

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care

2014 Funding Competition Process: Ranking, Project Priority Listing & New
PSH Project Application

This report and its contents were approved by the CoC Board on November 12, 2014.

*Prepared by the Office of Community & Economic Development
www.ewashtenaw.org/oced
November 2014*

Introduction

The federal Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act reauthorizes the 1992 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 CoC 2014 Competition Notification of Funding Availability (NOFA) was released on September 16th, 2014. In addition to instructions about submitting renewal projects, this year's NOFA provided an opportunity for all communities to submit one 'bonus' project application for a Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) project to exclusively serve chronically homeless households. To ensure a fair and transparent process, a Request for Proposals (RFP) process was completed to select an applicant.

For renewal project and the new PSH project application, HUD requires that the local Continuum of Care board ensure the review and ranking/selection of each project. This process is completed by the Funding Review Team (FRT), a standing subcommittee of the CoC.

In order to meet the October 30th, 2014 deadline, the CoC Board voted electronically on both the renewal project rankings and the new PSH project application. This process report document will be brought to the CoC Board for review and approval at the November 12, 2014 board meeting.

CoC Renewal Scoring and Ranking Process

Washtenaw County receives approximately \$4.4 million in CoC funding 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 Office of Community & Economic Development- in its role as the Continuum of Care Collaborative Applicant- staffs the Funding Review Team (FRT) in the review and ranking process associated with this CoC funding competition, and does so upon the release of the NOFA from HUD.

As in past years, HUD requires the renewal projects to be ranked in two tiers, the first including 98% of renewal funding, and the second the remaining 2%. Washtenaw County scored well last year with 135 points out of a possible 156. This year, HUD is using the same score in lieu of a community-level application. Moreover, HUD predicted sufficient funding for all renewal projects, giving reasonable expectations that currently funded projects will be fully renewed.

Using a standard scoring rubric (attachment A) to review project outcomes, data quality, and HUD compliance based on HUD audits and expenditure of funds, the FRT was able to score projects and rank them according to the 2014 CoC Ranking Policy (attachment B), adopted by the CoC Board in early October. Using the scoring rubric, the FRT also identified agency- and program-specific concerns for improvement in the next year (see attachment C).

As seen in the following table, Tier 1 includes PSH projects ranked first (by score), RRH projects next (by score), and the planning grant last. The four new renewal grants were not scored on the rubric due to their late start date (October 1, 2014), and were ranked after the scored projects according to the CoC Ranking Policy.

CoC 2014 Renewal Projects Ranking

Tier	No.	Applicant Name	Project Name	Project Type	Project Award Amount
TIER 1	1	Michigan Ability Partners	ICAN MVP	PSH	\$ 52,073.00
	2	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	MAP TRA	PSH	\$ 75,546.00
	3	Michigan Ability Partners	GATEWAY WP	PSH	\$ 42,103.00
	4	Ozone House, Inc.	PSH for Young Families	PSH	\$ 45,813.00
	5	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	SAWC SRA	PSH	\$ 61,435.00
	6	POWER Inc.	LIGHT Program	PSH	\$ 181,543.00
	7	Avalon Housing, Inc.	Avalon/Ashley Supportive Housing	PSH	\$ 90,975.00
	8	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	SPC Avalon Bonus	PSH	\$ 18,862.00
	9	Ozone House, Inc.	Supportive Housing for Youth	PSH	\$ 119,860.00
	10	Avalon Housing, Inc.	Avalon/Pontiac Trail Supportive Housing	PSH	\$ 87,797.00
	11	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	SAWC TRA	PSH	\$ 255,439.00
	12	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	MAP SRA	PSH	\$ 327,652.00
	13	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	SPC Avalon SRA	PSH	\$ 232,636.00
	14	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	Avalon- PSH for Families	PSH	\$ 227,779.00
	15	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	Avalon- PSH for Individuals	PSH	\$ 831,415.00
	16	SOS Community Services	RRH 2014	RRH	\$ 164,643.00
	17	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	IHN/SOS RRH-1	RRH	\$ 1,341,124.00
	18	Washtenaw County OCED	Planning Grant	N/A	\$ 54,636.00
TIER 2	19	Ann Arbor Housing Commission	IHN/SOS RRH-2	RRH	\$ 214,145.00
Total					\$ 4,425,476.00

New PSH Project Scoring and Selection Process

The 2014 NOFA allowed for all communities to submit one 'bonus' project application for a Permanent Supportive Housing project that will exclusively serve chronically homeless households in an amount totaling up to 15% of the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). According to this limit, Washtenaw County was eligible to submit an application for one new PSH project that could bring up to an additional \$655,626 to the community.

