

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 can 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 (\$348,374) 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.

CoC BONUS/EXPANSION PROJECTS							
Total funding available: \$290,312							
Populations Served	Total Units	Rental Assistance	Supportive Services	Admin	Subtotal (Funding Request)	Match	Grand Total
AVALON HOUSING- PSH SINGLES EXPANSION APPLICATION							
AVERAGE APPLICATION SCORE: 92.3 POINTS							
<i>Submitted project would expand a current 64 unit PSH project serving Chronically Homeless Individuals</i>							
Chronic Individuals	29 new (64 existing)	\$44,592	\$146,318	\$19,090	\$210,000	\$52,500	\$262,500
SOS COMMUNITY SERVICES – NEW PSH FOR FAMILIES							
AVERAGE APPLICATION SCORE: 86.0							
Chronically Homeless Families with Children	9 units; 25 beds	\$152,916	\$45,866	\$11,218	\$210,000	\$14,271	\$224,271
DV RRH BONUS PROJECTS							
Total funding available: \$154,579							
Populations Served	Total Units	Rental Assistance	Supportive Services	Admin	Subtotal (Funding Request)	Match	Grand Total
SOS COMMUNITY SERVICES- SOS/SAFEHOUSE RRH EXPANSION FOR DV							
AVERAGE APPLICATION SCORE: 85.4 POINTS							
<i>Submitted project would expand a current 122 unit RRH project serving families.</i>							
6 Family Survivors; 2 Individual Survivors	4 units; 11 beds (112 existing units, 425 exiting beds)	\$63,336	\$81,910	\$9,333	\$154,479	\$38,645	\$193,224

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 part of the SOS RRH 2019 renewal project, the bonus projects, and the DV bonus project.

2019 HUD CoC Project Rankings					
TIER	PROJECT STATUS	RANK	PROVIDER	PROJECT	PROJECT AMOUNT
1	Renewal	1	OCED	HMIS	\$ 137,334
		2	MAP	MAP PSH RASS	\$ 368,240
		3	Avalon	Avalon PSH Families	\$ 227,103
		4	Avalon	Avalon PSH Singles	\$ 814,071
		5	Ozone	Ozone Supportive Housing for Youth	\$ 129,016
		6	MAP	MAP MVP	\$ 52,073
		7	MAP	MAP Willowpond	\$ 42,103
		8	Avalon	Avalon/Ashley	\$ 96,549
		9	Avalon	Avalon/Pontiac Trail	\$ 93,537
		10	MAP	MAP SPC SRA	\$ 435,599
		11	Avalon	SPC Avalon SRA + Bonus 2010 Consolidation	\$ 305,436
		12	Avalon*	Avalon 2014 Bonus PSH	\$ 701,945
		13	MAP	MAP PSH PASS	\$ 194,694
		14	MAP	MAP SPC TRA	\$ 384,481
		15	Ozone	Ozone SHP for Young Families	\$ 51,177
				16**	SOS/IHN
TIER 1 TOTAL					\$ 5,457,866
2	Renewal	16**	SOS/IHN	SOS RRH for Families 2019	\$ 348,374
	Bonus Project	17	Avalon	Avalon PSH Singles Expansion	\$ 210,000
	Bonus Project	18	SOS	PSH for Families	\$ 80,312
	DV Bonus	19	SOS	RRH for Families Expansion	\$ 154,579
TIER 2 TOTAL					\$ 793,265
OVERALL TOTAL					\$ 6,251,131
*Ann Arbor Housing Commission is fiduciary.					
**This project will be split in two between Tier 1 and Tier 2.					

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 funding and ranking recommendations submitted by the FRT and 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.

Attachment A

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.								
THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION						THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO)		
Agency meets the financial audit requirements stipulated under the Coordinated Funding Request for Information (RFI).								
Agency has attended at least 1 of 2 CoC All-Membership Meetings in the past 12 months.								
Agency has representation in at least one of the CoC committees (i.e. WHA Operations Committee, Coordinated Entry Oversight & Evaluation) and has attended at least 75% of meetings convened by the committee.								
Agency has a 75 % attendance rate at Community Housing Prioritization Meetings.								
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. <i>Please note: Projects that have not completed a full calendar year will be EXEMPT from this threshold.</i>								
THRESHOLD DESCRIPTION					OUTCOME PERCENTAGE		THRESHOLD MET (YES/NO/EXEMPT)	
Program Outcomes: 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 be considered for funding.					%			
Compliance: 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 be considered for funding.					%			
HMIS Compliance & Data Quality: 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.					%			

NOTE: For threshold items that are not met, the agency will need to submit an explanatory letter to the CoC Funding Review Team to request a waiver for each threshold item not met before the project application can be considered for funding.

