

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC)

Special Notice of Funding Opportunity to Address Rural & Unsheltered Homelessness (SNOFO)

Funding Review Team (FRT) Recommendations

September 29, 2022

Introduction & Funding Competition Details

On June 22, 2022, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released a new funding opportunity to help communities address rural and unsheltered homelessness (SNOFO). Washtenaw County CoC is not eligible for funds to address rural homelessness but can apply for funds to address unsheltered homelessness. HUD will award \$322 million to communities through this NOFO. It is a competitive process. Up to 10 CoCs per state can be awarded, although there is no minimum or maximum total number of CoCs. Washtenaw County CoC is eligible for up to **\$2,064,692** in project awards. HUD will rate CoC on their plan to leverage housing and healthcare resources, use of data-driven strategies and Housing First approaches to address unsheltered homelessness, and plan to serve underserved communities and advance racial equity. HUD will rank CoCs by their application score and then fund allowable projects according to the CoC Priority Listing. Allowable projects include:

1. Permanent Housing, including Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), and Joint Transitional Housing/Rapid Re-Housing (TH-RRH)
2. Supportive Services Only (SSO), Street Outreach & Other
3. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

CoCs can also apply for up to 3% of the maximum award for CoC Planning costs.

Community Discussions on August 24th and 25th and an open comment period through September 9th informed the Ranking Policies presented to and approved by the CoC Board on September 21st. The Ranking Policy (Appendix A) specifies a series of threshold criteria for general eligibility as well as a ranking order by project type. It prioritizes SSO, RRH, HMIS, and then CoC Planning Projects. The community is interested in funding each project category including other eligible projects. In open discussions, community members shared how this is an important opportunity to fund projects not typically eligible in the regular CoC Program NOFO, such as SSO projects, and to serve people – namely, non-chronic households – who lack resources in our current system.

Washtenaw County CoC invited applications from new and existing CoC providers. Letters of Intent were due by September 12th and full applications by September 23rd. Three organizations submitted Letters of Intent for new projects. Final applications received included (grant amounts shown are for all three years of funding):

- Avalon Housing – Rapid Re-Housing – \$936,444
 - Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC) – Supportive Services Only – \$552,000
 - Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED) – HMIS – \$53,437.98
 - Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (OCED) – CoC Planning – \$61,940.76
- Total: \$1,603,822.74 (\$460,869.26 short of total eligibility)*

FRT Funding Considerations

The FRT met on September 29th to review and discuss project applications per the Project Rubrics (Appendix B). FRT members appreciated how the applications from SAWC and Avalon fit the unique opportunity of the SNOFO, particularly SAWC's design of a SSO project to expand their recuperative care program. Both SAWC and Avalon leveraged community partnerships (in healthcare and housing, respectively) to build out their applications. The FRT discussed ways to tighten up the project applications for the official submission but did not note any issues that would disqualify an applicant. The FRT brought up the possibility of funding the PSH project Michigan Ability

Partners (MAP) had submitted as a CoC Program Bonus Project. It was not selected because the community's ranking policies for the Bonus Projects prioritized coordinated entry projects. However, the FRT had scored MAP's project highly, and at the CoC Board Meeting on 9/21/22 suggested a change to the SNOFO ranking policies to allow projects originally submitted as a CoC Program Bonus Project to be considered for ranking under the SNOFO. Because the CoC Board approved this change to the ranking policies, the FRT believed including MAP's project in their recommendations would be appropriate. Consequently, the CoC Board will vote on two items: first, to approve their recommendation that the four projects submitted under the SNOFO proceed, and second, to determine if MAP's project should be recommended as well, given that funds are available. The FRT recognizes that partners interested in the CoC Bonus were not aware of the Special NOFO Ranking Policy (and additional funding opportunity available to them) at the time of the Bonus application deadline.

CoC Priority Listing

Because the applications received were all for different project types, scores of individual projects were not compared. Since all projects met the threshold criteria for funding, the FRT ranked them according to the community-approved Ranking Policy as shown below. If approved, the MAP project will be included as well.

1. SSO Project – Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (\$552,000)
2. RRH – Avalon Housing (\$936,444)
3. HMIS – Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (\$53,437.98)
4. CoC Planning – Washtenaw County Office of Community & Economic Development (\$61,940.76)
5. *If approved: PSH – Michigan Ability Partners (\$390,924)
**If MAP project is approved, the new total would be: \$1,994,746.74 (\$69,945.26 short of total eligibility)*

This table summarizes key aspects of each project that applied under the SNOFO.

