County of Ocean
Human Services
Jamie Busch, Director
Administration Building, Toms River, NJ 08754

EVALUATION TABULATION

CC No. TBD

Acquisition for Innovations to Address Homelessness

RESPONSE DEADLINE: June 6, 2024 at 4:00 pm

Report Generated: Wednesday, September 3, 2025

SELECTED VENDOR

VENDOR AWARDED BY THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Vendor	Location
HABcore, Inc	Red Bank, NJ

PHASE 1

EVALUATORS

Name	Title
Tony Agliata	Director
Joanne Bergin	Business Administrator
Jamie Busch	Assistant Director
Courtney Hartshorn	Community Service Aide
Tracy Maksel	Director
Cheryl Meyer	Program Specialist 3
Kimberly Reilly	County Alcohol and Drug Coordinator
Shelby Voorhees	Youth Services Commission Administrator

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Technical Criteria	Points Based	40 *(40% of Total)*

Description:

- Does the vendor's proposal demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope of work and related objectives? Is the proposed project consistent with the objectives of the funding opportunity?
- Is the vendor's proposal complete and responsive to the specific requirements? Does the proposal adequately address all response items?
- Are all aspects of the proposed project described and explained?
- Is the project feasible and cost effective?
- Is the implementation plan complete and comprehensive?
- Is there evidence to support the efficacy of the proposed project?
- Does the vendor's proposal use innovative technology and techniques?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Management Criteria	Points Based	30 *(30% of Total)*

Description:

- Does the proposer appear to be a solid organization who has demonstrated ability to perform the functions described in its project plan?
- Does the vendor document experience as required?
- Project readiness
- Is the implementation plan viable?

- Is the sustainability plan viable?
- Are the appropriate partners committed to the project?

Criteria	Scoring Method	Weight (Points)
Cost Criteria	Points Based	30 *(30% of Total)*

Description:

- How does the cost compare to other similarly scored proposals?
- Is the price and its component charges, fees, etc. adequately explained or documented?
- Ability to leverage resources with other partners resulting in innovative service approaches will be considered.

AGGREGATE SCORES SUMMARY

Vendor	Tony Agliata	Joanne Bergin	Jamie Busch	Courtney Hartshorn	Tracy Maksel	Cheryl Meyer	Kimberly Reilly	Shelby Voorhees
HABcore, Inc	93	85	90	96	97	95	85	93
Oceans Harbor House, Inc.	38	45	40	39	36	40	50	35
Just Believe, A New Jersey Non-profit Corporation	39	30	40	42	36	35	35	35

Vendor	Total Score (Max Score 100)
HABcore, Inc	**91.75**
Oceans Harbor House, Inc.	**40.38**
Just Believe, A New Jersey Non-profit Corporation	**36.5**

VENDOR SCORES BY EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vendor	Technical Criteria Points Based 40 Points (40%)	Management Criteria Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Cost Criteria Points Based 30 Points (30%)	Total Score (Max Score 100)
HABcore, Inc	37.6	27.3	26.9	**91.75**
Oceans Harbor House, Inc.	15.8	13.3	11.4	**40.38**
Just Believe, A New Jersey Non-profit Corporation	13.5	12.3	10.8	**36.5**

INDIVIDUAL PROPOSAL SCORES

HABcore, Inc

Technical Criteria | Points Based | 40 Points (40%)

Tony Agliata: 37

Clear direction and experience

Joanne Bergin: 35

Outlining the properties and strategy was very helpful and encouraging.

Jamie Busch: 37

The proposal meets the intent of the funding opportunity. While many details of the proposal are yet to be determined, the proposal is as comprehensive and forthcoming as could be expected. The various options for the second building is innovative and reflective of the agency's readiness to engage in such projects.

Courtney Hartshorn: 39

+ well detailed. + innovative.

Tracy Maksel: 40

- Projects well defined and relevant - Builds new capacity - Reputable collaborative partners +++ Currently receives/implements CoC funds +++ Active member of CoC, HPAC, Coordinated Entry sessions

Cheryl Meyer: 38

Proposal includes a detailed budget, proposed cost of projects, reasonable timeline, explanation of experience with similar projects, partnerships, and grant administration.

Kimberly Reilly: 35

History in Monmouth County Linkages in Toms River and with other partners chart on weekly and monthly deliverables provides evidence to the efficacy of the project by breaking down activities to a realistic timeline, their timeline was very detailed to showcase work flow during duration of contact

Shelby Voorhees: 40

Clearly demonstrates an understanding of the project. Proposer has outlines several different properties for this project. Builds capacity. Identifies priority plans and options. Has been in communication with community partners to find hotel/motels to be acquired/renovated and used as shelters throughout the community in different locations throughout the county.