On October 1st, the Office of Community & Economic Development released a Request for Proposals (RFP) soliciting applications for a PSH project to serve chronically homeless households. The RFP required that applicants' projects meet the following threshold criteria:

- Serve 100% chronically homeless individuals and families
- Provide scattered-site leasing or tenant-based rental assistance
- Be in good standing with HUD
- Request no less than 70% of total program funding for leasing, rental assistance, or operating costs and no more than 30% on supportive services costs
- Demonstrate a plan for rapid implementation of the program within 6 months of the award
- Demonstrate a connection to mainstream service systems
- Be a current participant or agree to participate in the CoC's coordinated assessment system (Housing Access for Washtenaw County)

Two applications were submitted by the deadline, and both applications met the minimum threshold. The applications were then review by the FRT and scored using the attached scoring sheet (attachment D).

Michigan Ability Partners (MAP) submitted an application to serve 10 long term chronically homeless households, specifically those with significant health or behavioral health challenges or functional impairments which require a significant level of support in order to maintain permanent housing. This project requested a total of \$135,036 (rental assistance, supportive services, and admin). The MAP project scored 88 points out of a possible 100 points.

Ann Arbor Housing Commission (AAHC) & Avalon Housing submitted an application to serve 52 chronically homeless individuals who are medically fragile, and high utilizers of emergency health systems. This project seeks to identify these chronically homeless individuals through the Washtenaw County FUSE initiative- a permanent supportive housing program targeting high cost individuals that began as part of a national demonstration project of the Corporation for Supportive Housing. The AAHC/Avalon project requested \$648,089 (rental assistance, supportive services, and admin) and scored 95 points out of a possible 100.

Applicant	FRT Score	Amount Requested
MAP	88/100	\$ 135,036
AAHC & Avalon	95/100	\$ 648,089

Based upon the stated scoring criteria, the FRT recommended the AAHC/Avalon project be included as the bonus project in the 2014 CoC competition for Washtenaw County.

As with the 2013 CoC competition, Washtenaw County consulted with Housing Innovations, Inc. in order to submit the most competitive PSH project application. In their role, they guided the RFP process and reviewed the CoC approved application for completeness and accuracy. In addition, Housing Innovations held a mandatory conference call on October 7th, 2014 with all interested applicants to provide NOFA guidance and answer any question application questions.

CoC Board Approval of FRT Recommendations

Due to the timing of the release of the NOFA and the due date for application submission occurring between CoC Board meetings, the Board voted electronically to approve the submitted FRT recommendations. Following the CoC Governance Charter, items up for vote need at least half of the Board for approval. The CoC Board received all necessary information on 10/17/14 to vote on renewal ranking and the new PSH project application. Votes were finalized on 10/20/17. The renewal project ranking was approved by the board and passed with 11 out of 17 board members voting to approve the rankings. Out of the 21 Board members, four Board members abstained due to conflict of interest and six did not respond. For the new PSH bonus project, the board approved the FRT recommended project with 12 out of 19 board members voting to approve it. Out of 21 Board members, two abstained due to conflict of interest and six did not respond.

On October 30th, OCED- in their role as lead applicant- submitted the approved 2014 renewal project ranking and new PSH project application to HUD.

FUNDING REVIEW TEAM

RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING RUBRIC

AGENCY:		PROGRAM:			
SECTION 1 - PROGRAM OUTCOMES (OUT OF __ LEAVERS)					
Criteria	Standard	Agency Rate	Scoring	Points/ Possible Points	Source
Occupancy/Average Bed Utilization Rate	90%		90% or > = 10 85-89% = 5 75%-84% = 2 Below 75%=0	/10	APR
<u>PSH Programs:</u> Length of stay 7 months or longer for leavers	85%		85% or > = 10 80-84% = 5 Below 80%=0	/10	APR
Leavers who Exit to Shelter, Streets or Unknown	10% or <		0-5%=10 6-10%=5	/10	APR
Health Insurance at Program Exit (Includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Health Care)	60%		60% or > = 8 50-59% = 4 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/8	APR
Food Stamps Rate for Leavers	60%		60% or > = 9 50-59% = 4 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/9	APR
Employment Rate for Leavers	35%		35% or > = 10 25-34% = 6 20-24% = 3 Below 20% = 0	/10	APR
Income Amounts Maintained or Increased for Leavers	85%		85% or > = 8 75 – 84% = 4 Over 20% = 0	/8	APR
Leavers with Any Cash Financial Resources	83%		83% or > = 8 70-82% = 4 Below 70% = 0	/8	APR
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY			___/73		