Organization	Project Description	Population Served	Funding Request
SAWC	Supportive Services. -Coordinate hospital discharge & post-acute care, including referrals, shelter access, housing case management. -Expand recuperative care program.	362 individuals experiencing homelessness with high health needs per year (312 outreach, 50 recuperative)	\$552,000 total -75% staff salaries -10% food -5% transportation -5% move-in costs -5% admin
Avalon	Rapid Re-Housing. -Up to 12 months rental assistance with tenant-based rental assistance (TBRA) or tenant-based Housing Choice voucher. -Supportive services, case management.	About 45 non-chronic individuals experiencing homelessness who have moderate health needs.	\$936,444 total -60% TBRA -27% staff salaries -4% moving/utilities -9% admin
OCED	HMIS. -HMIS support including training, TA, policy development	n/a	\$53,437.98 -100% staff salaries
OCED	CoC Planning. -Oversight of grants, support systems coordination, reporting	n/a	\$61,940.76 total -100% staff salaries

CoC Board Approval of FRT Recommendations

The CoC Board voted during its September 21st meeting to approve the FRT's recommendations via a virtual vote. The virtual vote is taking place beginning after the FRT's meeting and submission of recommendations on September 29th. Approval needs to be complete so that projects can be notified no later than October 5th, as required by HUD. The CoC Board's responsibility in the 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 2022 SNOFO Application and Priority Rankings and publicly post both by October 18, 2022

Appendixes:

1. CoC-Board Approved Project Ranking Policy
2. Project Application Sample Rubric

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) CoC Supplemental to Address Unsheltered and Rural Homelessness FY2022 Funding Competition

2022 Ranking Policy

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has released the [Special Notice of Funding Opportunity \(NOFO\) to Address Unsheltered and Rural Homelessness](#). Washtenaw County is eligible to apply for up to \$2,064,692 through the 2022 funding process.

“Unsheltered homelessness is continuing to rise in many areas of the country and recent analysis of homelessness data shows that people experiencing unsheltered homelessness report significantly greater health challenges and experiences of trauma and violence than their sheltered peers. These challenges often begin before they lose their housing. This NOFO supports this highly vulnerable population by supporting CoCs in their efforts to identify people living in unsheltered situations, including encampments, and connects them with health and housing resources. It also supports CoCs in their efforts to enhance their Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to collect more comprehensive data on people experiencing unsheltered homelessness in their geographic area.” FR-6500-N-25S

Note: This Special NOFO is administered under [24 CFR Part 578](#). This Competition is separate from the FY 2022 CoC Program Competition.

This policy is was approved by the CoC Board on September 21st, 2022.

Eligibility Criteria: Projects must meet the below criteria to be eligible and considered for ranking

- Serve Category 1 Households (literally homeless) who are not chronic and have histories of unsheltered homelessness
- Participate in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
- Align with [Housing First](#)
- Include a robust plan for involving people with lived experience of homelessness in service delivery and decision making
- For New Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) projects, commitments for 50% of units is required to be funded outside of CoC/ESG funding (e.g., Housing Choice Vouchers, HOME-ARP, HOPWA)

*Existing projects/programs that are not currently funded by CoC/ESG funding are considered new for the purposes of this Special NOFO and eligible if the above criterion is met.

Ranking Order: Projects will be ranked in the following order

1. Supportive Services Only (SSO) Projects: Street outreach, Care coordination for high system utilizers (Community Mental Health, Health Care, Treatment Centers, Jails/Prisons, etc.), Discharge planning (Households exiting institutions), Collaborative case management, etc.
2. Supportive Services Only-Coordinated Entry (SSO CE) Projects
3. New Rapid Re-Housing: New construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation is not eligible
4. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Projects: License Fees and Staff to support increased training and technical support
5. CoC Planning Projects: Developing and supporting the CoC system, evaluating and monitoring recipients and subrecipients, preparing and participating in the consolidated plan, etc. as outlined in [24 CFR 578.39](#)

Note: Only a maximum of 3% of the total award can be allocated towards CoC Planning per the Special NOFO.