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) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Chronically Homeless <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans <input type="checkbox"/> Youth (under 25) <input type="checkbox"/> Families with Children <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse <input type="checkbox"/> HIV/AIDS <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ 	PROJECTED HOUSING TYPE (check all that apply) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Scattered-site apartments: Total Units ____ # Agency Owned ____ <input type="checkbox"/> Clustered apartments: Total Units ____ # Agency Owned ____ <input type="checkbox"/> Single Room Occupancy: Total Units ____ # Agency Owned ____ <input type="checkbox"/> Single-family homes/townhouses/duplexes: Total Units ____ # Agency Owned ____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ Total Units ____ # Agency Owned ____ 	PROJECTED UNITS/BEDS Total Units: ____ (total agency-owned) ____ Total Beds: ____ PROJECTED CLIENTS SERVED Total Households Served: ____ Total Persons Served: ____ Total Adults: ____ Total Accompanied Children (Under 18): ____ Unaccompanied Children (Under 18): ____
--	--	--

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

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

<p>D) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment</p> $\frac{\text{Total no. of Adult (L + S) with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \times 100\%$	20%	%	20% or > = 4 10-19% = 2 Below 10% = 0	/4
<p>E) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adults (L + S) who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \right] \times 100\%$	60%	%	60% or > = 6 40-59% = 4 20-39% = 2 Below 20% = 0	/6
SUBTOTAL PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES			/42	
2B – RAPID RE-HOUSING (RRH) PROJECT OUTCOMES				
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ POSSIBLE POINTS
<p>A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right] \times 100\%$	80%	%	80% or > = 28 65-79% = 21 50-64% = 14 25-49% = 7 Below 25%= 0	/28
<p>B) Leavers with Health Insurance (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right] \times 100\%$	60%	%	60% or > = 4 50-59% = 2 40-49% = 1 Below 40% = 0	/4

<p align="center">C) Employment Rate for Leavers</p> $\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers with earned } Y}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \times 100\%$	20%	%	20% or > = 4 15-19% = 3 10-14% = 2 Below 10% = 0	/4
<p align="center">D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total } Y}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \right] \times 100\%$	60%	%	60% or > = 6 40-59% = 4 20-39% = 2 Below 20% = 0	/6

SUBTOTAL RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES			/42	
--------------------------------------	--	--	------------	--

SECTION 3 - CONSUMER FEEDBACK

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

SUBTOTAL CONSUMER FEEDBACK			/12	
-----------------------------------	--	--	------------	--

SECTION 4 - 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 = 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 $\left[\frac{\text{Amount drawn from LOCCS within 90 days end of project}}{\text{Total Grant Amount}} \right]$ X 100%
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					
CRITERIA	STANDARD	AGENCY RATE	SCORING	POINTS/ POSSIBLE POINTS	SOURCE
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:					
SUBTOTAL BUDGET					/6
SECTION 6 - 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	/0	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
Destination	5% or < *		5% or <= 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
Relationship to Head of Household	5% or < *		5% or <= 1 >5% = 0	/1	HMIS Report
SUBTOTAL HMIS COMPLIANCE & DATA QUALITY					/9
GRAND TOTAL					/89

REVIEWER COMMENTS & QUESTIONS

Reviewer: _____

APPENDIX A: PROJECT OUTCOMES CALCULATIONS

2A –PSH PROJECT OUTCOMES

CRITERIA	SOURCE & CALCULATION	
<p>A) Occupancy/Average Bed Utilization Rate</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of households served}}{\text{Total no. of projected units}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i></p> <p>A. APR Q8a Total Households</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i></p> <p>B. Rubric Section 1: Project Description Total Projected Units</p>	$\frac{A}{B} \times 100\%$
<p>B) Retention of Permanent Housing or Movement to Other Permanent Housing</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of stayers + No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of persons served}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i></p> <p>A. APR Q22a1 Total stayers + B. APR Q23a Permanent Subtotal + C. APR Q23b Permanent Subtotal Q23b</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i></p> <p>D. APR Q7a Total persons served (inc. children)</p>	$\frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100\%$

