



(ARCH) — Collaborative Applicant, AL-507

FY 2026 CoC Program

Rating & Ranking Manual

AL-507 Alabama Balance of State Continuum of Care

The scoring instrument the Rank and Review Subcommittee uses to score and rank every project application in the AL-507 local competition. Companion document to the AL-507 Local Competition Application.

Local Rating & Ranking Tool

This manual is used by the Rank and Review Subcommittee to score every project application that passes threshold review (see the Threshold Eligibility Requirements in the AL-507 Local Competition Application). Scores determine each project's position on the CoC's Priority List and its Tier assignment. Consistent with HUD's FY 2026 NOFO, at least 50% of locally available points are objective, measurable criteria (Project Performance & Readiness and Cost Reasonableness alone total 50), and at least 25% are system-performance measures — permanent housing outcomes, returns to homelessness, and employment/income growth total 30 of the 100 points. Because an individual project cannot control CoC-wide measures like the overall Point-in-Time count or areawide encampment reduction, this tool scores each project on its own measurable contribution to those system outcomes instead.

Threshold gate

Threshold review is pass/fail. Failure to satisfy any threshold requirement in the AL-507 Local Competition Application may result in rejection of the application before merit scoring, subject to the appeal rights described in the AL-507 Review, Ranking & Appeal Procedures.

Scoring categories (100 points possible — new and renewal projects)

Category	What is scored	Possible	Awarded
Project Performance & Readiness	Renewal projects: demonstrated performance from APRs, HMIS data, grant expenditure, occupancy, housing outcomes, and returns to homelessness (see sub-measures below). New projects: demonstrated readiness and capacity — program design, organizational experience, implementation readiness, staffing, partnerships, and the applicant's likelihood of success operating comparable federal, state, or local programs.	45	
Program Design & FY26 Alignment	Connection to treatment/recovery, employment, and self-sufficiency supports; approach to advancing housing stability; quality of the Section C narrative in the Local Competition Application	20	
System Coordination, CE & HMIS	Coordinated Entry participation; HMIS bed coverage and data quality; service-participation agreements; law enforcement/first-responder partnerships (SSO); mainstream-resource coordination	15	

Organizational & Fiscal Capacity	Grant management history; staff turnover and implementation capacity; audit/monitoring findings; financial systems and internal controls	10	
Cost Reasonableness	Cost per participant/outcome relative to comparable AL-507 projects; budget justification quality	5	
Equity & Access	Steps to identify and reduce disparities in access to, and outcomes from, the project across populations served	5	
TOTAL	100		

Clarification, not revision: The Rank and Review Subcommittee may request clarification regarding any application response but may not permit substantive revisions after the local competition deadline unless such revisions are required by HUD or are necessary to correct a clerical or administrative error.

Project Performance & Readiness sub-measures (renewal projects)

Renewal projects' 45 Project Performance & Readiness points are scored using the measurable sub-criteria below. New projects do not yet have this operating history — the Subcommittee instead scores new projects' 45 Project Performance & Readiness points qualitatively, based on program design, organizational experience, implementation readiness, staffing, partnerships, and the applicant's demonstrated capacity and likelihood of success operating comparable federal, state, or local programs (Local Competition Application, Sections C and E).

Renewal Sub-Measure	Source	Possible	Awarded
Exits to permanent housing	Percentage of leavers who exited to permanent housing (Local Competition Application, Question D2)	5	
Housing retention while enrolled	Percentage of participants who retained permanent housing during the reporting period (Local Competition Application, Question D3)	5	
Returns to homelessness	Percentage returning to homelessness within 24 months of exit (Local Competition Application, Question D4)	10	
Employment and income growth	Percentage with new or increased income, employment or non-employment (Local Competition Application, Question D5)	10	
Occupancy/utilization	Occupancy or unit-utilization rate (Local Competition Application, Question D1)	5	

HMIS/data quality	HMIS error/missing-data rate and corrective action (Local Competition Application, Question D7)	5	
Timely expenditure/compliance	Timely draw-down of prior grant funds (Local Competition Application, Question D8)	5	
TOTAL (of the 45 Project Performance & Readiness points)	45		

Point breakout rubrics (renewal projects)

The rubrics below convert each renewal sub-measure's underlying percentage into the points shown in the table above, so every reviewer applies the same benchmark to the same data. These specific benchmarks are ARCH's proposed local standard, calibrated to AL-507's own performance history rather than dictated by HUD; the CoC Board should review and may adjust them before this manual is adopted, and periodically thereafter as AL-507's baseline performance changes.

