

**2017 OR-505 BOS CoC / Rural Oregon Continuum of Care (ROCC)
CoC Annual Funding Competition
Internal Projects Review & Ranking Process**

Applications for both Renewal and New/Reallocated projects will undergo threshold reviews to ensure compliance with the HEARTH Act, the CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), and the local CoC Request for Proposals (RFP). Any Renewal or New/Reallocated project not meeting threshold requirements as outlined in HUD and CoC guidance will not be further reviewed and will not be considered for funding. Late applications (those submitted after the due date and time listed in the RFP) will not be accepted.

Prior to final Board approval of each year's updated CoC funding competition internal pre-application and review and ranking (R&R) processes, multiple opportunities for input provision are provided via regular monthly meetings, specifically focused email communications, HMIS Data Workgroup conversations, among others. Upon Board approvals, respective CoC R&R materials are posted to both Community Action Partnership of Oregon (CAPO; CoC's Collaborative Applicant) and Oregon Coalition on Housing and Homeless (OCHH) websites. If additional review time exists prior to HUD CoC NOFA release, additional feedback is welcomed during CoC meetings and any other appropriate opportunities. The Renewal and New/Reallocated projects Scoring Criteria documents and Scoring Maps are included as Appendix A (renewal) and Appendix B (New/Reallocated).

Review and scoring of Renewal and New/Reallocated projects is completed by CoC's HMIS Data Workgroup¹ through a process involving both individual and collaborative responsibilities. Scoring is based on data obtained from APRs, data quality report cards, LOCCS draw-down data, HUD monitoring reports, system-wide performance measures, narrative responses and other relevant, previously-disclosed HMIS data.

Submitted projects which meet initial threshold requirements of both the local RFP and HUD CoC Program NOFA are then eligible for scoring as outlined in the local RFP, New/Reallocated Project Scoring Criteria (Appendix B) and Renewal Project Scoring Criteria (Appendix A). Oregon BOS CoC Consultant/Coordinator and the HMIS Data Workgroup then utilize scoring to inform selection of conditional grantees.

The CoC's Board has discretion to include in the CoC's Consolidated Application one or more project applications for the funding amount available for New Projects. The CoC Board may also give CoC's Consultant/Coordinator discretion to negotiate with conditional grantees regarding project applications to best maximize overall score and increase opportunity for increasing the CoC's projects portfolio. After review and ranking is completed via process outlined in following paragraphs, CoC Consultant/Coordinator, in conjunction with the HMIS Data Workgroup,

¹ Strategic planning and data analyses workgroup comprised of HMIS and Executive Committee members and other interested CoC and community members.

will complete the draft Priority Listing and make recommendation to CoC Board for priority listing adoption during its next regular meeting².

Ranking Policy

HUD requires that all projects accepted by the CoC Board in the CoC's Priority Listing are placed in two tiers using pre-established priorities. Tier 1 is defined in respective HUD CoC program NOFAs as a percentage of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) approved by HUD on the final HUD-approved Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW). Tier 1 projects are traditionally protected from reductions in funding and considered conditionally approved upon submission of the CoC's full application including Priority Listing ahead of the competitive deadline. Tier 2, as described in the NOFA, is the difference between Tier 1 and the CoC's ARD plus any amount available for the permanent housing bonus. Tier 2 projects are individually reviewed by HUD and compete against other CoC Tier 2 projects for funding.

Oregon BOS CoC's HMIS Project and SSO for Coordinated Entry will be ranked 1 and 2, respectively, in Tier 1; as previously determined by the CoC Board, both projects are essential to effective operation of the CoC. Projects renewing for the first time, that were funded in the prior CoC program competition (have not been in operation for at least one year) will be ranked in the bottom of Tier 1 and ahead of first-time Renewal Projects that have been in operation for at least one year. Traditionally the CoC Planning Project is not scored or ranked in either Tier 1 or 2.