Management Criteria | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Tony Agliata: 28

Joanne Bergin: 25

Exceptional

Jamie Busch: 28

The partnership between HABcore, Bright Harbor, and Family Promise is outstanding. All three agencies have a solid reputation and the consortium, as well as the partnership with the Coordinated Assessment entity, will provide checks and balances.

Courtney Hartshorn: 28

+ plan is viable. + solid organization with prior experience in sheltering/housing.

Tracy Maksel: 27

- Well established plan Condition: +Family Promise should serve as main purchasing agent for township building in LEH based on existing relationship with township

Cheryl Meyer: 29

Proposal demonstrates agencies experience in similar projects and the project timeline shows the organization has done the needed research and planning to complete the proposed project with the appropriate community partners.

Kimberly Reilly: 25

As stated in previous comment, this proposer has a long history within Ocean and Monmouth to implement project plan. History multiple geographic sites. Provided options throughout Ocean County. After renovations, their appears to be sustainability with this plan with multiple viable locations and the ability to service the largest number of residents.

Shelby Voorhees: 28

Documents experience required Plan is viable. Community collaboration and partners demonstrated Family Promise/ Bright Harbor Health Care. Secured plan for 1 building and options for a second building. Demonstrated understanding and willingness to work with OCHS to identify and plan for locations.

Cost Criteria | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Tony Agliata: 28

Joanne Bergin: 25

Exceptional

Jamie Busch: 25

The costs for Building 1 acquisition and rehab are clear and reasonable. The costs for Building 2 options need to be fleshed out further. It is understood that costs may fluctuate depending on the property in question, timing, and other factors.

Courtney Hartshorn: 29

Tracy Maksel: 30

Reasonable

Cheryl Meyer: 28

Proposal is very clear about the known and unknown costs. If the costs are unknown, an explanation is provided.

Kimberly Reilly: 25

There are many pieces to this proposal and I felt the budget aligned with proposed work activities and procurement/acquisition of properties within Ocean County.

Shelby Voorhees: 25

very detailed out cost criteria

Just Believe, A New Jersey Non-profit Corporation

Technical Criteria | Points Based | 40 Points (40%)

Tony Agliata: 15

Needs more explanation and detail in proposal

Joanne Bergin: 10

Support letters were for a different grant - that's not appropriate.

Jamie Busch: 10

This proposal does not meet a fundamental element of the scope of work. This proposal is to construct a Class F Boarding Home/ Sober Living Residence, which is a permanent housing solution and NOT a shelter. The proposal lacks detail and preplanning.

Courtney Hartshorn: 16

- permanent housing solution and not a shelter. - mirrors an oxford housing model. - has not administered CoC funds which is required. - no organizational plan. + strong community presence.

Tracy Maksel: 12

- Agency does not meet eligibility criteria: Does not have experience administering CoC funding. - Project does not meet eligibility criteria: Project submitted as articulated is for a DCA Class F License which is technically a Cooperative Sober Living Residence (NJAC 5:27) and is NOT an emergency homeless shelter. Homeless shelters operate under NJAC 5:15 and require different licensing. - The Continuum of Care was established in 1994 within Ocean County. It was administered by the Department of Human Services until 2014 when it was assigned to Ending Homelessness Group as the lead CoC agency. The applicant articulates a skewed scenario. - There is no actual continuity of operations plan approved by the Agency's Board. - The grievance statement is specific to Larry's House and not the entire agency. Moreover the submission does not present as a Board approved grievance policy. - Cost effectiveness is unclear. Agency has received $450K for "long term use", however, they submit a construction estimate of $355,505 to establish the home. Long term use is not defined and there is no explanation why the existing funds can't be used for construction of the facility. The budget submitted seems to be an operational budget, but not the requested amount. There is no budget narrative to differentiate which of the estimate costs are included in the request. - The agency does not address sheltering.

Cheryl Meyer: 15

Proposal is for transitional/Sober living housing for veterans where the individuals will be charged a program fee of $600 a month. Proposal is very hard to follow and isn’t cohesive. Project is not innovative; it is helping to fund an existing project.

Kimberly Reilly: 15

Vendor was able to complete technical requirements but wish more detail was provided, this was not for a shelter opportunity, did not meet scope of work, was looking at current construction of Larry House, permanent housing -missing documents/not updated documents/MOU with reported partners/LOS issue

Shelby Voorhees: 15

Agency has demonstrated a history of operating Code Blue operations only. Proposal is for a Veteran homeless shelter and sober living home. Target population is homeless veterans and veterans coming from recovery. Received federal awarding for outreach program not homeless sheltering. Proposer has no history of receiving COC funding. Application process for enrollment includes a voting process by current residents. Does not state length of time for shelter placement. Includes a fee for living at the shelter paid by occupants. Sustainability linked to private grants not yet secured. A loan of $350,000 claims to have been secured through Manasquan Bank for long term sustainability? Why was this not used to build the home? Proposing a permanent housing solution not a shelter. Proposal does not demonstrate an understanding of the shelter housing request. Sober living is a permanent housing model and requesting residents to contribute financially to stay there, additionally members of the home vote to accept new members. Outdated organizational chart. No delineation of staff!

