the application
   - Failure to submit required attachments to the application
   - Failure to submit the application by the required deadline

   Any mathematical errors found by an applicant will be corrected by the Collaborative Applicant.

3. Timing of an Appeal

   Formal appeals may be submitted by a project within two (2) business days

of debriefing. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Collaborative Applicant, Haley Conner (hconner@caresny.org), who will forward them on to the Review Team. The written appeal must consist of a brief statement no longer than 1 page and can be in the form of a letter, memo or email.

4. Appeals Decisions

   The Review Team also serves as the Appeals Team. Appeals are decided by majority vote of the Appeals Team. Once decided, all appeals are final and may not be overturned by the Program Review Committee, Steering Committee or Membership.

FINAL