It is recommended that the CoC use the R&R process of applications in the 2017 CoC NOFA competition to accomplish the following objectives:

- To prioritize activities that are most successful in ending homelessness;
- To maximize funding available to end homelessness in the CoC;
- To direct new resources toward the most pressing needs for services within the CoC's many communities, addressing populations underserved for assistance and prioritizing assistance toward those with the greatest need (via analyses of PIT-HIC, local community data);
- To provide incentive to CoC-funded providers to monitor/improve performance to ensure continued funding.

Therefore, the following R&R policies are applicable for project ranking in the 2017 HUD CoC consolidated application/project priority listing:

Tier 1

Where multiple projects exist within a specific priority group, projects will be ranked according to renewal evaluation score.

Notes: *Projects renewing for the first time will be placed at the bottom of Tier 1 though ranked below renewal projects scored within the same priority group.*

² Or via 'special' meeting for specific purpose, should that option be needed.

New project applications submitted from an area within CoC geography not currently funded will receive an additional preference point during R&R scoring.

As previously determined by the CoC Board, the HMIS and SSO for Coordinated Entry project applications will be ranked 1 and 2, respectively, in Tier 1 as both projects are essential to effective operation of the CoC.

CoC Planning Project is not scored or ranked in either Tier 1 or Tier 2.

Priority Group 1: Core CoC Services

- HMIS
- Coordinated Entry

Priority Group 2: PH/PSH/RRH

- Renewal PH/PSH/RRH projects: *lowest-scoring projects may drop to Tier 2*
- Reallocated projects: *lowest-scoring projects may drop to Tier 2*
- New PH/PSH/RRH projects
- First-time renewal PH/PSH/RRH projects *not in operation for at least a year*

The last funded project in Tier 1 will likely ‘straddle’ Tiers 1 and 2. If so, the portion of the project in Tier 1 will be ranked with Tier 1 and the balance will be ranked as first project in Tier 2 (HUD procedures).

Tier 2

Where multiple projects exist within a priority group, projects will be ranked according to the score on the new project application or renewal score for reallocating projects:

- *Remaining New PH/PSH/RRH Projects*
- *Remaining Renewal Projects*
- *Remaining Reallocated Projects (new projects may out-rank renewal projects and/or reallocated projects of the same component type by score in Tier 2)*

Tier 2 project components will be organized to best maximize the CoC Consolidated Application’s overall score.

The final order of listing of projects in Tier 2 will be based on two factors:

- Maintenance of the priorities *previously described*
- Maximization of points for Tier 2 ranked projects to maximize the amount and probability of funding in Tier 2

Reallocation

Reallocation is the process by which the CoC shifts funds, in whole or in part, from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects within the CoC’s annual renewal demand for CoC Program funds. During the comprehensive reviews of renewal projects, the HMIS Data Workgroup will use the pre-determined/approved scoring criteria and selection priorities to

determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and address policy priorities; e.g. ending chronic homelessness, rapid re-housing of families with children, etc.

The HMIS Data Workgroup will reallocate funds to new projects whenever such reallocations would reduce homelessness or address an underserved homeless population. If the HMIS Data Workgroup identifies a renewal project (or projects) whose funding should not be renewed (or funding should be decreased), the HMIS Data Workgroup will then determine whether any new proposed projects should be awarded and will proceed with reallocation.

Re-Allocation Process

Funds reallocated as result of recapturing unspent funds, voluntary re-allocation, or involuntary reallocation will be made available for reallocation to create New Projects during the local competition/application process. In the FY2017 competition, these reallocated funds will first be applied to supplementing CoC's HMIS project, then toward augmenting renewal projects in need of additional funds, and finally to the funding pool available for New Project(s).

Unspent Funds

Projects that are not fully expended by the end of the grant term or are underspending during the grant term are subject to the reallocation process. Projects that have underspent the award by 5% or more for the prior two grant cycles may have funding reduced (reallocated) as previously described. Oregon BOS CoC will recapture 80% of the 2-year average of the unspent funds.