Management Criteria | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Tony Agliata: 12

Outdated Organizational Chart, No Board policies

Joanne Bergin: 10

Not enough details on the delivery of service

Jamie Busch: 15

The proposal demonstrates experience serving this population in Ocean County during the last 5 years. However, there appears to be extremely limited knowledge of historical context prior to the agency's incorporation (ex: the Ocean County CoC was formed in 1994, not 2019). There is very limited experience managing government grants and no evidence of internal capacity to conduct program evaluation or continuous quality improvement activities. No key staff identified who would be responsible for bringing the project to fruition. The letters of support provided did not pertain to this project or funding opportunity. This misrepresentation does not bode well for the integrity of the organization and whether or not it really has the commitment of partners. No COOP. No formal grievance policy.

Courtney Hartshorn: 14

- unclear implementation plan. - project timeline and phases are not detailed. - no level of service detailed.

Tracy Maksel: 12

- The agency submitted an outdated organizational chart. There is no clear articulation who will provide project development oversight. - The agency has experience operating code blue sheltering, but does not adequately demonstrate CoC implementation or collaboration with the flow of clients within the existing system of care. - Sheltering experience beyond code blue is unique to the CEO and not the Just Believe agency as a whole. - The only partner MOU is with M22, there are no official documents articulating collaboration with the county welfare, coordinated entry or continuum of care agencies. Letters provided besides M22 are supporting a different (past) state grant opportunity and still provide no commitment of resources (time, funds, policy, protocol, actionable items). - This project has been in development for several years. It is unclear what barriers have prevented the agency from moving farther along.

Cheryl Meyer: 10

Kimberly Reilly: 10

NJ agency starting in 2014/2015 timeframe multiple partnerships and volunteers so the organization has experience in Ocean County working with partners. Management include Larry's Home (new, Veterans) and Code Blue, with a HQ, reported strong partnerships in the community

Shelby Voorhees: 15

no projected level of service Does not demonstrate organizational experience in sheltering. All experience is linked to CEO, PH. Does not demonstrate experience beyond code blue sheltering. Letters of support provided were for a different grant. Only indicates federally funded for outreach projects not sheltering.

Cost Criteria | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Tony Agliata: 12

Joanne Bergin: 10

Costs outlined are not for sheltering.

Jamie Busch: 15

It is unclear how much funding is requested. The first page indicates $300,000, but the attached construction quote/estimate totals $355,505. No proposal budget or budget narrative was provided. Leveraged sources of funds for the construction portion (only) are not sufficiently explained. For example, the Manasquan Bank grant in the amount of $350,000 is mentioned as if it would support both the construction and the ongoing operating costs, but the exact amount (or even approximate amount) for the construction phase of the project is not indicated. $3,000 per year is said to be used towards operating expenses but the term of the Bank grant is not indicated. There is much more detail offered about the anticipated operating budget, which speaks to sustainability, but it does not clarify the proposal at hand. The construction estimate appears to be reasonable.

Courtney Hartshorn: 12

- did not articulate where the funds were going.

Tracy Maksel: 12

This project proposed is not for sheltering and therefore the budget provided can't be compared to the other scored proposals.

Cheryl Meyer: 10

Proposal did not include a budget narrative

Kimberly Reilly: 10

Budget provided - some reporting funding sources were confusing, cannot be used to compare to other proposals as this is not for sheltering!!! Not quite sure what was happening with this application, vendor encouraged to read through proposals in full before submitting to ensure appropriate submissions in the future

Shelby Voorhees: 5

Only a construction quote and operational quote submitted. No actual budget and narrative submitted for review. missing a page on the construction quote submitted. Project submitted is not for sheltering.

Oceans Harbor House, Inc.

Technical Criteria | Points Based | 40 Points (40%)

Tony Agliata: 14

Eligibility issues and CoC experience

Joanne Bergin: 15

Jamie Busch: 20

The project meets the intent of the funding opportunity. It appears that the agency is in the process of receiving the necessary permits and permissions on the local level and has engaged local level leadership. Did not respond to all program narrative prompts. Why the agency closed a youth shelter to attempt to open a family shelter is unclear, especially since the agency plans to leverage the same federal funding stream.

Courtney Hartshorn: 15

- did not mention CoC funding which is a requirement. - project is already developed. + long standing history within the community.