SECTION 2 – COMPLIANCE

Criteria	Standard	Agency Rate	Scoring	Points/ Possible Points	Source
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 = 10 Findings with CAP submitted = 5 Findings but no CAP = 0	/5	Agency report
Agency returned funds to HUD on one or more existing grants in the last two years.	No		No=5 Yes=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
SUBTOTAL COMPLIANCE			___/15		

SECTION 3 – HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY

Criteria	Standard	Agency Rate	Scoring	Points/ Possible Points	Source
*HMIS - % of Universal Data Elements (UDEs) with No or Null Values in HMIS (left blank) for the following criteria:					
Name	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Date of Birth	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Gender	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Social Security Number	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Race	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Ethnicity	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Veteran Status	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Disabling Condition	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Residence prior to program entry	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Zip code of last residence	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Destination	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Housing Status	5% or < *		5% or < = 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY			___/12		
TOTAL (SECTION 1 + SECTION 2)			___/100		

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE (CoC) FY2014 PROJECT COMPETITION

RANKING POLICY 2014

Each year, HUD requires all new and renewal applications submitted as a part of the annual Continuum of Care funding competition to be ranked according to a CoC-approved, community ranking policy. As with the 2013 CoC Application, HUD is mandating that projects be ranked into two tiers for the 2014 CoC Competition. The 2014 CoC NOFA indicates that Tier 1 should include projects that total up to 98% of Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) and Tier 2 should include all remaining projects, up to 2% of ARD. Within the tiers, HUD indicates that it will fund projects in the following order:

1. Renewal permanent housing projects (Rapid Re-Housing – RRH, and Permanent Supportive Housing - PSH);
2. New PSH projects created through reallocation for 100 percent CH
3. New rapid re-housing created through reallocation for homeless families
4. Renewal safe havens;
5. Renewal transitional housing;
6. Coc planning costs;
7. UFA costs;
8. SSO projects for centralized or coordinated assessment system;
9. Renewal HMIS;
10. All other renewal supportive services only projects, and
11. Any application submitted by coc not included in the HUD-approved GIW.

This year, our community has the opportunity to apply for a “bonus” permanent supportive housing project in the amount of \$655,626 (15% of ARD). This bonus project is not ranked within this tiered system.

For the 2014 CoC Competition, Washtenaw County CoC is committed to the following ranking policy:

Place projects into Tier 1 in the following order:

1. All renewal projects, ranked by project component in accordance with HUD priorities (PSH first, RRH second).
 - a. Within each project component, rank according to evaluation score (i.e. higher-scoring PSH projects first, then lower-scoring PSH projects, then higher scoring RRH projects, etc.).
 - b. Projects with equal scores and same project component type are ranked alphabetically
 - c. Within project component, rank projects renewing for the first time that have not completed an APR, and thus do not have a renewal score, at the end of that funding component. For example, PSH projects renewing for the first time will be the last ranked PSH projects
 - d. Note: This year our community does not have new reallocation projects, safe haven projects, transitional housing projects, UFA costs, SSO projects, or stand-alone HMIS projects.
2. The Continuum of Care Planning Grant will be ranked at the bottom of Tier 1 for continued funding to support the work of the Collaborative Applicant.

Place all remaining projects into Tier 2 in the following order:

1. All remaining renewal projects that did not fit into Tier 1, ranked in the same order as Tier 1 projects.

Bonus Project: Not ranked.

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care Scoring Rubric Findings

The standard scoring rubric (attachment A) reviewed the program performance in three sections:

Section 1- Program Outcomes- Data is pulled from the agency’s Annual Progress Report (APR) to review program outcomes such as bed utilization rate, length of stay in program, and food stamps rate for those who exit the program. Program outcomes were scored against a community standard as seen in attachment A.

