FY 2018

FL-507 - Orlando/Orange, Osceola, Seminole Counties Continuum of Care

1E-1. Objective Criteria—Rate, Rank, Review, and Selection Criteria

New and Renewal Projects

Highlights include:

CoC used objective data:

Cost effectiveness – p. 48
Performance data – p. 48
Type of population served – p. 9 – 10
Reasons for denying eligibility or terminating services – p. 12 – 13
Uses client satisfaction surveys – p. 16
Participation in CES – p. 16
Participation in HMIS – p. 19
CoC Participation – p. 21
Efforts to increase access to mainstream benefits – p. 25, 26
Filed 990's and have audits – p. 27, 28
Drawdown rates in eLOCCS – p. 29
Utilization rates – p. 29

CoC used factors related to achieving positive housing outcomes

Exits to PH – p. 39 & 48
# of days from project entry to placement into PH – p. 39, 48
% Returning to homelessness – p. 39-40, 48
% with increased income – p. 40, 48

Specific methodology for evaluation project submitted by victim service provider

DV providers are not yet running APRs in their comparable data base
Method to score for those not able to enter into HMIS – p. 42

- Scorecard Methodology and Explanation for RFA for HUD Funding pg 2
- Attachment A-1 Applicant and Project Performance Measurement Using HMIS and Other Administrative Data Sources pg 45
- Attachment B, Steps in the Review, Ranking and Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the 2018 Submission to HUD pg 49
- Attachment C, Activities Eligible and Prioritized for Funding Under the 2018 CoC FL-507 Request for Applications pg 51
- Attachment D, Selected Policies and Priorities Re: the 2018 Application for HUD CoC Program Funding pg 54
- Attachment E, Requirements Related to Adoption of a Housing First Approach pg 59
- Meeting Minutes from CoC Ranking and Project Selection Committee pg 62
- Appendix to Application Scorecard, CoC Proj. Evaluation Tool pg 65

Central Florida Continuum of Care (CoC FL-507)
2018 Regional Request for Applications for HUD Funding
Scorecard Methodology and Explanation

8 Application Scoring Categories and Respective Weighting Factors	Weights
1. Continuity of Overall CoC Efforts	7
2. Contribution to CoC Permanent Housing Supply by Priority Type	5
3. Geographic Coverage & Applicant Responsiveness to Jurisdictions	3
4. Population Targeting & Resource Prioritization	4
5. System Participation, Engagement & Coordination	4
6. Applicant Performance, Capacity, Effectiveness, Efficiency	8
7. Project Quality, Feasibility and Design	6
8. Budget Presentation: Reasonableness, Cost-Effectiveness and Value	3
TOTAL	**40**

Summary of Scoring and Ranking Process (see Detailed Scoring and Preliminary Ranking Method for more information):

1. For each of the 8 scoring categories above, an applicant's score will be tabulated based on applicant responses to both administratively scored (based on formula) and manually scored (based on reviewer assessment) items.

2. For any scoring item that is not applicable to a particular applicant or project type, the applicant's score will be adjusted proportionately in a manner that neither penalizes nor rewards the applicant.

3. Within each scoring category, an application will be compared only with other applications of the same project and activity type (e.g., RRH Services).

4. For each scoring category, applicants' scores will be tabulated and then converted to a ranking among all applications of the same project and activity type. Each application will then be assigned a total score, which will be the sum of the 8 applicable ranks, after weighting each rank as described above. Of particular note is the fact that the numbers of points assigned to the various scored items can only be compared within the same scoring category; no individual or total numbers of points can be compared across categories.

5. Within each project type, all applications will be ranked based on total score. Higher-ranking applications will accordingly be those with LOWER total scores. (For example, if an application receives the highest raw score among its project type in every scoring category, that application would receive a "perfect" (minimum) score of 40 points.

6. A proposed project consists of at least one housing component and at least one services component. Each application's total score will count toward the applicable project's housing component score, services component score or both, as applicable. Projects will be assembled from the list of applications by project and activity type in rank order.

7. The overall project ranking list submitted to the Community Ranking and Project Selection Committee for consideration will then be based on the combined total of the average housing component score and the average services component score from all applications comprising the project.