Voluntary Re-Allocation

Current CoC program grantees are encouraged – and always have opportunity – to voluntarily reallocate some or all project funding. Beyond funds reallocated for use in new project applications, remaining voluntarily reallocated funds will be pooled for reallocation as previously described.

Involuntary Re-Allocation

Poor performing projects, those not serving the intended population, and/or those that have unresolved HUD monitoring findings are subject to reallocation.

To minimize the risk of homeless participants being displaced because of reallocation, the HMIS Data Workgroup will approach the reallocation decision as follows:

Current Notice of Funding Available (NOFA)

Determine immediate (current NOFA) reallocation at current grant term ending through reallocation of funds to new project as follows:

- Project has unresolved on-site monitoring or financial issues as determined in the initial R&R process
- Project is extreme low performer – does not meet established CoC and/or HUD performance goals; wouldn't pass HUD threshold review
- Participants can be served by another program within the agency/local CoC so as not to create a displacement of current program participants

- Consider unspent funds and the ability to cut grants without cutting service/housing levels
- Consider history of reductions (e.g., if grant reduced one year, will not be apparent in spending the following year)
- Consider specific new PSH or RRH project(s) and specific renewal project(s) at-risk of not being funded
- Consider impact on consolidated application's score
- Consider impact on the community considering community needs

Conditional Renewal

Oregon BOS CoC establishes a renewal project application R&R score of 75% of the top scoring Renewal Project. For example, if the top score is 100, the minimum threshold will be set at 75.

Projects scoring below the threshold will be asked to develop a plan to address performance issues by the next year's competition (a Performance Improvement Plan). If problems continue, projects may have funding involuntarily reallocated in the following competition. Applicants may appeal the decision, using the CoC's written appeals process; the CoC Board will consider the appeal.

The impact of this policy is that high scoring projects may be reallocated if the above-listed considerations warrant that decision. Additionally, projects receiving a score lower than 65 could be considered for reallocation.

Appeals

The CoC grantee (sub-grantees) may appeal the HMIS Data Workgroup decision for renewal reallocation and/or new project selection as follows:

- a) The CoC grantee or new project applicant will submit a written appeal of the decision to the CoC Collaborative Applicant, Consultant/Coordinator, and the Chair of the HMIS Data Workgroup.
- b) The Chair will convene the HMIS Data Workgroup to receive and review the appeal statement.
- c) The CoC grantee or new project applicant will attend the meeting to answer questions the HMIS Data Workgroup may have in reviewing the filed appeal.
- d) The HMIS Data Workgroup determination will be recorded in minutes, and the CoC Collaborative Applicant will proceed with filing the CoC consolidated application in accordance with this policy and the determination of the HMIS Data Workgroup. Should the CoC grantee or new project applicant seek to appeal the decision to a higher authority, the CoC membership and CoC Board will hear the matter at the next monthly meeting of the CoC.

The HMIS Data Workgroup's decision to make local decisions to be implemented in "future NOFA" cycles will support the transition of homeless participants as well as reduce the need for appeal hearings during a very tight application submittal timeframe.

Code of Conduct and Recusal

The implementation of a Code of Conduct for the HMIS Data Workgroup is an essential element that supports the inclusive, collaborative, and objective goals of the HMIS Data Workgroup [CoC

Program 24 CFR 578.95]. As stated in Section 7.2.1 of the CoC's 2016 Board-Approved By-Laws:

The ROCC promotes impartiality in performing official duties and prohibits any activity representing a conflict of interest. No member of the ROCC, its Board and/or Officers should act on a matter if a reasonable person who knew the circumstances of the situation could legitimately question someone's fairness. Likewise, no member of the ROCC, its Board and/or Officers should use his or her position within the ROCC for personal gain or for the benefit of family or friends.