Section 2- Compliance- Agencies reported whether they had any unresolved HUD audit findings, returned HUD funds in the last two years, or had outstanding obligations to HUD.

Section 3- HMIS Compliance & Data Quality: Data entry quality in HMIS for Universal Data Elements (e.g. social security number, veteran status, date of birth) was reviewed.

Upon reviewing agency and program performance for each grantee, the FRT identified the following areas for improvement.

Avalon Housing

Programs:

SRA, Pontiac-Trail, Avalon-Ashley, SPC Bonus

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes across all programs: health insurance rate, food stamps rate, employment rate, clients who gained cash financial resources, clients who gained or maintained income. Avalon performed well in other program outcomes.

Compliance:

While compliant in HUD audits and the timeliness of their fund draws, Avalon returned 6.5% of funds in combined TRA funding. The agency indicates that this is due to the unpredictability of Rental Assistant vouchers where the subsidy amount can change with the tenant’s income and also due to vacancies. Avalon has a process for grant management in place where they evaluate SPC usage during the grant year and add additional vouchers if they are underutilizing the funds. While Avalon’s percent returned was below the threshold of 7.5% used for scoring purposes, the FRT recommends that they continue to evaluate their SPC usage to ensure as few funds are returned to HUD as possible.

Data Quality:

Avalon’s data quality varied across programs and need improvements to resolve inconsistencies. Data entry improvements are needed particularly in the race and ethnicity data elements.

Michigan Ability Partners (MAP)

Programs:

TRA, SRA, MVP/ICAN, Willowpond-Gateway

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes across all programs: health insurance rate, employment rate. . Moreover, the TRA and SRA programs did not meet the scoring threshold for clients who exited the program with cash resources. MAP performed well in all other program outcomes.

Compliance:

While compliant in HUD audits and the timeliness of their fund draws, MAP returned 7.2% of funds in combined SRA and TRA funding. The agency indicates that this is due to the unpredictability of Rental Assistant vouchers where the subsidy amount can change with the tenant's income and also due to vacancies. While MAP's percent returned was below the threshold of 7.5% used for scoring purposes, the FRT recommends that they evaluate their voucher usage to ensure as few funds are returned to HUD as possible.

Data Quality:

No issues were identified.

Ozone House

Programs:

PSH for Young Families, Supportive Housing for Youth

Program Outcomes:

The following outcomes received low scores for those who exited the program with health insurance, food stamps, cash financial resources, and an increase or maintenance in income. Ozone performed well in all other program outcomes.

Compliance:

No issues were identified.

Data Quality:

Ozone House's data quality varied across programs and could use improvements to resolve inconsistencies.

POWER, Inc.

Program:

LIGHT

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes across all programs: food stamp rates, clients who increased or maintained their income. LIGHT Program scored well in all other program outcomes.

Compliance:

No issues were identified.

Data Quality:

POWER's data quality needs improvement and should work with the HMIS program administrator to address data entry issues.

Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC)

Programs:

TRA, SRA

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes across all programs: health insurance rate, food stamps rate, employment rate, clients with cash financial resources, and clients who increased or maintained their income. SAWC performed well in other program outcomes.

Compliance:

While compliant in HUD audits and the timeliness of their fund draws, SAWC returned 14.6% of funds in combined TRA and SRA funding. In response to the high percentage, SAWC reported they held vouchers for the FUSE initiative and, while all of the vouchers were full in the end, they had months in which they were not full, hence not spending grant money. While the FRT applauds the leveraging of community resources to support the FUSE initiative, this is above the 7.5% threshold and they recommend that SAWC work closely with partners to create a process to avoid this in the future.

Data Quality:

SAWC's data quality varied across programs and could use improvements to resolve inconsistencies.

SOS Community Services

Program:

RRH

Please note that this program began January 2014 and has not yet operated for a full grant year.

Program Outcomes:

The following program outcomes did not meet the threshold used for scoring purposes: food stamps rate, employment rate, and clients who increased or maintained their income. SOS scored well in all other program outcomes.

Compliance:

No issues were identified.

Data Quality:

No issues were identified.

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE

SCORING SHEET FOR NEW APPLICATIONS

Reviewer: Please read this document in its entirety before beginning. The appendix has relevant excerpts and definitions to help guide your review of the applications.

