

FINAL TIER 1 RANKING

Score	Rank	Agency	Project	Comments	Tier 1	Tier 2	% Cut	Reject
1	1	Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency	Dakota PSH Bryant	No Comment	X			
2	2	Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency	Pro Rata/Bonus Leasing Combo 2011	No Comment	X			
3	3	Mental Health Resources, Inc.	Project Restore	No Comment	X			
4	4	CommonBond Communities	Granda Lakes Supportive Housing	No Comment	X			
5	5	Carver CDA	Carver CDA S+C	No Comment	X			
6	6	Washington County HRA	HomeFree 2010	No Comment	X			
7	7	Metropolitan Council, Minnesota	Anoka County Shelter + Care Program	No Comment	X			
8	8	Supportive Housing and Managed Care Pilot, aka Hearth Connection	Hearth SMAC Leasing	No Comment	X			
9	9	County of Scott	H238	No Comment	X			
10	10	Dakota County CDA	S+C 2013	No Comment	X			
11	11	South Metro Human Services	2011 SMAC RA renewal	No Comment	X			
12	12	Scott-Carver-Dakota CAP Agency	Scott/Carver Transitional Housing 2011	No Comment	X			
13	13	Canvas Health	SHARE 2011	No Comment	X			
14	14	Mental Health Resources, Inc.	Permanent Housing for Chronically Homeless Disabled Adults	No Comment	X			
15	15	Elim Transitional Housing, Inc.	Anoka Dakota SHP/Samaritan (Lutheran Social Services) Anoka PSH	Score still related to transfer of grant. Data quality, leverage, etc. Applicant increased leverage even though it still will not improve score.	X			
16	16	Human Services, Inc., in Washington County Minnesota	Mosaic 2013	CH beds, employment, data quality leading to lower score. 12 month housing stability was extremely close.	X			
17	17	The Link	Lincoln Place 2013	Low score. Income and employment were scored low. Lower since they haven't been serving CH.	X			

Score	Rank	Agency	Project	Comments	Tier 1	Tier 2	% Cut	Reject
				Relationship with CDA is bonus. Greater stability with this program than with Safehaven.				
19	18	Dakota County	Supportive Housing Program	Very low score. Ranked above Safehaven for the following reasons. Big project. Considering converting (some/all?) of project to RRH or PSH. Not allowed to do this this year. About 1/3 headed by young adult parent. Exceeded all old HUD measures, but were slightly under new measures. Rank just above HMIS project due to TH and low score.	X			
21	19	Hearth Connection	NEW SMAC RA 2013	New project. We opted to move this project up and move the Planning grant to Tier 2 since it is more likely to put us in a more competitive position for this funding round. Hearth Connection was chosen to move up instead of South Metro (which scored higher) since their total request was lower and the amount left in Tier 1 was small.	X			
22	20	Wilder Foundation	HMIS SMAC (MN0072B5K031003)	HUD prioritizes funding of HMIS. There are many needs for HMIS with technical assistance, data sharing, coordinated assessment changes soon to come. Ranks on the bottom of Tier 1 since it is not housing related, but in Tier 1 since it is needed.	X			

FINAL TIER 2 RANKING

Score	Rank	Agency	Project	Comments	Tier 1	Tier 2	% Cut	Reject
18	21	Safehaven	SH Project 2013	It was moved to Tier 2 for the following reasons. While close to transfer, have been close for years and fixes have not occurred. Program lacks capacity. \$1,000 in the bank. Many errors in application documents and process. Inconsistencies from site visits to paper work (how many CH beds? Leverage?). Safehaven is first in Tier 2 due to HUD prioritizing renewals over new projects.		X		
20	22	South Metro Human	SMAC RA 2013	New project. We reviewed whether there		X		

Score	Rank	Agency	Project	Comments	Tier 1	Tier 2	% Cut	Reject
		Services		were any renewals not already in Tier 2 that warranted moving to Tier 2 to make room for a new project in Tier 1. Ultimately, we decided against this (Dakota SHU was the closest to move down, but it is a very large project and it is considering converting to RRH or PSH next year which will strengthen its performance in coming years). When it was revealed that we needed to account for planning grant funding in our renewal, we opted to keep this grant in Tier 2 due to its large total request.				
23	23	SMAC—Washington County	SMAC Planning Grant 2013	New Project. It was prioritized to submit another planning grant to ensure that planning activities continue to be funded with the many changes that the HEARTH Act will yet require in the coming years. We ranked it in Tier 2 since we thought a new PSH CH project in Tier 1 would strengthen our CoC application, therefore strengthening our chances to fund all 2013 requests.		X		

NOT RANKED (decided not to renew)

Score	Rank	Agency	Project	Comments	Tier 1	Tier 2	% Cut	Reject
n/a	n/a	Mary Kay McJilton People Incorporated	ARCH (Anoka Residents Community Housing)	No Comment				