- *R&R workgroup meetings will be reserved for workgroup members; however, scoring results and final full CoC priority listing will be publicly available and posted prior to funding competition completion.*
- Members will provide information that is truthful and accurate
- Members will be respectful to others always
- Decision-making process will:
 - Be made by consensus at scheduled meetings
 - For non-funding decisions, all members present will have an option to participate in the voting, e.g. – selection of chair, co-chair, or other general membership decisions
 - For decisions involving funding, one vote per member organization (required attendance of at least 6 meetings in past 12 months) and one vote per community at-large member.
- *Conflict of Interest.* Members will withdraw/excuse themselves from participating in decision-making (voting) process concerning awards of grants or provisions of financial benefit to which such member or his/her organization could have a future hold or benefit, especially including any projects and/or opportunities presenting from within that member's local CoC-defined regional service area.

Threshold

In addition to the scoring criteria, all renewal projects must meet several threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the R&R process to ensure baseline requirements are met. To be scored in the 2017 competition, all renewal projects must meet the following thresholds:

- *Submission of full and complete CoC Supplemental Application (in addition to DRAFT e-snaps Project Application).*
- *Submission of all required supplemental documentation (see front page of Packet 1 - Intro).*
- Project must have full and active HMIS participation and the data quality report card score is at least an A, unless the project is a victim services agency. *Projects with data quality score below a B will be required to attend additional training via TBD and within a specific short timeframe.*
- Project must participate (or agree to participate) in Coordinated Entry, unless the project is a victim services agency.
- Project must be able to meet the HUD threshold requirements for renewal projects including that there are none of the following:
- Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has

not been agreed upon

- Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory
- History of inadequate financial management accounting practices
- Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award
- History of other major capacity issues that have significantly impacted the operation of the project and its performance
- History of reimbursing sub-recipients for eligible costs in an untimely manner, or at least quarterly
- History of serving ineligible persons, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes.

Appendix A – Renewal Scoring Criteria

2017 OR-505 BOS CoC Review and Ranking Scoring Criteria *Renewal Projects*

Project: _____ Score: _____

Reviewer: _____

Summary of Factors	2017 Points
Threshold Requirements	
1. Outcomes	45
2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity	45
3. HMIS Data Quality	15
Total	105
4. Prioritization	Up to 5 Per Project

I. Threshold Requirements

Threshold Criteria These factors are required but not scored. If the project indicates “no” for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.	2017 Points
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS unless the project is a victim-services agency serving survivors of domestic violence or a legal services agency.	N/A
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry when available in local service area(s).	N/A

II. Detail

1. Outcomes: 45 Points

Overall, has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed? Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower in a more difficult-to-serve population (such as chronically homeless and those with mental and/or addictive illnesses).

Factors:

1A: Capacity	2017 Points	
<p>Is the project serving the number of homeless <u>households</u> it was designed to serve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on four points during the year - APR dates <p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q8b (households)</i></p> <p><i>To calculate:</i></p> <p><i>Determine %, add 4 points together, divide by 4. Points will be relational, i.e. 90%=9 points, 80%=8 points, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Make notes of overutilization (beyond 105%)</i></p>	10	
<p>Is the project serving the number of homeless <u>people</u> it was designed to serve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on four points during the year - APR dates <p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q7b (persons)</i></p> <p><i>To calculate:</i></p> <p><i>Points will be relational, i.e. 90%=9 points, 80%=8 points, etc.</i></p>	10	
<p>1B: Housing Stability (PSH Only)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculated based on HMIS data • Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal • Panelists may score programs up or down two points from the scaled score below based on factors such as the population served or services provided <p><i>Question looks at units to determine which scale to use and then looks at APR # of persons to determine the measure</i></p>	2017 PSH/RRH Scale	2017 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i></p>	>95%	10
	90-94%	9
	86-89%	8

<p>For permanent housing (including RRH): For applicants with <u>5 or more</u> units/households (HH), what is the percentage of <u>actual persons</u> who accomplished the HUD national goal for clients to remain in permanent housing.</p>	80-85%	7
	70-79%	4
	65-69%	2
<p><i>NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i></p> <p>For permanent housing (including RRH): For applicants with <u>4 or fewer</u> units/households, what is the percentage of actual persons who accomplished the HUD national goal for clients to remain in permanent housing.</p> <p><i>If only one unit/HH is unoccupied, applicant will be given the '80%-85%' points. More than one unoccupied unit/HH will receive 0 while all units/HH occupied will receive '>95% points'.</i></p> <p>HUD Goal: 80%</p>	>95%	10
	90-94%	9
	86-89%	8
	80-85%	7
	70-79%	4
	65-69%	2

