# CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD

**SEPTMBER 18, 2019 | 3:00 – 5:00PM**

**UNITED WAY OF WASHTENAW COUNTY | 2305 PLATT RD, ANN ARBOR 48104**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>1. Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:01pm</td>
<td>2. Welcome/Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03pm</td>
<td>3. Public Comment <em>(limited 2 minutes per person)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05pm</td>
<td>4. Approval of Agenda <em>(ACTION)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:06pm</td>
<td>5. Approval of Minutes <em>(ACTION)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:08pm</td>
<td>6. Welcoming Ruth Kraut to the CoC Board – Jimena Loveluck, Washtenaw County Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:20pm</td>
<td>8. ESG Funding Update – Anna O’Toole, Office of Community and Economic Development <em>(OCED)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3:30pm | 9. CoC Funding Competition Update – Anna O’Toole, OCED  
   a. CoC Project Reallocation Policy *(ACTION)*  
   b. Funding Recommendations *(ACTION)* |
| 3:50pm | 10. CoC Systems Collaboration & Efforts  
   a. Veteran Homelessness & USICH Update – Amanda Carlisle, WHA  
   b. Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA) Update – Amanda Carlisle, WHA  
   c. SafeHouse Transitional Housing Grant – Barbara Niess-May and Kim Montgomery, SafeHouse Center  
   d. Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC) Recuperative Care Program – Dan Kelly, SAWC  
   e. SIM/CHIR Project Update – Patrick Kelly, CHRT and Amanda Carlisle, WHA |
| 4:35pm | 11. OCED Updates  
   a. Community Mental Health Millage – Morghan Williams, OCED  
   b. MSHDA Housing Agents Update – Anna O’Toole, OCED  
   c. Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project – Anna O’Toole, OCED  
   d. 9/26 All-Staff Training and All-Membership Meeting – Anna O’Toole, OCED |
| 4:50pm | 12. Board Member Updates/Issues |
| 4:55pm | 13. Public Comment *(limited 2 minutes per person)* |
| 5:00pm | 14. Adjournment |
CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) BOARD
JULY 17, 2019 | 3:00 – 5:00PM
SUPERIOR ROOM, LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER | 4135 WASHTENAW AVE. ANN ARBOR

**Members Present:** Dan Kelly, Jan Little, Jean Carlberg, Jim Mogensen, Jillian Rosen, Jennifer Hall, Zachary Fosler, Shawn Dowling, John Hieftje, Tony DeGiusti, Amanda Carlisle, Jimena Loveluck, Teresa Gillotti, Heather Linky, Alice Seipel, Renee Smith, Nicole Adelman, Eric Hendershot, Pam Cornell-Allen

**Members not in Attendance:** Linda Rama, Pam Smith, Greg Dill, Jason Forsberg, Jerry Clayton, Susan Wyman, Rhonda Weathers, Shamar Herron

**Staff & Presenters:** Morghan Williams-Boydston (OCED), Anna O’Toole (OCED), Lindsey Crandle (OCED), Mirada Jenkins (OCED)

**Public:** Amanda Crosby (Child Care Network), Annette Sobocinski (Child Care Network)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>1. Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Hieftje called the meeting to order at 3:08pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:01pm</td>
<td>2. Welcome/Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03pm</td>
<td>3. Public Comment <em>(limited 2 minutes per person)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No comment given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05pm</td>
<td>4. Approval of Agenda <em>(ACTION)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Hall proposed to add an agenda action item regarding HUD NED voucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Carlisle moved to approve the amended agenda. J. Little seconded. There</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was no further discussion and the motion carried with no opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:06pm</td>
<td>5. Approval of Minutes <em>(ACTION)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Little moved to approve the minutes. A. Carlisle seconded. There was no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>further discussion and the motion carried with no opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:08pm</td>
<td>6. Approval of Executive Committee Membership <em>(ACTION)</em> – Morghan Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boydston, OCED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Executive Committee members except Dan Kelly are up for re-election. Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggest that all existing members be re-appointed at this time and all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positions set to a re-election period in January. Current Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee members are typically the chairs of each CoC Board Committee, in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>addition to the two Board Co-Chairs and a Secretary. These are typically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elected at different times, so the suggestion is to align all re-election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>times to the same meeting. This would also allow time before January to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discuss other members’ appointment to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Rosen moved to approve the temporary re-appointment of all Executive Committee members until January. J. Loveluck seconded. The motion carried without opposition.

3:15pm

7. Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and CoC Funding Updates
   a. Emergency Solutions Grant Funding – Anna O’Toole, OCED
      i. Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) ESG Updates
         HUD ESG allocation is $178,973 which is an increase of over $12,000. Yesterday we received our MSHDA allocation of $451,625, an increase of over $18,000 from last year. This will be a total increase of $31,110 since last year. We also received the pay-for-performance bonus this year from MSHDA. This funding goes largely towards HAWC for the Coordinated Entry process.
      ii. Delegate Authority to Executive Committee (ACTION)
         The MSHDA ESG application is due July 24. Since the FRT will finalize their decision next week, staff asks that the CoC Board delegates authority to the Executive Committee to review the final recommendations from the FRT prior to application submission.
         J. Little moved to delegate this authority to the Executive Committee. J. Mogensen seconded. The motion carried without opposition.
   b. HUD CoC Notice of Funding Availability Update – Anna O’Toole, OCED
      i. Presentation and Selection of HUD CoC Bonus Project Strategy (ACTION)
         HUD CoC NOFA was released on July 3 with a deadline of September 30. We are able to apply for just over $5.8 million for renewal projects, $290,000 for bonus projects, $145,000 for Domestic violence bonus, and a CoC planning grant for approximately $175,000. The FRT will continue to meet over the next few months to review and finalize recommendations.
         We have not been granted a bonus project since 2015, so this is an attempt to be more strategic in our application. Historically our approach has been to put all potential bonus project funding towards one bonus project application. We believe that we will have a higher chance of getting a bonus project approved if we request a lower amount of funding for a project based on several calculations and projections completed by our staff. (see Board Packet pg. 11 for more details on strategies)
         Option A involves submitting a “dummy project” that we know will not qualify for funding. This involves a lot of work on the part of the submitting agency, but having two bonus projects would increase the likelihood that the first bonus project is selected by HUD for funding. The FRT would ultimately determine which project would be selected as option A and B for submission.
Option B would put forward only one bonus project at an amount that we predict would increase its likelihood of getting funded, and would not require the submission of a second project. Option C is to continue our strategy from previous years, which is to apply for one project at the full bonus funding amount.

The likelihood of our score increasing is slight given that we scored .25 points below the highest score during last year’s competition. Submitting bonus projects with smaller amounts increases our chances of getting some funding rather than no funding at all.

Z. Fosler moved to approve option A as the strategy this year. J. Little seconded. The motion carried with no opposition.

ii. Approval of HUD CoC Ranking Policies (ACTION)
(see page 12 of the Board Packet for details) The Washtenaw Housing Alliance Operations Committee recommends that we adjust how Bonus Projects are ranked. Last year we scored PSH for families above individuals, but the Operations Committee recommends that this year we rank Bonus Projects the same way we rank renewal projects to support existing housing stock.

J. Hall moved to approve scoring bonus projects in the same manner as renewal projects. J. Rosen seconded. The motion carried with no opposition.

3:55pm

8. CoC Systems Collaboration & Efforts
   a. Built for Zero Update – Morghan Williams Boydston, OCED; presented by Amanda Carlisle, WHA
   (see Board Packet for details on benchmarks) We are getting closer and closer to meeting the goal of eliminating Veteran homelessness (reaching functional zero). As of yesterday, the Veteran By-Name list was at 27 individuals, and the chronic homelessness list is at about 35. USICH was contacted yesterday to begin the process to get the declaration of ending Veteran Homelessness.

   b. Youth Homelessness Efforts – Pam Cornell-Allen, Ozone House
   We are still waiting for the results from the YHDP application and will report out once information is received from HUD. Ozone continues to work with SAWC and HAWC on implementing the TAY-SPDAT for Transition Aged Youth. This is a way to get our young people access to housing resources more quickly. Our exact hours at these locations are now on our website.

   The Youth Homelessness Committee has met twice. The sub-committee last met in mid-June with a focus on finalizing values and norms, as well as logistics as to what youth involvement means. This has slowed down over the summer, but we expect this to pick back up in the Fall.
The Family Unification Vouchers (FUP) are available to Former Foster Care youth and families that need housing for reunification. There are 32 households identified for those vouchers and either housed or working on being housed. MDHHS confirms eligibility for this voucher. We have had conversations on getting youth who have been involved in foster care since age 16 or older referred for this voucher.

c. Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC) Update – Dan Kelly, SAWC
We will be piloting the recuperative care program starting August 1. There will be more information shared later on this partnership with the local hospitals and other community health agencies. It will open 6 beds on the 2nd floor on the shelter for individuals discharged from St. Joseph’s and Michigan Medicine with no housing. These individuals will then be enrolled in the regular SAWC services as well as additional medical services for a treatment plan coordinated by Packard Health.

d. Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA) Update – Amanda Carlisle, WHA
(see handout in Board Packet) Highlights from the packet include the Sister Yvonne Gellise Fund offers additional PSH services for individuals with the greatest need. This fund has raised about $4 million so far with $1 million still needed.

The Harm Reduction in Policy & Practice Conference is coming up on November 19. Session topics including engagement people who use drugs, police collaboration with social work, and inclusive zoning models. Traditionally this is attended social workers and health practitioners, but would like to recruit more individuals from other fields.

e. Ann Arbor Affordable Housing Fund – Mirada Jenkins, OCED
(see Board Packet for details and information on where to find the application) The Affordable Housing Fund’s goal is to address housing affordability for households below 60% of the AMI. For every dollar of this fund it typically leverages $25 of other resources, so the fund monies are intended for leveraging purposes. Any proposals received by August 23 will be presented at the next meeting.

9. OCED Updates
a. MSHDA Housing Update – Anna O’Toole, OCED
   i. Approval of CoC Letters to MSHDA (ACTION)
   The two HCV housing agents for Washtenaw County are CMA and RPI. The CoC wrote a letter to MSHDA in early 2019 regarding some CMA practices that were not in the best interest of our clients, and these issues have continued, sometimes resulting in our clients losing their vouchers. Due to these ongoing issues, staff is requesting that the CoC Board write a letter to just MSHDA requesting a new HCV housing agent to replace CMA. CMA has previously been asked not to service our system due to performance issues; last time this resulted in J. Sells taking over those vouchers, but she has since retired.
D. Kelly suggested an option of addressing the ongoing issue with MSHDA and ask their suggestion for resolving the situation. Making it clear to MSHDA through a meeting that we cannot accept the behavior that CMA has been exhibiting for the last 7 months, particularly since individuals are losing their vouchers as a result of CMA’s poor management. It is in the opinion of staff that having a meeting or conversation with MSHDA would only delay action and clients would continue to feel the impact in the meantime.

RPI has also presented some issues for clients regarding unprofessionalism as well as poor communication and an inaccessible location for Washtenaw residents. Staff is requesting that the CoC write a letter to both MSHDA and RPI to ensure the process improves in the future.