<p>C) Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment with one or more type of Health Insurance (de-duplicated) (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of (L + S) with HI}}{\text{Total no. of Adults with Annual Assessments and Adult Leavers}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> 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</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> E. APR Q7a Total no. of adults - F. APR Q21 # of stayers not yet required to have an assessment</p>	$\frac{A + B + C + D}{E - F} \times 100\%$
<p>D) Employment Rate for Leavers and Stayers at Annual Assessment</p> $\frac{\text{Total no. of Adult (L + S) with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}}$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> 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</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> E. APR Q18 Total adults + F. APR Q18 Total adult leavers - G. APR Q18 # of stayers not yet required to have an assessment</p>	$\frac{A + B + C + D}{E + F - G} \times 100\%$
<p>E) Leavers and Stayers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{Total no. of Adults (L + S) who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adults served}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> 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</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> D. APR Q19a3* Total adults (including those with no income) * Use row "Number of Adults with any Income" in table Q19a3</p>	$\frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100\%$

2A – RRH PROJECT OUTCOMES

CRITERIA	SOURCE & CALCULATION	
<p>A) Exit to Permanent Housing Destinations</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers exiting to PH types}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q23a Permanent destination subtotal + B. APR Q23b Permanent destination subtotal</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> C. APR Q5a Total leavers -D. APR Q23a Total deceased -E. APR Q23b Total deceased</p>	$\frac{A + B}{C - D - E} \times 100\%$

<p>B) Leavers with Health Insurance (includes Medicaid, Medicare, VA Insurance)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of leavers with HI}}{\text{Total no. of leavers served}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q21 Leavers with 1 source of health insurance + B. APR Q21 Leavers with more than 1 source of health insurance <i>Denominator:</i> C. APR Q5a Total adult leavers</p>	$\frac{A + B}{C} \times 100\%$
<p>C) Employment Rate for Leavers</p> $\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers with earned Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}}$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q18 Adult leavers with only earned income + B. APR Q18 Adult leavers with both earned and other income <i>Denominator:</i> C. APR Q5a Total adult leavers</p>	$\frac{A + B}{C} \times 100\%$
<p>D) Leavers who maintained or increased total income (earned + non-employment income)</p> $\left[\frac{\text{No. of Adult leavers who maintained or } \uparrow \text{ Total Y}}{\text{Total no. of Adult leavers served}} \right]$ <p>X 100%</p>	<p><i>Numerator:</i> A. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and same \$ + B. APR Q19a2* Retained income category and increased \$ + C. APR Q19a2* Did not have income category and gained income <i>Denominator:</i> D. APR Q19a2* Total adults (including those with no income) * Use row "Number of Adults with any Income" in table Q19a2</p>	$\frac{A + B + C}{D} \times 100\%$

Attachment C

2019 HUD CoC Renewal Project Scores

Renewal Project Rankings											
PROVIDER	PROJECT	rental assistance type	Agency owned units	PROJECT OUTCOMES (out of 42 points)	CONSUMER FEEDBACK (out of 12 points)	COMPLIANCE (out of 20 points or 15 for exempt)	BUDGET (out of 6 points)	DATA QUALITY (out of 9 points)	TOTAL SCORE (out of 89 points; see below for exempt)	% TOTAL SCORE	
	Average Score			38	12	20	6	9	84	95%	
	Highest Score			42	12	20	6	9	88	99%	
	Lowest Score			33	12	18	6	8	79	89%	
OCED	HMIS	Infrastructure	n/a	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	EXEMPT	
MAP	MAP PSH RASS	Leasing	yes	40	12	20	6	9	87	98%	
Avalon	Avalon PSH Families	SRA	yes	40	12	20	6	9	87	98%	
Avalon	Avalon PSH Singles	SRA	yes	33	12	20	6	8	79	89%	
Ozone	Ozone Supportive Housing for Youth	TRA	yes	34	12	20	6	9	81	91%	
MAP	MAP MVP	N/A	yes	42	12	20	6	8	88	99%	
MAP	MAP Willowpond	N/A	yes	40	12	20	6	9	87	98%	
Avalon	Avalon/Ashley	N/A	yes	38	12	20	6	9	85	96%	
Avalon	Avalon/Pontiac Trail	N/A	yes	38	12	20	6	9	85	96%	
MAP	MAP SPC SRA	SRA	mixed	40	12	18	6	9	85	96%	
Avalon	SPC Avalon SRA + Bonus 2010 Consolidation	SRA	mixed	36	12	20	6	9	83	94%	
Avalon*	Avalon 2014 Bonus PSH	TRA	mixed	34	12	20	6	9	81	91%	
MAP	MAP PSH PASS	TRA	no	40	12	20	6	9	87	98%	
MAP	MAP SPC TRA	TRA	no	40	12	18	6	8	84	94%	
Ozone	Ozone SHP for Young Families	TRA	no	36	12	20	6	9	83	93%	
SOS/IHN	SOS RRH for Families 2019	RRH TRA	no	42	12	20	6	9	89	100%	
*Project fiduciary is the Ann Arbor Housing Commission.											
PROJECT TYPE:		Permanent Supportive Housing				Rapid Re-Housing					