1B: Housing Stability (SSO Only) <i>Will be updated in future competitions to reflect performance of SSO for CE rather than the former SSO grant for services.</i>	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculated based on HMIS data • Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal • Panelists may score programs up or down two points from the scaled score below based on factors such as the population served or services provided 	>90%	10
	80-79%	9
	70-79%	8
<i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i>		

<p>For SSO: For applicants with 5 or more units/HH, did applicant meet or exceed HUD’s national goal to maximize number of clients exiting into permanent housing?</p> <p>HUD Goal: 65% for SSO</p>	65-69%	7
	60-64%	4
	<60%	0
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Qs 23a and 23b. use subtotals of permanent destination and add together to get the total number.</i></p> <p>For SSO: For applicants with 4 or fewer units/HH, did applicant meet or exceed HUD’s national goal to maximize number of clients exiting into permanent housing? If only one bed is unoccupied, applicant will be given the ‘65%-69% points.’ More than one unoccupied unit/HH will receive a score of 0 while all units/HH occupied will receive the ‘>90% points’ score.</p> <p>HUD Goal: 65% for SSO</p>	>90%	10
	80-79%	9
	70-79%	8
	65-69%	7
	60-64%	4
	<60%	0

1C: Employment Income Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 PSH Scale	2017 RRH Scale	2017 TH Scale	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q18 Q18 shows adult leavers with earned income. Look at rows 1 and 3.</i></p> <p>The percentage of adult leavers that increase employment income from entry to exit</p> <p>HUD Goal for PSH: 20%</p>	>35%	>53%	>77%	>40%	5
	20-34.9%	38-52.9%	62-76.9%	25-39.9%	4
1D: Non-Employment Income Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 PSH Scale	2017 RRH Scale	2017 TH Scale	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q18</i></p>	>61.5%	>61.5%	>61.5%	>61.5%	5

<p><i>Q18 shows adult leavers that increase income from other than employment from entry to exit. Look at rows 2 and 3.</i></p> <p>HUD Goal: 54%</p>	54-61.4%	54-61.4%	54-61.4%	54-61.4%	4
	49-53.9%	49-53.9%	49-53.9%	49-53.9%	2
	44-48.9%	44-48.9%	44-48.9%	44-48.9%	1
	<44%	<44%	<44%	<44%	0
1E: Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits					
Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 PSH Scale	2017 RRH Scale	2017 TH Scale	2017 SSO Scale	2017 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q20b and I+ sources.</i></p> <p>The percentage of adult participants that receive non-cash mainstream benefits.</p> <p><i>See Scoring Outcomes 1A-1E (Packet 2, Threshold Review, and Narratives 2 page 1).</i></p> <p>HUD Goal: 54%</p>	>90%	>61%	>71%	>82%	5
	80-89.9%	51-60.9%	61-70.9%	72-81.9%	4
	75-79.9%	46-50.9%	56-60.9%	67-71.9%	2

2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity: 45 Points

Factors:

2A: Administrative Capacity	2017 Points
<p>Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been agency response to requests for information, data, reporting, etc.? – <i>provided via attendance/email requests (Jo and Rena)</i> • Does the agency have HEARTH-required policies/procedures in place? (Agencies to complete checklist as part of materials) 	10
2B: HUD Oversight	2017 Points

<p>Does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit and reporting requirements? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any outstanding HUD findings or concerns and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD instituted any sanctions on the grant, including – but not limited to – suspending disbursements (e.g., freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues? • To what extent has the program advised the Collaborative Applicant of outstanding HUD findings or concerns. 	10
--	-----------