J. Hieftje suggested changing the Action Item to delegate authority over this issue to the Executive Committee to ensure that if action is required before the next CoC Board meeting, the EC may support staff in this action.

D. Kelly moved to delegate authority for action on this issue to the Executive Committee. J. Carlberg seconded. The motion carried with no opposition.

b. Youth Emergency Shelter Regulations – Lindsey Crandle, OCED
   i. Approval of CoC Letter to Governor Whitmer (ACTION)
      While compiling the Youth Homelessness & Housing Instability Report, it was brought to staff’s attention that according to current licensing requirements, youth under the age of 18 are required to obtain parent permission prior to receiving shelter services at Ozone House. This appears to be due to an oversight in existing licensing procedures that lump Youth Homeless Shelters in with Group Child Care Homes for licensing purposes. As part of a larger advocacy project, Lindsey is requesting that the CoC Board sign a letter to Governor Whitmer requesting action to remove this barrier.

      J. Hall indicated that she would be ok with the CoC Executive Committee signing the letter after it is signed off by the affected agencies.

      J. Hall moved to delegate authority of reviewing and signing this letter to the Executive Committee. A. Carlisle seconded. The motion carried with no opposition.

c. Michigan’s Statewide Plan to End Homelessness – Anna O’Toole, OCED
   MSHDA will be revising its plan to end homelessness and will be meeting with various community members to gain information on barriers to ending homelessness.
d. Amended Action Item from Ann Arbor Housing Commission NED voucher application – J. Hall

(see Board Packet handout for more information) HUD issued another NOFA for mainstream NED vouchers. We asked for 250 vouchers and we received 45. Of the 45, 35 are leased up; 80 households have been pulled from the wait list total and are in various stages (many who are pulled do not end up qualifying for various reasons). There is still a large need in the community that is not being met and more vouchers are needed.

In our program we have 1300 total vouchers, but typically only lease up 900 because that is the funding amount AAHC receives from HUD. The voucher amount is based on a rent program of $625 per month, but on average households are using $821 per month. This means that AAHC has to pull additional funds from the general HCV fund for the special HCV funds. This difference also means that AAHC gets a hit on funding prioritization.

The next funding application is due on September 5, prior to the next CoC Board meeting. AAHC will likely be approved for 50 vouchers but will be requesting more than that amount. Once approved, AAHC cannot prioritize any partnerships within the community and must open it to the public. Client application process will follow a similar structure as previous openings.

AAHC is requesting the CoC Board to compose (update last letter using current dates) and sign a letter for the current application round.

Z. Fosler moved to approve the signing of the updated letter. R. Smith seconded. The motion carried with no opposition.

4:45pm 10. Board Member Updates/Issues

T. Gillioti reported that OCED is working with CMH and WHA for use of the millage funds with the Millage Advisory Committee (MAC). A total of $300,000 - $400,000 dollars is for Crisis funding, PSH, and Youth Services. If this is approved by MAC, this will be released in September with about a 30-day turnaround for grant applications. This would go through a review (and a review recruiting process) to make funding recommendations back to MAC and the CMH board. There should be a finalized draft on this process done shortly, which will be passed along to CoC Board Members.

The Ann Arbor City Council has asked to review zoning changes and density for downtown area. They are recommending some changes that would include affordability housing requirement for new construction. If people want to increase density, they would need to create more affordable housing units.

J. Mogensen reported that the Religious Action for Affordable Housing is having its meeting on September 26 for its 20th Anniversary Party. As a follow-up to the last announcement about the AATA report and fare study: they are talking about changing policies so that only social service agencies are allowed to buy tokens. The potential changes state that the AATA will do the ADA requirements then have premium services outside of the ADA. It is important for people to recognize these changes are happening because they will impact our clients. For example, they
may switch to eliminating monthly passes and switch to buying a ticket for a 2-hour period of time. Additionally, there are some questions about how people would qualify for the half-fare tokens.

J. Loveluck thanked A. O'Toole and A. Carlisle who helped to submit comments for the HUD proposal regarding prohibiting mixed-status families from receiving services. This letter was successfully submitted.

J. Hieftje noted that during a trip to San Francisco, CA that homelessness was in the press every day and is a top issue there. One agency has tracked changes to affordable housing since the new tax bill was passed, and they believe they have missed out on 15,000 units.

J. Hall reported that City Council has directed staff to do a review of publicly-owned properties to see their viability for affordable housing. Some of those properties may be used as a mixture between housing and other purposes. If anyone is thinking about using or use space for their services, let them know to include in the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4:55pm</th>
<th>11. Public Comment <em>(limited 2 minutes per person)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No public comment given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>12. Adjournment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Hieftje adjourned the meeting at 4:48pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avalon Housing Dexter Development Letter of Support

Avalon Housing, Inc. is seeking funding to construct approximately twenty-four units, a community center, and food pantry on a two-acre parcel at Hilltop View Apartments, 7651 Dan Hoey in Dexter. Avalon plans to submit an application for Low Income Housing Tax Credits in October 2019 and is seeking an updated Letter of Support from the CoC that reflects changes in the site's plan since March 2019, when Hilltop View Apartments previously came before the CoC.

Current Action Needed:
Approval of a signed letter of support of the October 2019 tax credit application.

Motion:
The CoC Board supports the signing of a letter in support of Avalon’s tax credit application for 7651 Dan Hoey Way.

CoC Project Reallocation Policy

In the 2019 Continuum of Care (CoC) funding competition, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is awarding points to communities that have a written, CoC-approved project reallocation strategy. Reallocation is the process by which funding for an existing, under-performing renewal project is transferred to create a new project. Reallocation must be done without increasing the overall renewal funding amount for which the CoC is eligible to apply; full or partial reallocation is possible.

Current Action Needed:
Adoption of the Washtenaw County CoC Project Reallocation Policy.

Motion:
The CoC Board approves the Washtenaw County CoC Project Reallocation Policy.

2019 CoC Funding Recommendations

The 2019 CoC Competition Notification of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released in July. HUD requires that the local CoC Board ensure the review, selection, and ranking of each renewal and new project, including those created through reallocation, and any bonus projects. This process is completed by the Funding Review Team (FRT), a standing subcommittee of the CoC. The attached 2019 CoC funding report outlines the process undertaken to review, score, and rank renewal projects, as well as to select new (reallocation and/or bonus) project applications. This process lead to the funding recommendations submitted to the CoC Board for approval by the FRT as explained in the report.

As in past years, HUD requires the renewal projects to be ranked in two tiers. This year’s NOFA mandated the first tier to include 94 percent of Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), and the second tier to include the remaining 6 percent of renewal funding plus any funds available for permanent housing bonus projects. In addition to renewing currently funded projects, this year’s NOFA provided an opportunity for all communities to submit one or more ‘Bonus’ project applications. The Washtenaw County CoC is eligible to apply for up to $290,312 in Bonus project funding. Along with regular bonus, CoCs are also able to apply for a bonus project to specifically serve domestic violence survivors (DV Bonus). Washtenaw County CoC is eligible to apply for up to $154,579 in DV Bonus funding. Further, the NOFA allowed CoCs to apply for a non-competitive Planning Grant in the amount of 3 percent of the ARD ($174,187 for Washtenaw County). This non-competitive grant funds activities related to coordinating the CoC and is not ranked within the tiered system.

All previously CoC-funded projects were recommended for renewal by the FRT; no reallocation was determined necessary. Two bonus project applications and one DV bonus application were submitted for review by the FRT. The
attached funding report outlines the submitted bonus projects and which projects were selected to move forward and at what amount. The report also displays the project rankings per the 2019 Ranking Policies.

Current Action Needed:
Approval of the 2019 HUD CoC Funding Competition Report and its contents, including the Funding Review Team’s funding recommendations and project rankings, as well as affirming that CoC staff will complete the Consolidated Application and Ranking Priorities and publically post these by September 27, 2019.

Motion:
The CoC Board:

1. Approves the 2019 CoC Funding Competition report and its contents;
2. Approves the Funding Review Team’s funding recommendations & project rankings as listed in the report;
3. And affirms CoC staff will complete the Consolidated Application and Ranking Priorities and publically post these by September 27, 2019.
September 18, 2019

MSHDA
Low Income Housing Tax Credit Division
Permanent Supportive Housing Set Aside
735 E. Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48912

Dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to be able to write to you in support of the application for Tax Credits submitted by Avalon Housing for the new Hilltop View Apartments development at 7651 Dan Hoey located in Dexter. This project is consistent with our community’s Built for Zero goals and helps to meet the needs identified through our community’s HMIS data.

As a leader in developing permanent supportive housing, Avalon’s proposal for these units for households who are homeless helps keep us moving toward our Blueprint goal of 500 additional supportive housing units in our community. Avalon’s long-term plan to build twenty-four (24) new units of affordable housing at this site, including 15 units of permanent supportive housing, enables us to expand our dedicated housing stock.

Avalon provided us with a concept letter in March, 2019 outlining key components of their plan for supportive housing at this site. They attended our March 20, 2019 Continuum of Care (CoC) Board meeting. The concept letter and the presentation before our CoC Board conveyed many aspects of the development. Avalon returned to the CoC Board meeting September 18, 2019 to provide an update on their development of Hilltop View.

We understand that Hilltop View will have twenty-four (24) total affordable units, including six (6) one-bedroom units, ten (10) two-bedroom units, and eight (8) three-bedroom units.

Target residents of this project will be households at 50% or 60% of area median income. The fifteen (15) supportive housing units will be for with households at or below 30% of AMI. All fifteen (15) of these supportive housing units will also be further targeted to the most vulnerable supportive housing populations, including households who are chronically homeless, households who are referred through a Data Match system, and households who are within the top 10 percent of the CoC’s prioritized for housing. Referrals for the supportive housing units will come directly from the County’s central wait list, Housing Access of Washtenaw County (HAWC). The supportive housing units are anticipated to include six (6) one-bedroom units, five (5) two-bedroom units, and four (4) three-bedroom units.

As the Lead Agency for services, Avalon will coordinate with HAWC to insure that referrals to this project will be aligned with eligibility criteria for homelessness and special needs.

We understand that Avalon is coordinating with the VA for VASH vouchers on all six (6) one-bedroom units and that Avalon will be requesting project based vouchers from MSHDA for the nine (9) remaining supportive housing units. With vouchers, households will not pay more than 30% of their income for rent.

Support Services will focus on helping tenants achieve housing stability. Eviction prevention efforts for high-risk tenants are prioritized and coordinated with property managers. There will be an on-site Community Center Community and food pantry. The Development team includes Avalon Housing, as Owner (through a 100% controlled General Partner), Sponsor, Developer and Lead Agency. Avalon Housing will also be providing direct property management services. Faith in Action will be providing on-site support services.
We recognize that the plan for Hilltop View Apartments incorporates strong social supports to stabilize both the tenants and the community. The CoC Board voted to endorse and support this plan.

Please give this application the greatest care as you consider applications. If we can provide any other specific information in support of this application, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for all you do.