Tracy Maksel: 12

- Agency does not meet required eligibility: is not currently CoC provider; was a past CoC recipient but the agency DID NOT articulate past CoC experience and why the grant is no longer available. - This is a project already under development with initial zoning approvals through the Township. It appears the agency is seeking reimbursement for several items that were already paid for including security systems already installed, legal fees, permits/applications and staff salaries. - The agency requests salary reimbursement $125,870 for hours already incurred to the project in 2023 through July of 2024. This request is outside the scope of service, not an allowable expense. - The agency requests funds for operations (salaries, supplies, etc.) $449,834/$149,945 related to direct service provision which are prohibitive costs. - Agency seeks to pay Just Believe salaries for direct service provisions. Prohibitive cost. - The timeline provided only illustrates through 4th quarter of 2024, which seems unrealistic for the amount of renovation work proposed. - No experience implementing CoC funds/have not been a recipient of CoC funds. - Did not address all prompts including loss of past grants. - If the agency had discussed their past CoC experience, discussed where the grant(s) have come and gone, and ONLY focused on the renovation...this may have been recommended for funding.

Cheryl Meyer: 15

Proposal is to renovate an existing property and existing program. Nothing new or innovative.

Kimberly Reilly: 20

experience with funding from county state and federal history of community relationships history of property acquisition Proposal was clear in understanding scope of project with detail but not overly innovative, small eligible population

Shelby Voorhees: 15

Proposer does not demonstrate 5 years of property acquisition or development/rehabilitation. The agency has 2 locations in TR both acquired over 20 years ago. They do have ample experience in owning/operating congregate/non-congregate sheltering for individuals. They do not demonstrate a solid collaboration between the OCCOC and EHG. Identified property is one the agency already owns. Did not demonstrate a history of COC funded programs. Agency does have history with county and federal grants. Grant does not address the term of owning/operating the property for 20+ years and offering OC right of first refusal if the need arises to sell or close. Has not answered questions required under Agency background and Experience. Project under development and is seeking reimbursement for already incurred expenses.

Management Criteria | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Tony Agliata: 12

Joanne Bergin: 15

Jamie Busch: 10

It is unclear why the agency "sunsetted" the youth shelter. Being that a significant amount of the funding request is for (unallowable) ongoing operational costs, the sustainability plan is tenuous. Being that a significant amount of the funding request is for (unallowable) previously incurred costs, the fiscal solvency of the agency is potentially problematic.

Courtney Hartshorn: 12

- did not detail sustainability or collaboration.

Tracy Maksel: 12

- Timeline does not seem realistic for renovations. - Sustainability plan does not address sheltering funds through DFD (per person/family per night) as a method to offset costs or already available funding sources in the Continuum of Care. - More detail needed regarding anticipated collaboration, or existing flow of referrals with County welfare agency or other Continuum of Care and Coordinated Entry agencies.

Cheryl Meyer: 15

Organization has provided similar programming in the past. No EHG affiliation

Kimberly Reilly: 15

35 years of providing shelter and support renovate Windsor Ave property, proposal demonstrated proposer's organization and capability of handling this project plan, demonstrate experience with property and renovation had a historical funding but did not report out

Shelby Voorhees: 15

Agency has a long standing history in the community running 2 housing type facilities. One was a short term (28/30 day) runaway homeless youth shelter from 1988 - 2023, and a Transitional Living Program for youth from 2004- current. Experience operating a homeless shelter and working with county/state agencies to secure housing has not been demonstrated in this proposal. Sustainability speaks to monies secure by Bank of America with no dollar amount listed. Additionally, sustainability linked to fundraising seems concerning given the operational costs of the agency. The proposer speaks of community partnerships but does not list out who those community partners are, or have letters of support for this grant project request.

Cost Criteria | Points Based | 30 Points (30%)

Tony Agliata: 12

Joanne Bergin: 15

Jamie Busch: 10

Many items on the budget proposal ($171,984) are costs that have already been incurred by the agency and staff costs for work completed prior to the issuance of this funding opportunity, which are not allowable. $172,700 of the request is for ongoing operating costs of the shelter that are also not allowable in this funding opportunity. Only the renovations ($312,654) and beds ($1,900) are allowable costs, which is less than half of the funding requested. Costs are adequately explained and appear reasonable for what they are. There isn't enough information to determine whether or not the amount of funds to be raised by donations is feasible.

Courtney Hartshorn: 12

- asking for reimbursement for work already done and prior staffing costs which is not in alignment with the solicitation.

Tracy Maksel: 12

There are several items listed, as reimbursements, that do not align with the scope of the solicitation (see technical criteria)

Cheryl Meyer: 10

Budget includes a majority of staff costs.

Kimberly Reilly: 15

cost criteria did not make sense to this reviewer, seeking reimbursement for things done or were that not applicable

Shelby Voorhees: 5

Requesting funds for things that have already happened prior to this grant proposal application. Requesting funding for direct services (staff salary) provided and is not allowable in the grant. Requesting funding for case management with JB for 3 months which is also direct services and not allowable in the grant.