2C: Unspent Grant Funds Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 Scale	2017 Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the agency left project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? <i>e-LOCCS doc (2 years completed; current year for draw)</i> • Consider if the program is running at capacity and if the project receives leasing or rental assistance. <i>Reference responses in QIA.</i> 	0-3%	10
	3.1-9%	6
	9.1-15%	3
	15-100%	0
2D: Alignment with CoC Priorities	2017 Scale	2017 Points
<p>This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their CoC alignment.</p>		
<p>Does the project and agency align and support CoC priorities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance goals • CoC participation 	100%	10
	91%	8
	82%	6
	73%	4
	64%	2

<p>2E: Alignment with Housing First Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their alignment with Housing First principles. 	<p>2017 Points</p>
<p>Does the project incorporate Housing First principles into its operations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritization of most vulnerable participants Low or no entry barriers Voluntary participation in support services Other factors 	<p>5</p>

3. HMIS Data Quality: 15 Points

Factors:

3A: Interim Reviews	2017 Scale	2017 Points
<p><i>Does the agency utilize interim reviews and are annual interim reviews complete within the required +/-30 days?</i></p> <p><i>Reference ART Report 0703 – SPM Data Quality Framework Tab D.</i></p>	<i>Prior Outside</i>	5
	<i>Current Outside</i>	0

3B: Complete Data Panelists may score programs up or down one point from the scaled score below	2017 Scale	2017 Points
<p><i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q6a-c; CoC ‘acceptable’ error rate = 5% or less.</i></p> <p><i>Add three percentages listed and divide by 3 for overall percentage.</i></p> <p>NOTE:</p> <p><i>NEW Canned APR Q6e shows Data Quality Timeliness; this</i></p>	0% to 1%	10
	2% to 4%	8
	5%	6
	6% to 8%	4
	9% to 10%	2

<i>question may be added into next Renewal Scoring Criteria update.</i>	<10%	0
---	------	----------

4. Prioritization: 5 Bonus Points – CoC priority preference

Factors:

4B: Chronic Homelessness (CH)	2017 Scale	2017 Points
<i>Out of non-dedicated CH beds, how many are prioritized for CH?</i> <i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q25a and Q25b as well as Q26f under Veteran information.</i>	100%	5
	91%	4
	82%	3
	73%	2
	64%	0

Appendix B – New/Reallocated Scoring Criteria

**2017 OR-505 BOS CoC Review and Ranking
Scoring Criteria
*New/Reallocated Projects***

Project: _____ Score: _____

Reviewer: _____

Summary of Factors	2017 Points
Threshold Requirements	
1. Project’s Work Consistent with Community Needs	20
2. Project Quality, Appropriateness, and Readiness	35
3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity	35
4. HMIS Participation	10
Total	100
5. Prioritization	Up to 5 Per Project

I. Threshold Requirements

<p>Threshold Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates “no” for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding. 	2017 Points
<p>HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency.</p>	N/A
<p>Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry, when it is available for the project type.</p>	N/A
<p>Eligible Applicant: Applicants and sub-recipients (if any) are eligible to receive CoC funding, including: non-profit organizations, States, local governments, and instrumentalities of state and local governments.</p>	N/A

<p>Eligible New Project Type: If the project is a new project in 2017, it is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent supportive housing, serving only chronically homeless individuals and families. • Rapid rehousing, serving individuals, families, or unaccompanied youth who come directly from streets, shelters, or are fleeing domestic violence or otherwise meet the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness. 	<p>N/A</p>
---	------------

II. Detail

1. Project’s Work Consistent with Community Needs: 20 Points

Factors:

1A: Renewable Activities	2017 Points
Extent to which the project utilizes grant funds for renewable activities (e.g., leasing rental subsidies, and housing operations) as opposed to non-renewable funds (e.g., acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation).	10

1B: Unmet Need	2017 Points
Extent to which the project addresses an unmet need by utilizing CoC/regional priorities as determined by data analyses and local input. <i>Top 5 identified gaps/needs as determined by local community; CAAs use CSBG '17-'19 MGA.</i>	10

2. Project Quality, Appropriateness, Readiness: 35 Points

Consider overall design of the project in light of its outcome objectives and the CoC’s goal that permanent housing programs for homeless people result in stable housing and increased income (through benefits or employment).