Sincerely,

Chair, Washtenaw County Continuum of Care Board
2019 ESG Funding Recommendations

Funding Allocations
Washtenaw County receives Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funding from HUD and MSHDA for the staffing of coordinated entry roles, as well as prevention and rapid re-housing (RRH) direct assistance. The 2019-20 ESG allocations are as follows:

- **HUD ESG**: $178,973 (an increase of $12,714 from 2018 funding)
- **MSDHA ESG**: $451,625 (an increase of $18,396 from 2018 funding)
- **Total ESG**: **$630,598**

(Note: OCED received an increase of $1,917 in HUD ESG Admin and an increase of $3,148 in MSHDA ESG Admin, in part to make up for the decrease absorbed last year. The Funding Review Team (FRT) considered how to allocate the remaining $10,797 in HUD ESG and $15,248 in MSHDA ESG.)

FRT Funding Considerations
In order to make ESG funding recommendations for 2019, the FRT discussed the following:

1. The Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC) and Housing Access for Washtenaw County (HAWC) submitted a joint proposal to the FRT to fund two part-time positions during the winter shelter season. Under this proposal, Warming Center Intake Specialists work at the Delonis Center and conduct HAWC referral screenings and SAWC assessments for individuals accessing winter shelter. The total request to fund these two positions was $15,192.
   
   SAWC indicated an increase in their share of ESG funding would be allocated to this position.

2. The Salvation Army asked the FRT to consider adjusting their staffing budget line item by $2,000 to implement salary increases to make their positions more competitive and $5,568 to support staff transportation costs.
   
   The Salvation Army indicated an increase in their share of ESG funding would be allocated to homeless prevention direct assistance.

3. SafeHouse is a domestic violence (DV) shelter that receives ESG funding to conduct DV survivor assessments. SafeHouse indicated an increase in their share of ESG funding would support hiring of additional staff to serve families in shelter.

4. Ozone House, our community’s youth provider, indicated an increase in their share of ESG funding would support hiring of an additional case manager.

Final ESG Funding Decisions (approved by Executive Committee on 7/22/19)
With all of these considerations taken into account, the Executive Committee approved the following (see table on the next page for funding breakdown):

- Approve Salvation Army’s request to transfer $5,598 to cover staff transportation costs and $2,000 to increase staff salaries
- Allocate $10,797 in HUD ESG funding to SAWC to support the hiring of two part-time Winter Intake Specialists
- Allocate $15,248 in MSHDA ESG funding to Salvation Army for homeless prevention direct assistance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY &amp; ROLE</th>
<th>2019 RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army (Housing Access for Washtenaw County)- Intakes,</td>
<td>$497,021 (an increase of $15,248)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family literally homelessness assessments, prevention assessments, direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance administration, shelter and permanent housing referrals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone House- Intakes and assessments for unaccompanied youth</td>
<td>$29,204 (level funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SafeHouse- Intake and assessments for survivors of domestic violence</td>
<td>$26,394 (level funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Association of Washtenaw County- Single adult literally homeless</td>
<td>$52,797 (an increase of $10,797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Community &amp; Economic Development- Grant administration; CoC lead</td>
<td>$25,182 (an increase of $5,065 from last year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$630,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINUUM OF CARE PROJECT REALLOCATION POLICY

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC)

Purpose:
The policy establishes the circumstances that would lead to the reallocation of a CoC-funded project. Per the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), reallocation allows a CoC to shift funds from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects. Funds can be shifted in whole or in part and must be done without decreasing the CoC’s renewal funding amount.

Policy:
The Funding Review Team (FRT) uses project and agency performance data contained in the CoC-approved rubric, along with community need data and narrative responses, to make reallocation determinations. At the agency level, applicants are evaluated based on a variety of threshold criteria assessing their fiscal management, active participation in the CoC and its committees, and attendance at the Community Housing Prioritization meetings. In addition, agencies’ projects are evaluated based on project outcomes, compliance with federal and local requirements, and data quality standards. If a threshold is unmet, agencies may submit an explanatory waiver request to the FRT. After thorough consideration, the FRT may prescribe a corrective action plan to improve agency/project performance.

Reallocation will be recommended by the FRT if an agency: 1) does not meet the threshold criteria AND a waiver is not granted of the threshold criteria; OR 2) does not meet the requirements of a corrective action plan AND if a waiver has not been granted for unmet requirements; OR 3) if the project is no longer needed, as determined by community need.

Full or partial reallocation is possible. The FRT will make reallocation recommendations as necessary to the CoC Board. The CoC Board will make the final decision on any recommended reallocations.

Expiration:
This policy, as written, expires March 1, 2020.

---

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care

2019 Funding Competition Process:
Ranking, Project Priority Listing, & New Project Applications

This report and its contents were approved by the CoC Board on September 18, 2019.
Introduction & Funding Competition Details
The Federal Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act reauthorized the 1987 McKinney-Vento Act with a renewed emphasis on performance and establishing goals and outcomes to end homelessness. To this end, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Continuum of Care (CoC) program provides funding to support the efforts of local public and private non-profit agencies providing services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

The 2019 CoC funding competition Notification of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released on July 3, 2019. The funding competition includes the submission of a collaborative application, as well as submissions of renewal and new project applications. This year’s NOFA provided the following new project opportunities:

- **Bonus**: CoCs can submit one or more bonus project applications for up to 5 percent of their Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) ($290,312 for Washtenaw County). Bonus applications can be for new projects or projects that expand an existing project. The following types of projects are allowable:
  1. **New Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)** that is 100 percent dedicated to chronic homeless individuals and families OR meets the requirements of DedicatedPLUS (see Section III.C.2.g of NOFA)
  2. **New Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)** for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth
  3. **New Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid-Rehousing (Joint TH and PH-RRH)** combining two existing program components to better serve homeless individuals and families
  4. **New Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS)** for HMIS lead agencies
  5. **New Supportive Services Only (SSO)** to develop or operate a centralized or coordinated assessment system

- **DV Bonus**: CoCs could submit one or more applications for a Domestic Violence (DV) bonus for up to 10 percent of its Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN) ($154,579 for Washtenaw County). The DV Bonus would be funded through a $50 million appropriation and would provide housing and services to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking within the following types of allowable projects:
  1. **RRH projects**
  2. **Joint TH and RRH projects**
  3. **SSO projects** for coordinated entry to implement policies, procedures, and practices that equip the CoC’s coordinated entry to better meet the needs of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking

- **Reallocation**: CoCs can shift funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects without decreasing the CoC’s ARD. The allowable project types are the same as the Bonus projects listed above.

Aside from renewals, new projects created through reallocation, and bonus projects, this year’s NOFA allowed CoCs to apply for a non-competitive Planning Grant in the amount of 3 percent of the ARD ($174,187 for Washtenaw County). This non-competitive grant funds activities related to coordinating the CoC and is not ranked within the tiered system outlined in the next section.

The 2019 NOFA also included the following components:
• **Transition grants**: Through the reallocation process, eligible renewal project applicants can transition an existing project component (e.g. RRH) to another component type. For example, a Transitional Housing project could be transitioned into a RRH project.

• **Consolidation**: Eligible renewal applicants will have the ability to consolidate two or more eligible renewal projects into one project application.

For all renewal project and new project applications, HUD requires that the local CoC Board ensure the review, selection, and ranking of each project. This process is completed each year by the Funding Review Team (FRT), a standing subcommittee of the CoC charged with making funding recommendations. The CoC Board then approves final funding recommendations and ranking.

### 2019 Funding Process and Tier Details

Washtenaw County receives approximately $5.8 million in CoC funding annually and conducts a review of all CoC funded applicants every year prior to approving the submission of the CoC community & project applications. Each year, the Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED)—in its role as the CoC Collaborative Applicant—staffs the Funding Review Team (FRT) in the review and ranking process associated with the annual CoC funding competition. This year, FRT members include:

- Amanda Carlisle - Executive Director, Washtenaw Housing Alliance (WHA); CoC Board member
- Amanda Sternberg - Performance Management Analyst, Homeless Action Network of Detroit
- Jean Carlberg - Washtenaw Housing Alliance Board member; CoC Board member
- Pam Smith - Executive Director, United Way; CoC Board member
- Jimena Loveluck - Health Officer; Washtenaw County Health Department

As in past years, HUD requires renewal projects to be ranked in two tiers with the purpose of CoCs indicating which projects are prioritized for funding. This year’s NOFA mandated the first tier to include 94 percent of the ARD ($5,457,866 in Washtenaw County), and the second tier to include the remaining 6 percent of renewal funding plus any funds available for bonus projects.

The following describes how HUD awards funding within the two tiers and how scoring from the Collaborative Application is used:

- **CoCs’ Collaborative Applications** will receive a score based on a 200-point scale;
- HUD will fund all projects in Tier 1 beginning with highest scoring CoC to lowest scoring;
- HUD will select projects in Tier 2, in order of point value, until there are no more funds available;
- **Tier 2** will be based on CoC score and project scores. HUD will award a point value to each new and renewal project in Tier 2 using a 100-point scale:
  - CoC Score (up to 50 points directly proportional to the score of the CoC Application)
  - CoC Project Ranking (up to 40 points based on their ranking within Tier 2 according to HUD’s formula)
  - Low Barriers to Entry (up to 10 points for how the project demonstrates that it is low barrier and prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing)
- **DV Bonus projects** will be awarded a point value using a 100-point scale:
  - CoC score (up to 25 points directly proportional to the score of the CoC Application)
  - Need for new project (up to 25 points)
  - Quality of Project Applicant (up to 50 points)
- If a project straddles two tiers, HUD will fund the projects separately, first funding the Tier 1 amount and then funding the Tier 2 portion — if it qualifies based on the Tier 2 score defined above. The award announcement of a project that straddles two tiers may not be communicated until the Tier 2 projects are announced.
New and renewal projects are ranked using the CoC Board approved 2019 Ranking Policy (Attachment A).

**CoC Renewal Scoring and Ranking Process**

A total of 16 projects were up for renewal during this funding competition. Using a standard scoring rubric (Attachment B) to review project outcomes, data quality, and HUD compliance based on HUD audits and expenditure of funds, the FRT was able to score renewal projects and rank them based on scores (see Attachment C for score breakdown).

All renewal projects were recommended for funding by the FRT; no reallocation was identified.

**New Project Scoring and Selection Process**

After a review of community data and current resources, as well as system-level discussions about community needs, Washtenaw County CoC determined that bonus or expansion project applications for new permanent housing projects (PSH or RRH) were necessary to meet community need.

On May 17, 2019, OCED released a Request for Letter of Intent (LOI) for those interested in applying for a permanent housing bonus or expansion project. Interested parties were asked to confirm their intent to apply and attend a mandatory meeting on June 3, 2019 to answer questions and provide opportunities for collaboration. Applicants still interested in submitting projects after the mandatory meeting then submitted a full application. Bonus and DV Bonus applications were released on July 26, 2019.