Attachment D

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE 2019

REVIEWER NAME: _____

APPLICANT AGENCY: _____

PROJECT TITLE: _____

TOTAL SCORE (complete this once scoring rubric is completed): _____

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.

- 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.
- 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.

SCORING COMPONENTS	CRITERIA FOR SCORING	AWARDED POINTS
<p>II (A-H): APPLICANT/ SPONSOR EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience and capacity in delivering housing and supportive services for homeless clients.</p> <p>Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=15), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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’) <p>10-14 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>5-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <u>any</u> corrective action plan or explanation. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>____/15</p>

<p>III (A-G): PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/20</p>
---	---	---------------

<p>IV :</p> <p>COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <p>4-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/10</p>
<p>V: (A-I)</p> <p>SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PARTICIPANTS</p>	<p>This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render participants with the appropriate supportive services crucial for obtaining and sustaining permanent housing outcomes.</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (= 25), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear and comprehensive description of how project assists participants in obtaining and remaining in 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. <p>16-24 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>___/25</p>

	<p>areas of doubt.</p> <p>6-15 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Comments:</p>	
<p>VI: LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT <i>(APPLIES TO SCATTERED-SITE PROJECTS ONLY)</i></p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency's engagement efforts with landlords towards increasing affordable housing availability. (Applies to scattered-site projects only)</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description of applicant's outreach and engagement efforts with landlords is provided. • There is strong evidence of an ongoing positive relationship and communication with landlords that enhances their participation. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description provided. • Limited evidence of an ongoing positive relationship and communication with landlords. <p>0-1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no consideration for outreach to and engagement with landlords. • No evidence of relationship and communication with landlords. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/5</p>
<p>VII: COMMITMENT TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN <i>(APPLIES TO PROJECT-BASED PROJECTS ONLY)</i></p>	<p>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)</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and comprehensive description of how the project's location and design aligns with the <i>Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis</i>. 	<p>___/5</p>

	<p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description provided. • Limited alignment with <i>Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis</i>. <p>0-1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of alignment with <i>Housing Affordability and Economic Equity Analysis</i>. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	--	--

<p>VIII: PARTNERING AND COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with applicant agency's commitment to working collaboratively within the Continuum of Care.</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=5), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-1 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description is vague and indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process. <p>Comments:</p>	/5
--	--	----

<p>IX: BUDGET DETAIL</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project.</p> <p>Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=20), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	___/20
---------------------------------	---	--------

	<p>project requirements.</p> <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors.• Quantity descriptions are unclear and most parts are lacking in logic and connection to the overall application. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget charts are unclear on the whole and lacking in logic and connection to the overall application; multiple calculation errors.• Overall responses provided indicate poor adherence to the specific requirements in each section. <p>Comments:</p>	
--	--	--

Overall Comments:

Attachment E

WASHTENAW COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE 2019

REVIEWER NAME: _____

APPLICANT AGENCY: _____

PROJECT TITLE: _____

TOTAL SCORE (complete this once scoring rubric is completed): _____

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 y-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.