Exits to permanent housing (5 points)

Performance Level	Points
90% or higher	5
80–89%	4
70–79%	3
60–69%	2
50–59%	1
Below 50%, or no data	0

Housing retention while enrolled (5 points)

Performance Level	Points
95% or higher	5
90–94%	4
85–89%	3
80–84%	2
Below 80%	1
No data	0

Returns to homelessness within 24 months (10 points)

Lower is better — this measures the percentage of exited participants who returned to homelessness.

Performance Level	Points
0–5%	10

6–10%	8
11–15%	6
16–20%	4
Above 20%	2
No data	0

Employment and income growth (10 points)

Performance Level	Points
60% or higher	10
50–59%	8
40–49%	6
30–39%	4
Below 30%	2
No data	0

Occupancy/utilization (5 points)

Performance Level	Points
95% or higher	5
90–94%	4
85–89%	3
80–84%	2
Below 80%	1
No data	0

HMIS/data quality (5 points)

Lower is better — this measures the HMIS error/missing-data rate.

Performance Level	Points
0–2% error rate	5
3–5%	4
6–10%	3
11–15%	2
Above 15%	1
No data, or no corrective action documented	0

Timely expenditure/compliance (5 points)

Percentage of the most recently completed grant year's award drawn down by the grant end date.

Performance Level	Points
100%	5
95–99%	4
90–94%	3
85–89%	2
Below 85%	1
No data	0

Tie-breaker

In the event of identical total scores, preference is given to the project with the highest combined score on the System Performance sub-measures within Project Performance & Readiness (permanent housing outcomes, returns to homelessness, and employment/income growth). If still tied, preference is given to the project demonstrating the strongest permanent housing outcomes. If still tied, the CoC Board shall determine the final ranking after considering the best interests of the AL-507 Consolidated Application.

Tier assignment

Tier 1 is set at 60% of AL-507's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). Consistent with the FY 2026 NOFO, any competitively ranked project — new or renewal — may be placed in Tier 1; Tier 1 is not limited to renewal projects, and Tier 2 is not reserved exclusively for new projects. The Rank and Review Subcommittee recommends placement of projects into Tier 1 and Tier 2 based on the approved Local Rating and Ranking Tool, project performance, strategic priorities, and the best interests of the AL-507 Consolidated Application, subject to CoC Board approval.

After AL-507 submits its ranked Priority Listing, HUD applies its own national selection sequence to Tier 2 projects across all CoCs:

1. CoC Planning and Unified Funding Agency (UFA) cost applications
2. All Tier 1 projects
3. Additional Domestic Violence Bonus projects, if needed
4. Additional permanent housing for families with children, if needed
5. New Transitional Housing and Supportive Services Only projects in Tier 2
6. Other new Tier 2 projects, until the national new-project amount reaches \$1.3 billion

Remaining Tier 2 renewal projects are funded only if national funds remain after this sequence. AL-507's Rank and Review Subcommittee does not apply this national sequence itself — it ranks projects locally by score; HUD applies the sequence above across the national Tier 2 pool after AL-507 submits its Priority Listing.

Contacts & Resources

Alabama Rural Coalition for the Homeless, Inc. (ARCH) — Collaborative Applicant, AL-507 Alabama Balance of State CoC

Email: arch@archconnection.org · Phone: 334-273-0668 · Web: www.archconnection.org

Questions about this document, the local competition, or the FY 2026 NOFO? Visit ARCH's FY 2026 Competition page at archconnection.org and submit an Ask-A-Question (AAQ)/technical assistance request.