Two bonus/expansion applications and one DV bonus application were submitted as shown in the chart below. The FRT used a bonus project scoring tool (Attachment D) and a DV bonus scoring tool (Attachment E) to review and score the submitted projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CoC BONUS/EXPANSION PROJECTS</strong></th>
<th>Total funding available: $290,312</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Populations Served</strong></td>
<td>Total Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVALON HOUSING- PSH SINGLES EXPANSION APPLICATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted project would expand a current 64 unit PSH project serving Chronically Homeless Individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic individuals</td>
<td>29 new (64 existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS COMMUNITY SERVICES -- NEW PSH FOR FAMILIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Homeless Families with Children</td>
<td>9 units; 25 beds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DV RRH BONUS PROJECTS</strong></th>
<th>Total funding available: $154,579</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Populations Served</strong></td>
<td>Total Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS COMMUNITY SERVICES- SOS/SAFEHOUSE RRH EXPANSION FOR DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted project would expand a current 122 unit RRH project serving families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Family Survivors; 2 Individual Survivors</td>
<td>4 units; 11 beds (112 existing units, 425 exiting beds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bonus Project Selection**
At the July 17, 2019 CoC Board meeting, the CoC Board approved two projects to move forward in the 2019 CoC funding competition: one funded at $210,000 and a second funded at $80,312. Per the CoC-approved 2019 Ranking Policies, the higher scored project would move forward at the higher funding amount and the lower scoring project at the lower amount. The Avalon Housing PSH Singles Expansion application scored the highest among the two bonus applications (see Attachment F for score breakdown) and was selected to move forward at $210,000. SOS’s bonus project was selected to move forward at $80,312.

**DV Bonus Selection**
While only one project was submitted for the DV bonus, it was a strong application that showcased a partnership with local DV survivor experts. The application scored well and met the community need to serve a special population (see Attachment F for score breakdown). It was selected to move forward at the full DV bonus funding amount of $154,579.

**Funding Recommendations & Ranking**
As seen in the Project Rankings table below, Tier 1 includes 94 percent of the CoC’s ARD, which is the HMIS project renewal and all renewal PSH projects as ranked by the 2019 Ranking Policy (Attachment A). The RRH project (SOS RRH 2019) straddles the two tiers. Tier 2 includes the part of the SOS RRH 2019 renewal project, the bonus projects, and the DV bonus project.

If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project application up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 1; and then, using the CoC score and other factors, HUD may fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).
CoC Board Approval of FRT Recommendations

The CoC Board deliberated the FRT submitted funding and ranking recommendations outlined in this report on September 18, 2019. The CoC Board’s responsibility in this process included:

- Approval of the FRT report and its contents;
- Approval of the FRT funding recommendations and project ranking;
- Affirmation that CoC staff would complete and submit the 2018 CoC Consolidated Application and Priority Rankings and publically post both by September 27, 2019.

### 2019 HUC CoC Project Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER</th>
<th>PROJECT STATUS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>PROJECT AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OCED</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>$137,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP PSH RASS</td>
<td>$368,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon PSH Families</td>
<td>$227,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon PSH Singles</td>
<td>$814,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone Supportive Housing for Youth</td>
<td>$129,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP MVP</td>
<td>$52,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP Willowpond</td>
<td>$42,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon/Ashley</td>
<td>$96,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon/Pontiac Trail</td>
<td>$93,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP SPC SRA</td>
<td>$435,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>SPC Avalon SRA + Bonus 2010 Consolidation</td>
<td>$305,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Avalon*</td>
<td>Avalon 2014 Bonus PSH</td>
<td>$701,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP PSH PASS</td>
<td>$194,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP SPC TRA</td>
<td>$384,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone SHP for Young Families</td>
<td>$51,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16**</td>
<td>SOS/IHN</td>
<td>SOS RRH for Families 2019</td>
<td>$1,424,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TIER TOTAL $5,457,866

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIER</th>
<th>PROJECT STATUS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>PROJECT AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>16**</td>
<td>SOS/IHN</td>
<td>SOS RRH for Families 2019</td>
<td>$348,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonus Project</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon PSH Singles Expansion</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonus Project</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>PSH for Families</td>
<td>$80,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DV Bonus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>RRH for Families Expansion</td>
<td>$154,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL TOTAL $6,251,131

*Ann Arbor Housing Commission is fiduciary.

**This project will be split in two between Tier 1 and Tier 2, pending approval by SOS.
Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC)  
FY2019 Funding Competition

2019 Ranking Policy

Each year, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all new and renewal applications submitted as a part of the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) funding competition to be ranked according to a CoC-approved, community ranking policy. The 2019 Ranking Policy was drafted per recommendations from the Washtenaw Housing Alliance Operations Committee (OC), a committee of the CoC, and approved by the CoC Board on July 17, 2019.

Washtenaw County CoC is committed to the below ranking policy for the 2019 CoC Funding Competition.

Projects will be ranked in the following order:

1. Infrastructure projects (HMIS)
2. PSH Renewals ranked by score* (high to low) in the following order:
   a. Projects with agency-owned units and Leasing Projects
   b. Project-based rental assistance (PRA)
   c. Sponsor-based rental assistance (SRA)
   d. Tenant-based rental assistance (TRA)
3. RRH Renewals ranked by score* (high to low)
4. Renewals that do not have a full 12 months of Annual Performance Report (APR) data**
5. Projects created through reallocation in the following order: PSH for families, PSH for Individuals
6. Bonus projects ranked by score* (high to low) in the following order:
   a. Projects with agency-owned units and Leasing Projects
   b. Project-based rental assistance (PRA)
   c. Sponsor-based rental assistance (SRA)
   d. Tenant-based rental assistance (TRA)
7. Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus project for RRH serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking

*Projects with equal scores are ranked by higher Section 2 Component: Program Outcome rubric score. If there is still a tie in score, projects will be ranked by higher Section 3 Component: Compliance rubric score.

** Newly implemented projects that do not have a full 12 months of APR data are exempt from outcome scores

Guidance for projects that straddle Tiers:

If a project, once listed in ranked order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line, the following policy will apply:

If a project straddles the line (i.e. a portion of the project budget falls within Tier 1 and a portion within Tier 2), that agency will be asked if the project would still be feasible if only funded for the Tier 1 amount. Agency submits feasibility plan in writing for review by the Funding Review Team (FRT). The FRT reviews this plan and decides whether to accept it based on whether the project would be feasible at the reduced amount.

- IF YES: If project agrees and feasibility plan is accepted by the FRT, the project is submitted straddling the two Tiers.
IF NO: If project indicates it would not be feasible at a reduced amount or the FRT does not accept the feasibility plan, the project will be dropped so that it wholly fits into Tier 2 and the next ranked project will have the same opportunity to show feasibility straddling the line. This process is continued until a viable project is placed into Tier 1 amount. The FRT will do everything it can to ensure the full amount of Tier 1 funding is utilized.
# CoC RENEWAL PROJECT RUBRIC

**AGENCY:**

**PROGRAM:**

**PROJECT TYPE:**

## AGENCY LEVEL THRESHOLD

Agency Level Threshold requires agencies to meet local funding standards and be an active participant in the CoC based on the criteria below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency meets the financial audit requirements stipulated under the Coordinated Funding Request for Information (RFI).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency has attended at least 1 of 2 CoC All-Membership Meetings in the past 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency has representation in at least one of the CoC committees (i.e. WHA Operations Committee, Coordinated Entry Oversight &amp; Evaluation) and has attended at least 75% of meetings convened by the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency has a 75% attendance rate at Community Housing Prioritization Meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECT LEVEL THRESHOLD

Threshold needs to be met as described below for projects to be considered for funding renewal. Projects falling within certain score ranges will need to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), as stated below. **Please note: Projects that have not completed a full calendar year will be EXEMPT from this threshold.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>OUTCOME PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO/EXEMPT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Outcomes:</strong> Project attained above 60% of the total score possible. If not, projects scoring between 20-60% will need to submit a CAP and below 20% will not considered for funding.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance:</strong> Project attained above 70% of the total score possible. If not, projects scoring between 50-70% will need to submit a CAP and below 50% will not considered for funding.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMIS Compliance &amp; Data Quality:</strong> Project attained above 85% of the total score. If not, projects scoring between 55-85% will need to submit a CAP and below 55% will not be considered for funding.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT NARRATIVE (INSERT HERE)

The project narrative addresses the entire scope of the proposed project at full operational capacity. The project description should address the entire scope of the project, including:

- community need
- target population(s)
- the plan for addressing the identified needs/issues of the CoC target population(s)
- projected outcome(s)
- coordination with other source(s)/partner(s) and how participants will be helped to access mainstream services
- reasons why CoC support is needed
- For projects targeting youth ONLY: Information & data about how youth head of households increased life skills and supports system
### Target Population

(check all that apply)
- Chronically Homeless
- Veterans
- Youth (under 25)
- Families with Children
- Domestic Violence
- Substance Abuse
- HIV/AIDS
- Other

### Projected Housing Type

(check all that apply)
- **Scattered-site apartments**: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned___
- **Clustered apartments**: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned___
- **Single Room Occupancy**: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned___
- **Single-family homes/townhouses/duplexes**: Total Units ___ # Agency Owned___
- **Other**:________________ Total Units ___ # Agency Owned___

### Projected Units/Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agency Rate</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Occupancy/Average Bed Utilization Rate
  \[ \frac{\text{Total no. of households served}}{\text{Total no. of projected units}} \times 100\% \] | 90% | % | 90% or > = 8
  85-89% = 4
  75%-84% = 2
  Below 75%=0 |
| B) Retention of Permanent Housing or Movement to Other Permanent Housing
  \[ \frac{\text{No. of stayers} + \text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of persons served}} \times 100\% \] | 90% | % | 90% or > =20
  80-89% = 15
  75-79% = 10
  Below 75%= 0 |
| C) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment with one or more type of Health Insurance (de-duplicated)
  (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)
  \[ \frac{\text{Total no. of } (L + S) \text{ with HI}}{\text{Total no. of Adults with Annual Assessments and Adult Leavers}} \times 100\% \] | 60% | % | 60% or > = 4
  50-59% = 2
  40-49% = 1
  Below 40% = 0 |

### Section 2 - Project Outcomes

See Appendix A: Project Outcome Calculations for details about data sources and calculating scores in this section.