*Except for CoC Planning Projects, there are no designated caps or maximum allotments for each respective Project. The community is interested in funding each project category including other eligible projects. Projects not selected in the CoC Bonus Application process will be considered for Ranking under the Special NOFO.

SCORING RUBRIC FOR PROJECTS UNDER THE SUPPLEMENTAL NOFO TO ADDRESS UNSHELTERED HOMELESSNESS

Washtenaw County Continuum of Care (CoC) 2022

REVIEWER NAME: _____

APPLICANT AGENCY: _____

PROJECT TITLE: _____

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

INTRODUCTION:

This rubric operationalizes the scoring criteria for project applications in the FY 2022 CoC Supplemental Funding Competition to Address Unsheltered Homelessness. 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.

The “Application for Projects” document contains information about the application process, timeline, and eligibility criteria for applicants and projects. In short, eligible activities include Supportive Services Only (SSO), SSO-Coordinated Entry, HMIS, Rapid Re-Housing, and CoC Planning projects. Through a community process, Washtenaw County CoC determined that projects serving non-chronic Category 1 households with histories of unsheltered homelessness would be prioritized for this funding.

SECTION A: FUNDING ELIGIBILITY AND THRESHOLD CRITERIA CHECKLIST

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.

Quality Thresholds by Project Type

- The project serves the population Washtenaw County decided to prioritize for this opportunity.
- The project meets HUD threshold criteria (at least 4 of the available points):

if Supportive Services: ____ / 6

if Rapid Re-Housing: ____ / 5

Note any criteria the project missed:

Required Attachments:

- Most Recent independent audit and submission of SAS114, and 115, if applicable.
- Current year Board-approved agency budget

SECTION B: SCORING SHEET

FRT members can review the applications and award points according to the extent to which the scoring criteria are met. A point scale is suggested.

SCORING COMPONENTS	CRITERIA FOR SCORING	AWARDED POINTS
<p><i>// (A-H):</i> 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 of experience with renting units, operating rental assistance and providing supportive services that are aligned with what is proposed in the application & backed by examples • 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 • Applicant agency has a strong management and coordination structure, plus 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 CAP 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):</p> <p>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, concise, and addresses whole scope • Has a sound plan for executing the grant agreement, including dates • SSO project type is indicated and strategy enumerated • RRH projects detail unit strategy • Target population/subpopulation to be served is clearly articulated <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 can be clearer. • Project can be more explicit in its description of target population <p>7-13 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were more than 3 areas of project description requiring further clarification, and not all pointers in III(a) were addressed adequately • Timeline for implementation is questionable • Weak demonstration of project's capacity and plan for target population <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 goals of Unsheltered NOFO <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><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=10), application must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant clearly describes expertise in Housing First approach • Project design is aligned with Housing First principles, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Client participation in services is not a prerequisite for housing ○ Few, if any, programmatic requirements for entry into housing ○ 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 and experience lacking • Project design does not fully incorporate Housing First Principles within its service delivery and/or fails to address all highlighted criteria <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><i>V(A-I):</i></p> <p>Supportive Services for Participants</p>	<p>This component is concerned with project’s capacity to render appropriate supportive services to participants for obtaining & sustaining permanent housing.</p> <p><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> 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 • Supportive services are tailored to the needs of program participants and appropriate measures are in place to reduce barriers to access • 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 areas of doubt. <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 • Potential client barriers to accessing services are not addressed • “Supportive Services Type and Frequency Chart” does not match applicant agency capacity and is not feasible for implementation <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/25</p>
--	---	---------------

<p><i>VI:</i> 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><u>Suggested Scoring Scale:</u> For maximum points (=10), applicant must strongly demonstrate the following qualities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment towards collaboration with CoC partners at the agency and project level to maximize resources, avoid duplication is clear & strong <p>6-9 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is indication of commitment towards partnership and coordinated entry, but it is not fully demonstrated in the past or in current application <p>0-5 points:</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>	<p>/10</p>
<p><i>VII:</i> Budget Detail</p>	<p>This component is concerned with the budgeting aspects of the proposed project.</p> <p><u>Suggested scoring scale:</u> 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 project description, and quantity descriptions clearly identify what is included in requests • Grant term is 3-years • Committed match is indicated <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 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, lacking in logic & connection to project <p>0-6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple calculation errors, unclear descriptions, do not meet requirements <p>Comments:</p>	<p>___/20</p>

Total Points: _____ / 100