

eliminating racism empowering women

ywca

YWCA Quincy
639 York Street, Suite 202
Quincy, IL 62301

T: 217-221-9922
F: 217-221-9926
www.ywcaquincy.org

Lori Sutton
Chair of Ranking and Review Workgroup
West Central Illinois Continuum of Care

Dear Lori;

This letter serves as the YWCA's request to appeal the calculations used on the scoring matrix for the project applications that resulted in the ranking results. I am only asking that the Cost Per Person be recalculated for each project submitted. Here is my basis for requesting a recalculation of cost per person.

On a webinar I attended for ranking/review, they stated that it is okay to factor out HMIS and Admin (if Admin is below 10% like HUD wants) from the total grant when calculating cost per person. Just like we did for cost effectiveness. That was straight off the HUD ranking tool. They factor out HMIS and Admin and only use Leasing, Ops and Supportive Services. And I feel because we are basing outcomes on the APRs that we should use the actual dollars spent that is reflected in the APR instead of the proposed dollars in the new application. Along those same lines, I feel we should divide by the actual numbers served as reported in the APR rather than the number of beds proposed in the application. This number tends to be higher in most of my projects (not all because it is based on family size and turnover) and is a true reflection of the cost per person.

I had assumed we would base the calculations from the APR not the application since the outcomes measures are based on the APR.

So I took the liberty of recalculating my projects' cost per person. These numbers are all taken from the APR submitted with the exception of Project C which did not have an APR (which was explained) but you do have my APR report from HMIS and I am attaching a screen shot of the eLOCCS draw down that shows the actual expenditures for Leasing, Ops and Supportive Services. As far as scoring goes, it is not going to change dramatically because my projects could only possibly gain 5 points but it is going to speak volumes when these ranking tools hit the HUD desk and they start comparing cost per person with other CoCs.

Project A:

Number of persons served Q8=	25
Supportive Services	\$ 78,284
Leasing	\$ 39,650
Operations	<u>\$ 7,214</u>
Total	\$125,148/25= \$5,006



eliminating racism empowering women ywca

This project gains 5 points due to scoring 3 instead of 2 and a weight of 5

Project B:

Number of persons served Q8=74

Supportive Services \$183,075

Leasing \$ 84,780

Operations \$ 28,580

Total \$296,435/74= \$4,006 cost per person

This project gains 5 points due to scoring 3 instead of 2 and a weight of 5

Project C:

Number of persons served 4

Supportive Services \$10,705

Leasing \$12,600

Operations \$ 3,439

Total \$26,744/4= \$6,686 (we served less than proposed beds due to family size)

This project actually stays the same because the first time it actually scored 3 but it got recorded as 2. It's new score is 2

Project D:

Number of persons served Q8=7

Supportive Services \$13,750

Leasing \$ 8,520

Operations \$ 2,454

Total \$24,724/7= \$3,532

The first time it should have been scored a 3 but it was recorded as a 2. Scoring this time keeps it at 3 so it gains 5 points.

Again, I don't foresee this changing the ranking but I want all our projects to be competitive and using the same cost per person that other CoC's are using. So I respectfully ask that the projects be scored again to be consistent with the APR information that the other outcomes are based on.

Mary Muehlenfeld
Executive Director