SCORING COMPONENTS	CRITERIA FOR SCORING	AWARDED POINTS
<p>II (A-N): APPLICANT/ SPONSOR EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the applicant’s level of experience & capacity in delivering housing & supportive services for homeless clients. Suggested scoring scale: For maximum points (=15), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description (backed with concrete examples) of experience with renting units, operating rental assistance & providing supportive services with concrete examples of how applicant has identified & addressed target population’s housing & service needs. • Concrete example of level of need for this population & description of data sets/sources used to understand the need. • Clear description of experience executing requirements of the Violence Against Women Act (safety planning, confidentiality & record keeping requirements). • Concrete examples of providing holistic services to DV survivors & a description of key partnerships & their role in the success of program participants, especially partnering with DV providers if applicant is not a DV provider. • Clear description of applicant & subrecipient (if any) experience in collecting all required HUD data elements & generating required reports, as well as the infrastructure that ensures these requirements are met. • DV providers must use data from an HMIS-comparable database. • If it is a joint application, role of each partner is clearly described & delineated • Applicant agency has a strong management & 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 & no detrimental audit findings. (i.e. answers to questions IIK-N must be ‘No’). <p>10-14 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description & demonstration of above criteria with good examples given to support content. • 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. <p>5-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above criteria are not fully or clearly met. Some attempt to provide examples to demonstrate (i) & (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. <p>0-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <u>any</u> corrective action plan or explanation. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>____/15</p>

<p>III (A-E): PROJECT DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p style="text-align: right;">___/20</p>

<p>IV: COMMITMENT TO HOUSING FIRST</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the project’s alignment and commitment to the Housing First approach to homeless assistance.</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <p>4-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No clear evidence that applicant understands or has incorporated Housing First principles within its service delivery approach. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/10</p>
---	---	---------------

<p>V: (A-I) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR PARTICIPANTS</p>	<p>This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render participants with the appropriate supportive services crucial for obtaining & sustaining permanent housing outcomes.</p> <p>Suggested Scoring Scale: For maximum points (= 25), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear & comprehensive description of how project assists participants in obtaining & remaining in permanent housing. • Project includes a well-thought through plan for individual case management & linkage to mainstream health, social services, and employment resources & benefits where participants meet eligibility criteria. • Supportive services are tailored to the needs of program participants & appropriate measures are in place to reduce barriers to access (e.g. accessible location, relevant type of aid, etc.). • Detailed, coherent & well-thought through “Supportive Services Type & Frequency Chart” that is feasible for implementation. <p>16-24 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate description of how project functions to assist clients in obtaining & 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 & Frequency” Chart is adequately filled up with some areas of doubt. <p>6-15 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions & responses to questions are often inadequate & 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 & sought to minimize them. • “Supportive Services Type & Frequency” Chart raises doubts for implementation. <p>0-5 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions & 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 & Frequency Chart” does not match applicant agency capacity & is not feasible for implementation. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/25</p>
--	--	---------------

<p>VI: LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity in description provided. • Limited evidence of an ongoing positive relationship & communication with landlords. <p>0-2 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no consideration for outreach to & engagement with landlords. • No evidence of relationship & communication with landlords. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/5</p>
<p>VII: PARTNERING & COMMITMENT TO COORDINATED ENTRY</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>2-4 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>0-2 point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description is vague & indicates little or no commitment towards partnership or the coordinated entry process. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>/5</p>

<p>VIII: BUDGET DETAIL</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>14-19 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some errors in budget charts, including calculation errors. • Quantity descriptions are unclear & most parts are lacking in logic & connection to the overall application. <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Comments:</p>	<p>____/20</p>
---------------------------------------	---	----------------

Overall Comments:

Attachment F

2019 HUD CoC Bonus (including DV Bonus) Project Scores

Bonus Project Scores													
PROVIDER	PROJECT	Rental assistance	Agency owned units	Applicant/ Sponsor Experience and Capacity (out of 15 points)	Project Description (out of 20 points)	Commitment to Housing First (out of 10 points)	Supportive Services (out of 25 points)	Landlord Engagement (out of 5 points)	Commitment to Affordable Housing Plan (out of 5 points)	Coordinated Entry (out of 5 points)	Budget (out of 20 points)	TOTAL SCORE (out of 100 points)	% TOTAL SCORE
Avalon	PSH Singles (Expansion)	4 SRA	Yes	13.4	18.2	9.8	24	N/A	4.4	5	18.4	93.2	93.2%
SOS	PSH Families (New)	Leasing	No	11.6	16.6	9	21	4.6	N/A	5	18.2	86	86.0%
SOS/SafeHouse	RRH Families (Expansion - DV)	TRA	No	12.6	17.4	8	21	4.4	N/A	4.8	17.2	85.4	85.4%