Funding Opportunity: _____ CoC 2014 Competition: Application for New PSH Project _____

Name of Project & Sponsor: _____

Reviewer's Name (please print): _____

THRESHOLD & QUALITY REVIEW:

Under the FY2014-2015 CoC Program NOFA, HUD will review new PSH project applications to determine if they meet project quality threshold requirements on a pass/fail standard. Projects that do not meet threshold requirements will be rejected by HUD. Due to this, only project applications that meet the threshold requirements will be reviewed and scored by the Funding Review Team (FRT). HUD Threshold requirements are as follows:

1. **Applicant proposes to serve 100 percent chronically homeless individuals and families.**
2. **Applicant proposes to provide scattered-site leasing or tenant-based rental assistance; OR** if the applicant can provide a deed or long-term lease demonstrating site control for a building or units where evidence of site control exceeds the requested grant term, and where the building or units are ready to be occupied no later than 6 months after the award of funds, the applicant may instead **request operating costs or project-based rental assistance.**
3. **Applicant is in good standing with HUD** (does not have any open monitoring findings, or history of slow expenditure of grant funds).
4. **Applicant demonstrates a plan for rapid implementation of the program within 6 months of the award.**
5. **Proposed project meets the following budget requirements: Applicant requests no less than 70 percent of total program funding** (not including funds for administration) for leasing, rental assistance, or operating costs. **No more than 30 percent of the total program funding may be used for supportive services costs and the types of supportive services for which the funding may be used is limited to the following:** assistance with moving costs, case management, food, housing/search and counseling services, life skills, outreach services, transportation, and utility deposits (only if these are not included in rental/lease agreement); All other eligible supportive services costs under the CoC Program interim rule are not eligible costs.
6. **Applicant is a current participant or agrees to participate in the CoC's coordinated assessment system, Housing Access for Washtenaw County (HAWC).** (local threshold)
7. **Project applicant is located within Washtenaw County** (Washtenaw County CoC's geographic area). (local threshold)

The FRT will review those submitted projects that meet the threshold. These will be reviewed for quality and scored using the scoring sheet attached. The highest scoring project will be recommended to the CoC Board for funding.

SCORING CRITERIA

SCORE

PRIORITIZING HIGHEST NEED- THE CHRONICALLY HOMELESS (MAXIMUM 10 POINTS)

Applicants may receive up to 10 points based on the extent to which the project applicant demonstrates that it will first serve the chronically homeless according to the order of priority established *Notice CPD-14-012: Prioritizing Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness and Other Vulnerable Homeless Persons* (included in the appendix).

Applicant clearly describes the system it currently uses to determine severity of need for the chronically homeless.	___/3
--	-------

Applicant includes its process for prioritizing persons with the most severe needs.	___/4
---	-------

Applicant explains the outreach process used to engage chronically homeless persons living on the streets and in shelter.	___/3
---	-------

COMMENTS:

PRIORITIZING HIGHEST NEED SCORE	___/10
--	---------------

HOUSING FIRST (MAXIMUM 10 POINTS)

Applicants may receive up to 10 points based on the extent to which the Permanent Supportive Housing project will follow a Housing First (HF) model. Housing First definition is included in the appendix.

Applicant demonstrates it has experience in operating a successful housing first program	___/5
--	-------

Applicant clearly describes a program design that meets the definition of HF as described in CoC Notice (included in the appendix).	___/5
---	-------

COMMENTS:

HOUSING FIRST SCORE	___/10
----------------------------	---------------

MAINSTREAM SERVICES (MAXIMUM 10 POINTS)	
Applicant demonstrates that specific activities are in place to identify and enroll all Medicaid-eligible program participants, regardless of whether the project applicant's state is participating in Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act	___/5
Applicant demonstrates that the project includes Medicaid-financed services, including case management, tenancy supports, behavioral health services, or other services important to supporting housing stability. Project applicants may include Medicaid-financed services either by the recipient receiving Medicaid coverage payments for services provided to project participants or through formal partnerships with one or more Medicaid billable providers (e.g., Federally Qualified Health Centers). No points will be awarded for Medicaid-financed health services provided in a hospital setting. Where projects can demonstrate that there are barriers to including Medicaid-financed services in the project, applicants will receive up to 5 points under this paragraph for demonstrating that the project leveraged non-Medicaid resources available in the CoC's geographic area, including mainstream behavioral health system resources such as mental health or substance abuse prevention and treatment block grants or state behavioral health system funding.	___/5
COMMENTS:	
MAINSTREAM SERVICES SCORE	___/10
LEVERAGING (MAXIMUM 5 POINTS)	
Applicants may receive up to 5 points based on the extent to which the project will leverage additional resources to develop a comprehensive project that meets the needs of the chronically homeless and ensure successful program outcomes.	
Applicant demonstrates, with a written commitment, that the cash or in-kind value of leveraged commitments is at least 200 percent of the total request to HUD.	___/5
COMMENTS:	
LEVERAGING SCORE	___/5
APPLICANT/SPONSOR HISTORY AND EXPERIENCE (MAXIMUM 20 POINTS)	
Applicant's prior experience in serving homeless people and in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application. (10 points)	___/10
Satisfactory experience with prior HUD grants and other public contracts, including satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients (if applicable), regular drawdowns, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of APRs on existing grants. (10 points)	___/10

COMMENTS:	
APPLICANT HISTORY SCORE	
	___/20
QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM (MAXIMUM 20 POINTS)	
Extent to which the applicant establishes performance measures for housing and income that are measurable, objective and meet or exceed any established HUD, HEARTH or CoC benchmarks. (10 points)	___/10
Extent to which the applicant provides a sound plan to ensure that homeless people will be assisted to both OBTAIN and REMAIN in permanent housing. (5 points)	___/5
Extent to which there is a sound plan to ensure that participants will be assisted both to increase their INCOMES and to maximize their ability to LIVE INDEPENDENTLY. (5 points)	___/5
COMMENTS:	
QUALITY OF PROGRAM SCORE	
	___/20
OUTREACH TO ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS (MAXIMUM 5 POINTS)	
Extent to which the applicant identifies specific and appropriate programs (street outreach and shelters) from which it obtains referrals of potential eligible program participants that will ensure the project operates at full capacity and that eligible persons are served (coming from the streets or shelter for all programs, must also be chronically homeless for PSH).	___/5
COMMENTS:	
OUTREACH SCORE	
	___/5
TIMELINESS (MAXIMUM 10 POINTS)	
Extent to which applicant demonstrates a plan for rapid implementation of the program; the project narrative must document how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant within 6 months of the award.	___/10
COMMENTS:	

TIMELINESS SCORE	___/10
ACCURACY OF BUDGETS AND CHARTS (MAXIMUM 10 POINTS)	
Accuracy of budget documents (5 points)	___/5
Accuracy of bed/participant charts (5 points)	___/5
COMMENTS:	
BUDGET/CHART SCORES	___/10
TOTAL SCORE	___/100

APPENDIX:

Excerpted From Notice CPD-14-012: Prioritizing Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness and Other Vulnerable Homeless Persons

Order of Priority in CoC Program-funded Permanent Supportive Housing Beds Dedicated to Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness and Permanent Supportive Housing Prioritized for Occupancy by Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness

(a) **First Priority**—Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families with the Longest History of Homelessness and with the Most Severe Service Needs. A chronically homeless individual or head of household as defined in 24 CFR 578.3 for whom both of the following are true:

i. The chronically homeless individual or head of household of a family has been homeless and living in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter for at least 12 months either continuously or on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years, where the cumulative total length of the four occasions equals at least 12 months; and

ii. The CoC or CoC Program recipient has identified the chronically homeless individual or head of household, who meets all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of the definition for chronically homeless, of the family as having severe service needs (see Section I.D.3. of this Notice for definition of severe service needs).

(b) **Second Priority**—Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families with the Longest History of Homelessness. A chronically homeless individual or head of household, as defined in 24 CFR 578.3, for which both of the following are true:

i. The chronically homeless individual or head of household of a family has been homeless and living in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter for at least 12 months either continuously or on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years, where the cumulative total length of the four occasions equals at least 12 months; and,

ii. The CoC or CoC program recipient has **not** identified the chronically homeless individual or the head of household, who meets all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of the definition for chronically homeless, of the family as having severe service needs.

(c) **Third Priority**—Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families with the Most Severe Service Needs. A chronically homeless individual or head of household as defined in 24 CFR 578.3 for whom both of the following are true:

i. The chronically homeless individual or head of household of a family has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years, where the total length of those separate occasions equals less than one year; and

ii. The CoC or CoC program recipient has identified the chronically homeless individual or the head of household, who meets all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of the definition for chronically homeless, of the family as having severe service needs.