#### 2A - Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Project Outcomes

- **Total Households Served**: ___
- **Total Persons Served**: ___
- **Total Adults**: ___
- **Total Accompanied Children (Under 18)**: ___
- **Unaccompanied Children (Under 18)**: ___
### D) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment

\[
\text{Employment Rate} = \frac{\text{Total no. of Adult (L+S) with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \times 100\%
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% or &gt; = 4</td>
<td>/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19% = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10% = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)

\[
\text{Income Maintenance Rate} = \frac{\text{Total no. of Adults (L+S) who maintained or ↑ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \times 100\%
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% or &gt; = 6</td>
<td>/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59% = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39% = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20% = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBTOTAL PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES /42

### 2B – RAPID RE-HOUSING (RRH) PROJECT OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>AGENCY RATE</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| \[
\text{Exit Rate} = \frac{\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \times 100\%
\] | 80% | % | 80% or > = 28 | /28 |
| | | | 65-79% = 21 | |
| | | | 50-64% = 14 | |
| | | | 25-49% = 7 | |
| | | | Below 25% = 0 | |
| **B) Leavers with Health Insurance** | (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance) | | | |
| \[
\text{Health Insurance Rate} = \frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \times 100\%
\] | 60% | % | 60% or > = 4 | /4 |
| | | | 50-59% = 2 | |
| | | | 40-49% = 1 | |
| | | | Below 40% = 0 | |
### C) Employment Rate for Leavers

\[
\text{Employment Rate} = \frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers with earned } Y}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \times 100\%
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% or &gt; = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19% = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14% = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10% = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)

\[
\text{Leavers with Maintained or Increased Total Income} = \frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total } Y}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \times 100\%
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% or &gt; = 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59% = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39% = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20% = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBTOTAL RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES

/42

### SECTION 3 - CONSUMER FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>AGENCY RATE</th>
<th>POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer participation on organization board or other policy making entity. <em>(Mandated by HUD)</em></td>
<td>Yes, it’s currently in place</td>
<td>Yes, it’s currently in place &amp; outcomes direct future services = 4&lt;br&gt;Yes, it’s currently in place = 3&lt;br&gt;No, but there is an existing plan= 1&lt;br&gt;No, no plan= 0</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redress and grievance process in place for consumers. <em>(Mandated by HUD)</em></td>
<td>Yes, it’s currently in place</td>
<td>Yes, it’s currently in place &amp; outcomes direct future services = 4&lt;br&gt;Yes, it’s currently in place = 3&lt;br&gt;No, but there is an existing plan= 1&lt;br&gt;No, no plan= 0</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback collection and response process in place (e.g., clients satisfaction survey, consumer engagement session, etc.).</td>
<td>Yes, it’s currently in place</td>
<td>Yes, it’s currently in place &amp; outcomes direct future services = 4&lt;br&gt;Yes, it’s currently in place = 3&lt;br&gt;No, but there is an existing plan= 1&lt;br&gt;No, no plan= 0</td>
<td>/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUBTOTAL CONSUMER FEEDBACK

/12

### SECTION 4 - COMPLIANCE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>AGENCY RATE</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agency has one or more unresolved monitoring or audit finding(s) for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the applicant or potential subrecipients (if any). | No findings or findings addressed in Corrective Action Plan (CAP) | No findings = 5  
Findings with CAP submitted = 3  
Findings but no CAP = 0 | /5 | Agency report |
| Agency has expended funds on this grant in the last two years.            | 90%      | %           | 90-100% = 5  
85% - 89% = 3  
84% and below = 0 | /5 | Agency report |
| Agency has outstanding obligations to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon. | No       |             | No = 5  
Yes = 0 | /5 | Agency report |
| Agency has a history of late APR submissions (in the last 3 years or for the duration of this project) | 0        |             | 0-1 late APRs = 5  
2-3 late APRs = 0 | /5 | Agency report |

| SUBTOTAL COMPLIANCE | 20 |

**SECTION 5 - BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>AGENCY RATE</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Budget submitted is clearly filled out and calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical and consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application. Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests and are in line with project requirements. | Yes      |             | Yes = 6  
No = 0 | /6 | Agency report |
### Optional Narrative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>AGENCY RATE</th>
<th>SCORING</th>
<th>POINTS/POSSIBLE POINTS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Number</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/0</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabling Condition</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Head of Household</td>
<td>5% or &lt; *</td>
<td></td>
<td>5% or &lt;= 1</td>
<td>/1</td>
<td>HMIS Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS (left blank) for the following criteria:

**SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY** /9

**GRAND TOTAL** /89
**APPENDIX A: PROJECT OUTCOMES CALCULATIONS**

### 2A – PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SOURCE &amp; CALCULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A) Occupancy/Average Bed Utilization Rate** | **Numerator:**
| | A. APR Q8a Total Households |
| | B. Rubric Section 1: Project Description Total Projected Units |
| | **Denominator:**
| | A. APR Q8a Total Households |
| | **SOURCE & CALCULATION** |
| | \( \frac{A}{B} \times 100\% \) |
| **B) Retention of Permanent Housing or Movement to Other Permanent Housing** | **Numerator:**
| | A. APR Q22a1 Total stayers |
| | + B. APR Q23a Permanent Subtotal |
| | + C. APR Q23b Permanent Subtotal Q23b |
| | **Denominator:**
| | APR Q7a Total persons served (inc. children) |
| | **SOURCE & CALCULATION** |
| | \( \frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100\% \) |
### C) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment with one or more type of Health Insurance (de-duplicated) (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)

\[
\text{Total no. of } (L+S) \text{ with HI} / \text{Total no. of Adults with Annual Assessments and Adult Leavers} \times 100\%
\]

**Numerator:**
- A. APR Q21 Total at annual assessment with 1 source
  + B. APR Q21 Total at annual assessment w/ more than 1 source
  + C. APR Q21 Total leavers with 1 source
  + D. APR Q21 Total leavers with more than 1 source

**Denominator:**
- E. APR Q7a Total no. of adults
  - F. APR Q21 # of stayers not yet required to have an assessment

\[
\frac{A + B + C + D}{E - F} \times 100\%
\]

### D) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment

\[
\text{Total no. of Adult (L+S) with earned Y} / \text{Total no. of Adults served} \times 100\%
\]

**Numerator:**
- A. APR Q18 Total at annual assessment with 1 source
  + B. APR Q18 Total at annual assessment w/ more than 1 source
  + C. APR Q18 Total leavers with 1 source
  + D. APR Q18 Total leavers with more than 1 source

**Denominator:**
- E. APR Q18 Total adults
  + F. APR Q18 Total adult leavers
  - G. APR Q18 # of stayers not yet required to have an assessment

\[
\frac{A + B + C + D}{E + F - G} \times 100\%
\]

### E) Leavers and Stayers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)

\[
\text{Total no. of Adults (L+S) who maintained or ↑ Total Y} / \text{Total no. of Adults served} \times 100\%
\]

**Numerator:**
- A. APR Q19a3* Retained income category and same $
  + B. APR Q19a3* Retained income category and increased $
  + C. APR Q19a3* Did not have income category and gained income

**Denominator:**
- D. APR Q19a3* Total adults (including those with no income)
  * Use row “Number of Adults with any Income” in table Q19a3

\[
\frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100\%
\]

---

### 2A – RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>SOURCE &amp; CALCULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types} / \text{Total no. of leavers served} \times 100\%
\]

**Numerator:**
- A. APR Q23a Permanent destination subtotal
  + B. APR Q23b Permanent destination subtotal

**Denominator:**
- C. APR Q5a Total leavers
  - D. APR Q23a Total deceased
  - E. APR Q23b Total deceased

\[
\frac{A + B}{C - D - E} \times 100\%
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>B) Leavers with Health Insurance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ \frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \times 100% ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Numerator:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. APR Q21 Leavers with 1 source of health insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ B. APR Q21 Leavers with more than 1 source of health insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Denominator:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. APR Q5a Total adult leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \frac{A + B}{C} \times 100% )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>C) Employment Rate for Leavers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ \frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \times 100% ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Numerator:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. APR Q18 Adult leavers with only earned income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ B. APR Q18 Adult leavers with both earned and other income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Denominator:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. APR Q5a Total adult leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \frac{A + B}{C} \times 100% )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(earned + non-employment income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ \frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \times 100% ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Numerator:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and same $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ B. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and increased $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ C. APR Q19a2* Did not have income category and gained income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Denominator:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. APR Q19a2* Total adults (including those with no income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100% )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Use row “Number of Adults with any Income” in table Q19a2
## 2019 HUD CoC Renewal Project Scores

### Renewal Project Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT OUTCOMES</th>
<th>CONSUMER FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>DATA QUALITY</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
<th>% TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(out of 42 points)</td>
<td>(out of 12 points)</td>
<td>(out of 20 points or 15 for exempt)</td>
<td>(out of 6 points)</td>
<td>(out of 9 points; see below for exempt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCED</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
<td>EXEMPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP PSH RASS</td>
<td>Leasing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon PSH Families</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon PSH Singles</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone Supportive Housing for Youth</td>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP MVP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP Willowpond</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon/Ashley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Avalon/Pontiac Trail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP SPC SRA</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>SPC Avalon SRA + Bonus 2010 Consolidation</td>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon*</td>
<td>Avalon 2014 Bonus PSH</td>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP PSH PASS</td>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>MAP SPC TRA</td>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone SHP for Young Families</td>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS/IHN</td>
<td>SOS RRH for Families 2019</td>
<td>RRH TRA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project fiduciary is the Ann Arbor Housing Commission.

| PROJECT TYPE: | Permanent Supportive Housing | Rapid Re-Housing |
SCORING RUBRIC FOR NEW OR EXPANSION PERMANENT HOUSING PROJECT APPLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION:
The following rubric is an attempt to operationalize the scoring criteria for new permanent housing project or expansion project applications (i.e. bonus projects) in the FY 2019 CoC Funding Competition. It serves as a descriptive guide for use by the Funding Review Team, a CoC-appointed committee, when scoring the applications to minimize discrepancies in interpretation between scorers, thereby enhancing consistency and objectivity.

BACKGROUND & ELIGIBLE PROJECTS
The Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) accepted applications for one or more bonus or expansion projects totaling $210,000 for the 2019 CoC Funding Competition. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allows CoCs to apply for new (bonus) projects or for expansions of current CoC projects. This application uses definitions and requirements based on the 2019 NOFA.

Applicants can apply for a new permanent housing bonus project or for an expansion of a current permanent housing project.
  o All new permanent housing projects can apply for one of two types of projects, including:
    ▪ New Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects that meet the requirements of DedicatedPLUS as defined in Section III.A.3.d. of the NOFA or new PSH projects where 100 percent of the beds are dedicated to chronic homelessness.
    ▪ New Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) projects that will serve homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, who meet the following criteria:
      (a) residing in a place not meant for human habitation;
      (b) residing in an emergency shelter;
      (c) persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homeless, including persons fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence situations;
      (d) receiving services from a VA-funded homeless assistance program and met one of the above criteria at initial intake to the VA’s homeless assistance system.
  o Project applicants that intend to expand an eligible renewal project must:
    ▪ apply within the same component type;
    ▪ provide the eligible renewal grant number that the project applicant requests to expand on the new project application;
    ▪ indicate how the new project application will expand units, beds, services, persons served
    ▪ ensure the funding request for the new expansion project is within the funding parameters allowed under the reallocation process or permanent housing bonus.
SECTION A: FUNDING ELIGIBILITY AND THRESHOLD CRITERIA

(CHECK WHERE APPLICABLE)

Agency Threshold Criteria

☐ The project meets the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as defined in 24 CFR part 578 and provides evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation).

☐ The applicant agency demonstrates the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project and to administer Federal funds, as detailed in the project application.