2A: Population Served	2017 Points
Population to be served is well-defined and eligible and will prioritize serving project participants with the highest need.	5

2B: Program Design	2017 Points
<p>Program design includes provision of comprehensive/intensive case management and appropriate supportive services of the appropriate type, scale, and location to meet the needs of program participants (as well as transportation if necessary), using a Housing First model. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project staffed appropriately to provide the services? • Is the staff trained to meet the needs of the target population? • Does the program include involvement of clients in designing and operating the program? • Is the program design intentionally inclusive of and accessible to all eligible clients? • Are links to other services described? 	10
2C: Program Outcomes	2017 Points
<p>Program outcomes are realistic but sufficiently challenging given project scale. Outcomes are measurable and appropriate to the population being served. Minimal project outcomes should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of formerly homeless individuals who remain housed in PH at the end of the operating year or exited to another PH is at least 90%. • Percentage of leavers that increase employment income from entry to exit is at least 20% for PSH and 38% for RRH. • Percentage of leavers that increase non-employment income from entry to exit is at least 54%. • The percent of adult leavers and stayers in all CoC-funded projects that have non-cash mainstream benefits is at least 80% for PSH and 51% for RRH. 	5
2D: Housing	2017 Points

Housing where participants will reside is fully described and appropriate to the program design proposed. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project staffed appropriately to operate the housing? • Is the staff trained to meet the needs of the population to be served? • Will the program be physically accessible to persons with disabilities? 	5
2E: Policies and Procedures	2017 Points
Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the agency have HEARTH-required policies/procedures in place? (Agencies to complete checklist as part of materials) 	5
2F: Project Readiness	2017 Points
The project will be ready to start by HUD’s statutory deadlines. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement or relocation, environmental or zoning issues anticipated. 	5

3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity: 35 Points

3A: Past Performance	2017 Points
-----------------------------	--------------------

<p>Have the agencies/has the agency submitting this application demonstrated – through past performance – the ability to successfully carry out the proposed work and have they/has it successfully served homeless people as a group? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experience of the agency in handling a similar project (e.g., if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with relocation?). • If the agency has other CoC programs, has the agency left CoC project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? Consider if the program is running at capacity and if the program receives leasing or rental assistance funding. 	<p>15</p>
<p>3B: Agency Experience</p>	<p>2017 Points</p>
<p>Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements? Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have they/has it successfully handled federal or other major grants of similar size without difficulty or problems in the past 5 years? • Any outstanding HUD findings or concerns and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD instituted any sanctions on agency CoC grants, including– but not limited to – suspending disbursements (e.g., freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de- obligating grant funds due to performance issues? • To what extent has the program advised the Collaborative Applicant of outstanding HUD findings or concerns? 	<p>10</p>
<p>3C: Alignment with CoC Priorities This will be scored on the overall application, but programs can submit an essay answer demonstrating their CoC alignment.</p>	<p>2017 Points</p>
<p>Does the project and agency align and support CoC priorities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance goals • CoC participation 	<p>10</p>

4. HMIS Participation: 10 Points

- Does the application indicate clearly that the agency intends to participate in HMIS in the event the project is funded?
- If the agency has other programs, do they demonstrate HMIS participation?
Consider:
 - Percentage of null/missing, “don’t know,” or “refused” data
 - The percentage of clients with known income and benefits

5. Prioritization: 5 Bonus Points

Factors:

5: Chronic Homelessness (CH)	2017 Scale	2017 Points
<i>Out of non-dedicated CH beds, how many are prioritized for CH?</i> <i>Reference: NEW Canned APR Q25a and Q25b as well as Q26f under Veteran information.</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>91%</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>82%</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>73%</i>	<i>2</i>
	<i>64%</i>	<i>0</i>