(d) Fourth Priority--All Other Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families. A chronically homeless individual or head of household as defined in 24 CFR 578.3 for whom both of the following are true:

- i. The chronically homeless individual or head of household of a family has been homeless and living in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter for at least 12 months either continuously or on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years, where the cumulative total length the four occasions is **less than** 12 months; and
- ii. The CoC or CoC program recipient has **not** identified the chronically homeless individual or the head of household, who meets all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of the definition for chronically homeless, of the family as having severe service needs.

DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS:

Chronically Homeless: The definition of "chronically homeless" currently in effect for the CoC Program is that which is defined in the CoC Program interim rule at 24 CFR 578.3, which states that a chronically homeless person is:

(a) An individual who:

- i. Is homeless and lives in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter; and
- ii. Has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least one year or on at least four separate occasions in the last 3 years; and
- iii. Can be diagnosed with one or more of the following conditions: substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability (as defined in section 102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002)), post-traumatic stress disorder, cognitive impairments resulting from brain injury, or chronic physical illness or disability;

(b) An individual who has been residing in an institutional care facility, including a jail, substance abuse or mental health treatment facility, hospital, or other similar facility, for fewer than 90 days and met all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of this definition [as described in Section I.D.2.(a) of this Notice], before entering that facility; or

(c) A family with an adult head of household (or if there is no adult in the family, a minor head of household) who meets all of the criteria in paragraph (1) of this definition [as described in Section I.D.2.(a) of this Notice], including a family whose composition has fluctuated while the head of household has been homeless.

Severity of Service Needs: This Notice refers to persons who have been identified as having the most severe service needs.

(a) For the purposes of this Notice, this means an individual for whom at least one of the following is true:

- i. History of high utilization of crisis services, which include but are not limited to, emergency rooms, jails, and psychiatric facilities; or
- ii. Significant health or behavioral health challenges or functional impairments which require a significant level of support in order to maintain permanent housing. Severe service needs as defined in paragraphs i.

and ii. above should be identified and verified through data-driven methods such as an administrative data match or through the use of a standardized assessment tool that can identify the severity of needs such as the Vulnerability Index (VI), the Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (SPDAT), or the Frequent Users Service Enhancement (FUSE). The determination must not be based on a specific diagnosis or disability type, but only on the severity of needs of the individual.

(b) In states where there is an alternate criteria used by state Medicaid departments to identify high-need, high cost beneficiaries, CoCs and recipients of CoC Program-funded PSH may use similar criteria to determine if a household has severe service needs instead of the criteria defined paragraphs i. and ii. above. However, such determination must not be based on a specific diagnosis or disability type.

Housing First Principles:

(a) Housing First is a programmatic and systems approach that centers on providing homeless people with housing quickly and *then* providing services as needed.

(b) Housing is not contingent on compliance with services – participants are expected to comply with a standard lease agreement and are provided with services and supports to help maintain housing and prevent eviction

(c) Services are provided post-housing to promote housing stability and well-being

(d) Tenants have choice and access to affordable of Housing

(e) Housing is integrated into the Community

(f) Separation of Housing and Treatment – participation in services is not a condition of maintaining tenancy.

(g) Service Philosophy and Service Array

i. Low Demand Approach for Entry into the Housing

ii. Provides Access to Treatment Resources and Supports

iii. Employs Recovery Principles

Disability: A Physical, Mental or Emotional Impairment, including impairment caused by alcohol or drug abuse, post-traumatic stress disorder, or brain injury that Is expected to be long-continuing or of indefinite duration, substantially impedes the individual’s ability to live independently, and could be improved by the provision of more suitable housing conditions and

(a) Developmental Disability Defined in §102 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 USC 15002). Means a severe, chronic disability that Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination AND Is manifested before age 22 AND Is likely to continue indefinitely AND reflects need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated. An individual may be considered to have a developmental disability without meeting three or more of the criteria listed previously, if Individual is 9 years old or younger AND has a substantial developmental delay or specific congenital or acquired condition AND without services and supports, has a high probability of meeting those criteria later in life.

(b) HIV/AIDS Criteria Includes the disease of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) or any conditions arising from the etiologic agent for acquired immunodeficiency syndrome, including infection with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).