Project Type

Applicants can apply for a new permanent housing bonus project or for an expansion of a current permanent housing project. This project falls under the eligible project type of:

☐ New permanent housing project
  ☐ PSH serving eligible populations as described above
  ☐ RRH serving eligible populations as described above

☐ Expansion Project
  ☐ PSH serving eligible populations as described above
  ☐ RRH serving eligible populations as described above

Project Quality Threshold

New Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Re-Housing projects must meet at least three out of the four criteria and must meet the third criteria. Projects that do not meet at least three criteria and the third criteria will be rejected (see pages 34-35 of the NOFA).

☐ The type of housing proposed will fit the needs of the program participants

☐ The type of supportive services that will be offered to program participants will ensure successful retention in or help to obtain permanent housing, including all supportive services regardless of funding source

☐ The proposed project has a specific plan to coordinate and integrate with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs and ensure that program participants are assisted to obtain benefits from the mainstream programs for which they may be eligible (e.g., Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, Food Stamps, local Workforce office, early childhood education)

☐ Program participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs (e.g., provides the participant with some type of transportation to access needed services, safety planning, case management, additional assistance to ensure retention of permanent housing)

Additional Criteria

☐ The project must follow a housing first approach (page 6 of the NOFA)

Required Attachments

☐ Most Recent independent audit and submission of SAS114, and 115, if applicable.

☐ Current year Board-approved agency budget
**SECTION B: SCORING SHEET**

**Instructions:** FRT members are to review the applications and award points according to the extent to which the scoring criteria are met. A scale with suggested points has been created for each component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING COMPONENTS</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR SCORING</th>
<th>AWARDED POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| II (A-H): APPLICANT/SPONSOR EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY | This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience and capacity in delivering housing and supportive services for homeless clients. **Suggested scoring scale:** For maximum points (=15), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:  
  - Clear description (backed with concrete examples) of experience/expertise with renting units, operating rental assistance and providing supportive services that are aligned with what is proposed in the application.  
  - Clear and concrete examples of how applicant has identified and addressed target population’s housing and service needs  
  - If it is a joint application, role of each partner is clearly described and delineated  
  - Applicant agency has a strong management and coordination structure along with an adequate financial accounting system to administer the grant  
  - If a current recipient of CoC or other forms of federal funding, there are no outstanding obligations to HUD, no unexpended funds and no detrimental audit findings. (i.e Answers to questions IIE-H must be ‘No’)  
10-14 points:  
  - Adequate description and demonstration of above criteria with good examples given to support content.  
  - Where applicant answered ‘Yes’ to any of the questions (1E-H), there must be a clear demonstration of corrective steps taken which led to successful resolution of outstanding concerns.  
5-9 points:  
  - Above criteria are not fully or clearly met. Some attempt to provide examples to demonstrate (i) and (ii) but they are not always aligned with what is proposed in the application.  
  - Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit issues, applicant did not provide an adequate corrective action plan or explanation.  
0-4 points:  
  - Lack of clarity in demonstration of most of stated criteria. No concrete examples were provided to support claims.  
  - No clear role/responsibilities when it comes to joint applications  
  - Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit concerns, applicant did not provide any corrective action plan or explanation.  

Comments: ___/15
This component is concerned with the scope of the proposed project, its goals and the means in which the desired outcomes are to be realized.

**Suggested scoring scale:** For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:

- Project description is clear, complete, and concise and addresses the entire scope of the project.
- Clearly addresses the target population/community to be served and how applicant plans to go about meeting assessed needs. All pointers that are highlighted in the application are fully addressed.
- Has a sound plan for executing the grant agreement and beginning rental assistance within 12 months of the award.
- For expansion projects, application clearly explains why the expanded activity is needed and how it will be implemented.
- If project is designated as DedicatedPLUS, application provides clear explanation of the reasoning behind this designation and how the project will use this expanded criteria.
- Project has strong capacity for prioritizing persons with the most severe needs.
- If applying for rental assistance, project has a comprehensive method for assessing and determining the type and amount of rental assistance that participants can receive.

14-19 points:

- Project description is generally comprehensive with 1-2 areas that require clarification.
- Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are mostly addressed.
- Plan for implementing project within 12 months can be clearer.
- Project can be more explicit in its description of how chronic and vulnerable homeless persons are prioritized.

7-13 points:

- Project description can be more comprehensive and there were more than 3 areas requiring further clarification.
- Pointers highlighted in question III(a) are not addressed adequately.
- Timeline for implementation within 12 months is questionable and it is unlikely that project would be ready within 12 months of receiving award.
- Weak demonstration of project's capacity to prioritize chronic and vulnerable homeless persons.

0-6 points:

- Lack of clarity in overall project description with some pointers not addressed at all.
- Responses have little or no consistency with other parts of the application.
- There are serious doubts that project would be ready to implement in a timely manner.
- Project is not aligned with HUD’s goals of prioritizing chronic and vulnerable homeless persons.

Comments:
### IV: COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST

This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.

**Suggested Scoring Scale:** For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:

- Applicant must clearly describe past experience with the Housing First approach
- Current project design is aligned with Housing First Principles (refer to Appendix A of the application (page 18), including:
  - Client participation in services is not a prerequisite for housing placement
  - Few, if any, programmatic requirements for entry into housing (e.g. sobriety, minimum income threshold)
  - Services are provided as per client’s choice and discretion

4-9 points:

- Description of Housing First approach is weak; no clear indication of past experience in employing this approach.
- Project design does not fully incorporate Housing First Principles within its service delivery. Not all of the points highlighted in the criteria are referenced.

0-3 points:

- No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach.

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### V: (A-I) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PARTICIPANTS

This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render participants with the appropriate supportive services crucial for obtaining and sustaining permanent housing outcomes.

**Suggested Scoring Scale:** For maximum points (= 25), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:

- Very clear and comprehensive description of how project assists participants in obtaining and maintaining permanent housing.
- Project includes a well-thought through plan for individual case management and linkage to mainstream health, social services, and employment resources and benefits where participants meet eligibility criteria.
- Supportive services are tailored to the needs of program participants and appropriate measures are in place to reduce barriers to access (e.g. accessible location, relevant type of aid, etc.).
- Detailed, coherent and well-thought through “Supportive Services Type and Frequency Chart” that is feasible for implementation.

16-24 points:

- Adequate description of how project functions to assist clients in obtaining and maintaining permanent housing.
- Overall, project demonstrates ability to meet above criteria to a large extent, however some of the responses are lacking in detail or clarity.
- “Supportive Services Type and Frequency” Chart is adequately filled up with some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
areas of doubt.

6-15 points:
- Descriptions and responses to questions are often inadequate and require further clarification. It is not clear the extent to which the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income.
- Limited description of how applicant has acknowledged clients’ barriers to access and sought to minimize them.
- “Supportive Services Type and Frequency” Chart raises doubts for implementation.

0-5 points:
- Descriptions and responses to questions are severely lacking. There is little or no evidence that the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income.
- Proposed supportive services do not take into account client’s potential barriers to access.
- “Supportive Services Type and Frequency Chart” does not match applicant agency capacity and is not feasible for implementation.

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI: LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT (APPLIES TO SCATTERED-SITE PROJECTS ONLY)</th>
<th>This component is concerned with applicant agency’s engagement efforts with landlords towards increasing affordable housing availability. (Applies to scattered-site projects only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Scoring Scale</strong>: For maximum points ( =5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A clear description of applicant’s outreach and engagement efforts with landlords is provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is strong evidence of an ongoing positive relationship and communication with landlords that enhances their participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 points:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of clarity in description provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited evidence of an ongoing positive relationship and communication with landlords.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1 point:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little or no consideration for outreach to and engagement with landlords.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No evidence of relationship and communication with landlords.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII: COMMITMENT TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN (APPLIES TO PROJECT-BASED PROJECTS ONLY)</th>
<th>This component is concerned with applicant agency’s commitment to the community’s Affordable Housing Plan – Housing Affordability and Economic Equity – Analysis. (Applies to project-based projects only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Scoring Scale</strong>: For maximum points ( =5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear and comprehensive description of how the project’s location and design aligns with the Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>___/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| VIII: PARTNERING AND COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY | This component is concerned with applicant agency's commitment to working collaboratively within the Continuum of Care.  

**Suggested Scoring Scale:** For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:  
- Description indicates a strong commitment towards collaboration with CoC partners and concrete efforts to start/maintain this in the proposed project.  
- Strong indication of commitment to coordinated entry to maximize resources and avoid duplication.  

2-4 points:  
- Lack of clarity in description; there is indication of commitment towards partnership and the coordinated process but it is not fully demonstrated in the past or in current application.  

0-1 point:  
- Description is vague and indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process.  

Comments: |

| IX: BUDGET DETAIL | This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project.  

**Suggested scoring scale:** For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:  
- All budget charts are clearly filled out and calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical and consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application.  
- New projects can request 1 year of funding with up to an 18-month initial grant term.  
- Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests and are in line with project requirements.  
- Clear indication of potential additional funding sources that are committed to this project.  

14-19 points:  
- Budget charts are generally filled out in a logical and coherent manner with minor areas requiring clarification.  
- Quantity descriptions are adequate but may have some inconsistency with overall |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7-13 points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quantity descriptions are unclear and most parts are lacking in logic and connection to the overall application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-6 points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budget charts are unclear on the whole and lacking in logic and connection to the overall application; multiple calculation errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall responses provided indicate poor adherence to the specific requirements in each section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

**Overall Comments:**
SCORING RUBRIC FOR DV BONUS APPLICATIONS

DV Bonus applications are for new permanent housing rapid re-housing (RRH) projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3

INTRODUCTION:
The following rubric is an attempt to operationalize the scoring criteria for new permanent housing project or expansion project applications (i.e. bonus projects) in the FY 2019 CoC Funding Competition. It serves as a descriptive guide for use by the Funding Review Team, a CoC-appointed committee, when scoring the applications to minimize discrepancies in interpretation between scorers, thereby enhancing consistency and objectivity.

BACKGROUND & ELIGIBLE PROJECTS
As allowed under the 2019 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), the Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) accepted applications for new or expansion Permanent Housing Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) projects serving survivors of domestic violence (DV), dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3 (see page 30 of the NOFA). Applicants are permitted to request up to $154,579 for a one-year grant term.

Applicants do not have to be DV providers, but it is strongly advised that non-DV providers partner with DV programs to ensure critical program elements are included, such as ongoing safety planning, survivor confidentiality, trauma-informed services, victim-centered approaches, and survivor choice.

In the review of applications, reviewers should ensure the following expectations are met:

- Applicants can quantify the need for the project and how the project will fill that gap
- Demonstrated previous performance of applicant in serving survivors of domestic violence (DV), dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, as well as their ability to house survivors and meet safety outcomes

SECTION A: FUNDING ELIGIBILITY AND THRESHOLD CRITERIA
(CHECK WHERE APPLICABLE)

AGENCY THRESHOLD CRITERIA

☐ The project meets the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as defined in 24 CFR part 578 and provides evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation)

☐ The applicant agency demonstrates the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project and to administer Federal funds, as detailed in the project application.

☐ The applicant and subrecipient (if any) must have the ability to collect required HUD data and generate required reports in HMIS or a comparable data base (for DV agencies)
PROJECT TYPE
Applicants can apply for new permanent housing Rapid Re-Housing projects that follow a housing first approach and are dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3.

☐ New Rapid Re-Housing Project is dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3.

☐ Expansion Rapid Re-Housing Project is dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless at 24 CFR 578.3.

PROJECT QUALITY THRESHOLD
New permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing projects must meet at least 3 out of the 4 criteria and must meet the 3rd criteria. Projects that do not meet at least three criteria and the 3rd criteria will be rejected (see pages 34-35 of the NOFA).

☐ The type of housing proposed will fit the needs of the program participants

☐ The type of supportive services that will be offered to program participants will ensure successful retention in or help to obtain permanent housing, including all supportive services regardless of funding source

☐ The proposed project has a specific plan to coordinate and integrate with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs and ensure that program participants are assisted to obtain benefits from the mainstream programs for which they may be eligible (e.g., Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, Food Stamps, local Workforce office, early childhood education)

☐ Program participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs (e.g., provides the participant with some type of transportation to access needed services, safety planning, case management, additional assistance to ensure retention of permanent housing

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA
☐ The project must follow a housing first approach (see page 6 of the NOFA).

☐ The applicant must demonstrate that the project will use trauma-informed, victim-centered approaches (see page 7 of the NOFA).

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS
☐ Most Recent independent audit and submission of SAS114, and 115, if applicable

☐ Current year Board-approved agency budget
**SECTION B: SCORING SHEET**

**Instructions:** FRT members are to review the applications and award points according to the extent to which the scoring criteria are met. A scale with suggested points has been created for each component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORING COMPONENTS</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR SCORING</th>
<th>AWARDED POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II (A-N):</td>
<td>This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience &amp; capacity in delivering housing &amp; supportive services for homeless clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT/SPONSOR</td>
<td><strong>Suggested scoring scale:</strong> For maximum points (=15), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE AND</td>
<td>• Clear description (backed with concrete examples) of experience with renting units, operating rental assistance &amp; providing supportive services with concrete examples of how applicant has identified &amp; addressed target population’s housing &amp; service needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY</td>
<td>• Concrete example of level of need for this population &amp; description of data sets/sources used to understand the need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear description of experience executing requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (safety planning, confidentiality &amp; record keeping requirements).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concrete examples of providing holistic services to DV survivors &amp; a description of key partnerships &amp; their role in the success of program participants, especially partnering with DV providers if applicant is not a DV provider.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear description of applicant &amp; subrecipient (if any) experience in collecting all required HUD data elements &amp; generating required reports, as well as the infrastructure that ensures these requirements are met.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DV providers must use data from an HMIS-comparable database.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If it is a joint application, role of each partner is clearly described &amp; delineated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applicant agency has a strong management &amp; coordination structure along with an adequate financial accounting system to administer the grant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If a current recipient of CoC or other forms of federal funding, there are no outstanding obligations to HUD, no unexpended funds &amp; no detrimental audit findings. (i.e. answers to questions IIK-N must be ‘No’).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10-14 points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate description &amp; demonstration of above criteria with good examples given to support content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where applicant answered ‘Yes’ to any of the questions (IIK-N), there must be a clear demonstration of corrective steps taken which led to successful resolution of outstanding concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5-9 points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Above criteria are not fully or clearly met. Some attempt to provide examples to demonstrate (i) &amp; (ii) but they are not always aligned with what is proposed in the application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit issues, applicant did not provide an adequate corrective action plan or explanation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0-4 points:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of clarity in demonstration of most of stated criteria. No concrete examples were provided to support claims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No clear role/responsibilities when it comes to joint applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where there are outstanding obligations to HUD or audit concerns, applicant did not provide any corrective action plan or explanation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ___/15
### III (A-E): PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This component is concerned with the scope of the proposed project, its goals & the means in which the desired outcomes are to be realized.

**Suggested scoring scale:** For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:

- Project description is clear, complete, concise, & addresses the entire scope of the project.
- Clearly addresses the target population/community to be served & how applicant plans to go about meeting assessed needs. All pointers that are highlighted in the application are fully addressed.
- Has a sound plan for executing the grant agreement & beginning rental assistance within 12 months of the award.
- Project has strong capacity for prioritizing persons with the most severe needs.
- If applying for rental assistance, project has a comprehensive method for assessing and determining the type and amount of rental assistance that participants can receive.
- If not a DV provider, applicant describes a clear partnership with a DV provider

14-19 points:

- Project description is generally comprehensive with 1-2 areas that require clarification.
- Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are mostly addressed.
- Plan for implementing project within 12 months can be clearer.
- Project can be more explicit in its description of how chronic and vulnerable homeless persons are prioritized.

7-13 points:

- Project description can be more comprehensive and there were more than 3 areas requiring further clarification.
- Pointers highlighted in question III(A) are not addressed adequately.
- Timeline for implementation within 12 months is questionable and it is unlikely that project would be ready within 12 months of receiving award.
- Weak demonstration of project’s capacity to prioritize chronic and vulnerable homeless persons.

0-6 points:

- Lack of clarity in overall project description with some pointers not addressed at all.
- Responses have little or no consistency with other parts of the application.
- There are serious doubts that project would be ready to implement in a timely manner.
- Project is not aligned with HUD’s goals of prioritizing chronic and vulnerable homeless persons.
## IV: COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST

This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.

**Suggested Scoring Scale:** For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:

- Applicant must clearly describe past experience with the Housing First approach
- Current project design is aligned with Housing First Principles (refer to Appendix A of the application, including:
  - Client participation in services is not a prerequisite for housing placement
  - Few, if any, programmatic requirements for entry into housing (e.g. sobriety, minimum income threshold)
  - Services are provided as per client’s choice & discretion

4-9 points:
- Description of Housing First approach is weak; no clear indication of past experience in employing this approach.
- Project design does not fully incorporate Housing First Principles within its service delivery. Not all of the points highlighted in the criteria are referenced.

0-3 points:
- No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach.

Comments: ___/10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V: (A-I) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render participants with the appropriate supportive services crucial for obtaining &amp; sustaining permanent housing outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Scoring Scale:</strong> For maximum points (= 25), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very clear &amp; comprehensive description of how project assists participants in obtaining &amp; remaining in permanent housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project includes a well-thought through plan for individual case management &amp; linkage to mainstream health, social services, and employment resources &amp; benefits where participants meet eligibility criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supportive services are tailored to the needs of program participants &amp; appropriate measures are in place to reduce barriers to access (e.g. accessible location, relevant type of aid, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed, coherent &amp; well-thought through “Supportive Services Type &amp; Frequency Chart” that is feasible for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16-24 points:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adequate description of how project functions to assist clients in obtaining &amp; maintaining permanent housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall, project demonstrates ability to meet above criteria to a large extent, however some of the responses are lacking in detail or clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Supportive Services Type &amp; Frequency” Chart is adequately filled up with some areas of doubt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6-15 points:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descriptions &amp; responses to questions are often inadequate &amp; require further clarification. It is not clear the extent to which the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited description of how applicant has acknowledged clients’ barriers to access &amp; sought to minimize them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Supportive Services Type &amp; Frequency” Chart raises doubts for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-5 points:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descriptions &amp; responses to questions are severely lacking. There is little or no evidence that the applicant has experience or expertise in assisting clients with maintaining housing or increasing income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed supportive services do not take into account client’s potential barriers to access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Supportive Services Type &amp; Frequency Chart” does not match applicant agency capacity &amp; is not feasible for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ___/25
| VI: LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT | This component is concerned with applicant agency’s engagement efforts with landlords towards increasing affordable housing availability.  
**Suggested Scoring Scale:** For maximum points ( =5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:  
- A clear description of applicant’s outreach & engagement efforts with landlords is provided.  
- There is strong evidence of an ongoing positive relationship & communication with landlords that enhances their participation.  
2-4 points:  
- Lack of clarity in description provided.  
- Limited evidence of an ongoing positive relationship & communication with landlords.  
0-2 point:  
- Little or no consideration for outreach to & engagement with landlords.  
- No evidence of relationship & communication with landlords.  
Comments: ___/5 |
| VII: PARTNERING & COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY | This component is concerned with applicant agency’s commitment to working collaboratively within the Continuum of Care.  
**Suggested Scoring Scale:** For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:  
- Description indicates a strong commitment towards collaboration with CoC partners & concrete efforts to start/maintain this in the proposed project.  
- Strong indication of commitment to coordinated entry to maximize resources & avoid duplication.  
2-4 points:  
- Lack of clarity in description; there is indication of commitment towards partnership & the coordinated process but it is not fully demonstrated in the past or in current application.  
0-2 point:  
- Description is vague & indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process.  
Comments: /5 |
This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project. **Suggested scoring scale**: For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:

- All budget charts are clearly filled out & calculated correctly. Budget requests are clear, logical & consistent with the overall activities proposed in the application.
- Projects must be 1-year grant terms only.
- Quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in the requests & are in line with project requirements.
- Clear indication of potential additional funding sources that are committed to this project.

**14-19 points**:  
- Budget charts are generally filled out in a logical & coherent manner with minor areas requiring clarification.
- Quantity descriptions are adequate but may have some inconsistency with overall project requirements.

**7-13 points**:  
- Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors.
- Quantity descriptions are unclear & most parts are lacking in logic & connection to the overall application.

**0-6 points**:  
- Budget charts are unclear on the whole & lacking in logic & connection to the overall application; multiple calculation errors.
- Overall responses provided indicate poor adherence to the specific requirements in each section.

Comments:

| Overall Comments: | ___/20 |

---
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### 2019 HUD CoC Bonus (including DV Bonus) Project Scores

#### Bonus Project Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVIDER</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Applicant/ Sponsor Experience and Capacity (out of 15 points)</th>
<th>Project Description (out of 20 points)</th>
<th>Commitment to Housing First Supportive Services (out of 25 points)</th>
<th>Landlord Engagement (out of 5 points)</th>
<th>Commitment to Affordable Housing Plan (out of 5 points)</th>
<th>Coordinated Entry (out of 5 points)</th>
<th>Budget (out of 20 points)</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)</th>
<th>% TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>PSH Singles (Expansion)</td>
<td>Rental assistance: 4 SRA, Agency owned units: Yes</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>PSH Families (New)</td>
<td>Rental assistance: Leasing, Agency owned units: No</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS/SafeHouse</td>
<td>RRH Families (Expansion - DV)</td>
<td>Rental assistance: TRA, Agency owned units: No</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHA Update to the Washtenaw County CoC Board
for the September 18, 2019 Board Meeting

• Please SAVE THE DATE for a **Harm Reduction in Policy & Practice Conference** we are co-sponsoring on Tuesday, November 19th from 8am-4pm at Washtenaw Community College (WCC) – Morris Lawrence Building. Other sponsors include: Washtenaw Health Plan; Washtenaw County Health Department; and, WHI CareNet. The Conference is intended to push the envelope on the discussion and implementation of [harm reduction principles](#) in Washtenaw County and the audience will include social workers, nurses, physicians, behavioral health specialists, law enforcement providers, and, other community stakeholders. **Session topics will include:**
  
  - Engaging with People Who Use Drugs
  - Police and Social Work Together
  - Building Design & Inclusive Zoning
  - Exposure to New Models

A registration link should be going out within the next week!

• **National Hunger & Homelessness Awareness Week** is officially November 16-24, 2019. See more at [www.hhweek.org](http://www.hhweek.org). The WHA is planning two events that we hope CoC Board members will attend. These events will be:
  
  - **State of Homelessness Event** – Wednesday, November 13th in the evening at Washtenaw Community College Morris Lawrence Auditorium.
  
  - **Film Screening of the documentary** "Owned: A Tale of Two Americas" – Monday, November 18th in the evening at The Michigan Theater

Some of our partner agencies, are also planning events during National Hunger & Homelessness Awareness Week. Please [sign-up for WHA’s email newsletters](#) (bottom of webpage) and check out [WHA’s Facebook page](#) for more information about all the events happening in our community!

• In July, WHA staff member Amanda Carlisle attended the **National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) Conference in Washington, DC** along with a few other Washtenaw County colleagues. Amanda presented at a session titled, “Connecting Families to Housing: Allocating the Most Intensive Interventions”; other panelists were from California and Ohio. Amanda also participated in NAEH’s Capitol Hill visits, where she visited with Representative Walberg’s staff and the staff of Senators Stabenow and Peters to advocate for additional resources for homelessness and affordable housing.

• The State of Michigan’s [Interagency Council on Homelessness](#) held feedback sessions in Detroit, Lansing, and other parts of Michigan in August and September to help them revise [the state’s action plan](#) for ending homelessness. Several providers from Washtenaw County participated in the sessions, which was great. Also, [Michigan’s Homeless Summit](#) will take place October 2-3, 2019 in Port Huron, MI.
MEMO

To: Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) Board
From: Amanda Carlisle, WHA Executive Director
Date: September 11, 2019
Re: Update Regarding the Sister Yvonne Gellise Fund for Permanent Supportive Housing Services (SYG Fund) – Grant Making Changes for 2020-2022

This memo is intended to provide information about the SYG Fund, and current grant making processes, and inform the CoC Board of intended changes to the grant making process for 2020-2022. These grant making changes will impact the CoC’s Funding Review Team and CoC Board in some ways, so in this memo I am providing details about why, how, and when changes will be made, and the anticipated impacts to the CoC Board and its Funding Review Team (FRT).

As I shared in the WHA’s July 2019 update to the CoC Board, The Sister Yvonne Gellise Fund for Permanent Supportive Housing Services (SYG Fund) is an endowment at the Ann Arbor Area Community Foundation established in 2011 to provide funding for permanent supportive housing services to eliminate homelessness for people with the greatest need, in keeping with recommendations from Washtenaw County’s Blueprint to End Homelessness. The SYG Fund, which has a current market value of approximately $4.06 million, is intended to work in partnership with federal, county and community efforts to stabilize the funding of supportive services to keep people permanently housed, and provides annual distributions to agencies providing permanent supportive housing services. You can find a recently-launched video about the SYG Fund, and find more information about the SYG Fund, at the website www.sygfund.org.

Current Grant Making Process

Currently, the SYG Fund provides annual grants to agencies that provide Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) services; the most-recent year’s grant distributions totaled $79,000 and grants were made to Avalon Housing and Michigan Ability Partners utilizing the Washtenaw Coordinated Funding model. Funding was committed for 2018-2020 under this model.

Proposed Grant Making Changes for 2020-2022

Under an agreement reached between WHA and the AAACF, and endorsed by current SYG Fund grantees, WHA will be assuming the grant-making responsibilities for the SYG Fund from the AAACF beginning in January 2020.

There are two main reasons for this change:

1. We hope to better align the grant making for the SYG Fund with other the homeless sector CoC funding decisions, and in particular the decisions around PSH (bonus/new project process), and
2. By making WHA the grantee, which then sub-grants to non-profit agencies that provide PSH services, AAACF will reduce the administrative fee it takes to administer the SYG Funds, which means more money will be distributed to agencies that provide PSH services.

Who Has Been Notified of this Change in Grant Making To-Date:

- AAACF has been leading this conversation and received approvals from their Board to make the change.
- The WHA Board was notified in several meetings in the spring of 2019, tentatively agreed to the decision in June 2019 (pending next steps and approval by others), and officially granted approval of the change at their September 5, 2019 Board meeting.
- The SYG Fund Cabinet was notified in June 2019 and agreed with the change.
- The WHA Operations Committee was notified in June 2019.
- Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED) staff were notified of the change in summer 2019.
- St. Joe’s leadership was notified in August 2019, since St. Joe’s was the first donor to the Fund.
- The CoC Board is being notified via this communication (September 11, 2019) and will have an opportunity to discuss it at their next Board meeting on September 18th.

Next Steps

- WHA and AAACF will sign an MOU making this change official and effective for three years (2020-2022) in September 2019.
- After the CoC competition concludes in September 2019, WHA and OCED will meet to discuss SYG Fund grant making for calendar 2020-2022 (the term of the arrangement to which WHA/AAACF have agreed).
  - WHA would like to use the existing FRT funding competition process to determine grant making decisions in 2020-2022 (2019 CoC competition to make recommendations for 2020; then use the 2020 CoC competition to make recommendations for 2021; etc). The purpose of this strategy is to reduce the work that any eligible agencies may have to do to submit applications for other funding, and to use an existing Team of volunteers who are knowledgeable about how all permanent supportive housing resources are allocated in Washtenaw County.
  - For the 2020 CoC competition, WHA envisions including detailed information about the SYG Fund in the Request for Proposals that OCED sends out for new/bonus CoC competition funds, and that the FRT will make recommendations, which will then be approved by the CoC Board. We hope to be able to leverage the System Modeling work that is currently being done through the State Innovation Model (SIM) planning funds.

There is still much to be determined regarding these next steps, but I wanted to outline for you all where we may use and add-on to an existing CoC process that involves the Funding Review Team and/or the CoC Board.

Before any final decisions are made, WHA and OCED will develop a draft plan that will be presented to homeless service providers, the CoC Board, and the WHA Board.

Please feel free to reach out to me if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you!
Recuperative Care is a program operated & staffed by the Shelter Association of Washtenaw County in partnership with Packard Health Systems that provides immediate shelter, meals, housing case management, and medical care to homeless persons who require a successful resolution of an acute medical condition or the stabilization of a chronic medical condition. The program offers short-term care to patients with conditions that would be exacerbated by living on the street or other unsuitable places. The program maintains 6 beds (4 for men and 2 for women) at the Delonis Center. Although care and rest are provided the RCC is not a skilled nursing facility. On-site nursing staffing is limited and is primarily for treatment planning and health education. Please review the attached admission criteria carefully before submitting a formal referral application.

**WHEN TO MAKE A REFERRAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrals and Client Intakes are accepted from:</th>
<th>Referrals to hold a bed for next business day accepted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. Monday-Thursday</td>
<td>1 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 1 p.m. Friday</td>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. Saturday-Sunday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHO CAN MAKE A REFERRAL?**

A social worker, discharge planner, registered nurse, or prescriber may call to initiate a referral and check on bed availability.

**MAKING A REFERRAL**

Review admissions criteria on referral form. Call Delonis staff at **734-662-2829 x254** to leave contact information for RCC Admissions staff. RCC Admissions staff will return your call to discuss client referral. Once client is discussed for preliminary appropriateness for RCC, the referral form will be faxed to **734-996-3022** and reviewed by Admissions staff for acceptance or denial. Call **734-961-1999** for a HAWC Referral with client and mention Recuperative Care Center.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?**

Once the Referral Form is received, the Admissions staff will determine if the patient meets the Recuperative Care admission criteria. After review, the referring agency or provider will be notified (within a few hours) of acceptance or denial. If approved, the remainder of the Recuperative Care Referral documents need to be faxed to the Admissions staff.

The Program Director will then arrange the date and time for RCC admission will usually be the following business day. If a same day discharge is needed, discharge must be arranged early enough in the day for them to arrive prior to 4:30 PM. The discharging facility is responsible for arranging transportation. Clients to be admitted must arrive the following day at the RCC between Monday through Friday 8:30-4:30 PM.
WHAT HAPPENS NEXT? (CONT.)
If a client is deemed medically inappropriate, requiring a higher level of care, or does not have required medications upon arrival to our Recuperative Care Center, he/she will be returned to the referring facility.

Patients MUST BE PROVIDED a 30-day supply of all necessary medication unless a shorter course of administration is recommended or other arrangements are made with the RCC Program Director.

Patients MUST BE PROVIDED with assistive device for ambulation if prescribed by referring facility.

PROGRAM GUIDELINES/Criteria
Referrals are screened and evaluated by the on-call provider upon receiving the faxed Referral Form which MUST BE COMPLETED by the referring provider. A preliminary approval will be determined in a timely manner.

PATIENTS MUST:
- Experiencing homelessness including: residing in a place not mean for habitation, including an uninhabitable home, and/or previously living in an unstable environment that does not allow recuperation
- Have a medical issue that would benefit from an RCC stay
- Be independent in Activities of Daily Living or have adequate assistance and care
- Be willing to come to Delonis Center, comply with medical recommendations, and progress medical goals--unique circumstances of awaiting for guardianship or power of attorney approval, a SAWC staff can visit the patient at the hospital to share RCC program details
- Be bowel and bladder continent
- Be medically and psychiatrically stable enough to receive care in our Recuperative Care Center. Must not be suicidal or homicidal (danger to self or others).
- Patients requiring IV Antibiotic must be able to self-administer or the discharging facility needs to arrange to have a Home Health Nurse come to the RCC location to assist the patient
- Not require skilled nursing care unless it can be provided by Home Health nursing
- Not received benzodiazepine for alcohol withdrawal in the past 24 hours
- Be diabetes independent (with supplies) or would benefit from ongoing education and training
- Have a condition with an identifiable end point of care for discharge

EXCLUSION CRITERIA
- Active substance abusers unable or unwilling to abstain when on premises during the Recuperative Care stay
- A person with an active communicable disease such as the flu, MRSA, VRE etc. Isolation is not possible in the Delonis Center.

PAPERWORK REQUIRED POST PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF ACCEPTANCE AND PRIOR TO ADMISSION:

From hospital/inpatient:
- Recuperative Care Referral Form
- Release of Information from referring entity naming the Shelter Association of Washtenaw County
- Discharge summary
- Psychiatric or substance abuse consultations
- All pertinent social service information

From Emergency and Outpatient Department:
- Recuperative Care Referral Form
- Discharge summary
- All pertinent clinical information (i.e. labs, x-rays, etc.)
- TB status or other infectious diseases disclosure (i.e. MRSA, VRE, etc.)