Scoring Category #1: Continuity of Overall CoC Efforts

Scoring Component(s): Administrative   **Weighting Factor: 7**
Application Sections: **Section 2 - General Information About Proposed Project and Activities**

Project and Activity Type(s)	Location/Question	Issue/Factor	Method for Awarding Points	Maximum Pts. Awarded
All Applicants	Section 2 – Application Project Type Staff Administrative Data	Sustaining/Extending Existing System Capacity vs. vs. Creating New Project	Renewal Under Existing Project =5 points Expansion of Existing Project = 3 points New Project = 0 points	+5 pts.

Scoring Category #2: Project Contribution to CoC Housing Supply by Priority Type

Scoring Component(s): Administrative   **Weighting Factor: 5**

Application Sections: Section 3. Key Project Characteristics: Housing - review together with Sections 4, 6, 7

Affected Project and Activity Type(s)	Specific Project Type	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation/Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Maximum (or Minimum) # of Points Awarded
All Project Types Activity Type = Housing	PSH, RRH, Youth TH (YTH), TH-RRH	Proposed Total # of PH Units	Priority Renewal Activity	PSH: Add # of proposed units x4 pts. RRH/YTH: Add # of proposed units x 3 pts.	+100 pts.
			Priority Expansion Activity	PSH: Add # of proposed units in x 3 pts. RRH: Add # of units. x 2 pts. YTH: Add # of units x 1 pt.	
			Priority New Activity	PSH: Add # of proposed units. x 2 pts. RRH: Add # of proposed units. x 1 pt. TH-RRH/YTH: Add # of proposed units x ½ pt.	

	All Others		Non-Priority Project Activity	Add 0 pts.	
Component of Renewal Project Activity Type = Housing	PSH, RRH, YTH, TH-RRH	Status of Units Currently Funded	High-Priority Units Backlogged/Not Yet Online	PSH: # of units in Line 2 (not yet available) x -1 RRH/YTH: # of units in Line 2 x -.75	Best score is 0; Maximum deduction is -50
			High-Priority Project Units Previously Available but Currently Offline	PSH: # of units in Line 4 (not previously available) x -1 (negative) RRH/YTH: # of units in Line 4 x -.75	

Scoring Category #3: Project Geographic Coverage and Applicant Responsiveness to Jurisdictions

Scoring Component(s):   Administrative (with Manual Threshold Review)   Weighting Factor: 3

Application Section 1 of 2:   Section 5 - Geographic Coverage and Responsiveness to Jurisdictional Priorities

Affected Project and Activity Type(s)	Location	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation/ Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Max/Min Points Awarded
All Project and Activity Types	Box(es) checked in Column A	Service Coverage of Jurisdiction	Applicant Commits to Serve Clients from Jurisdiction	For each jurisdiction: ADD 2 points For each box checked	County-specific: +4 pts. Multiple counties: +12 pts.
	Box(es) checked in Column B	County-Specific Project: Jurisdictional Priority	Jurisdiction Indicates that Applicant Meets Jurisdictional Priority	For each jurisdiction: ADD 6 points for each box checked with accompanying certification of priority Project	County-specific: +12 pts. Multiple counties: +0 pts.
All Applicants	Box(es) checked in Column C	County-Specific Project: Jurisdictional History of Investment	Jurisdiction Indicates Historical Investment in Applicant's Effort	For each jurisdiction: ADD 3 points for each box checked with accompanying certification of past investment in Applicant-administered homelessness assistance efforts ADD Up to 3 additional points as follows:	County-specific: +12 pts. Multiple

				Take the annual average amount of the jurisdiction's certified investment in Applicant's homelessness efforts over the previous 3 fiscal years. Divide that amount by Applicant's HUD funding request, multiply by 3, and round to one decimal place.	counties: +0 pts.
All Applicants	Box(es) checked in Column D	Multi-county Projects: Applicant Has Served Individuals/Households in the Jurisdiction		For each jurisdiction: ADD 2 points for each box checked with accompanying certification of service by corresponding jurisdiction	County-specific: +4 pts. Multiple counties: +12 pts.
All Projects	Box(es) checked in Column E	Responsiveness to Need Identified by Jurisdiction		For up to 2 jurisdictions: ADD up to 6 points for each jurisdiction which meets an identified high-priority need.	All: +12 pts.

Application Section 2 of 2:   **Section 4 - Key Project Characteristics – Supportive Services**

Affected Project and Activity Type(s)	Location	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation/ Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Max/Min Points Awarded
All Project Types Activity Type = Services	Tables - Questions 39, 50, 60, 70	Jurisdictional Coverage of Assessment/Intake Street Outreach, Housing Navigation, Housing Stability Case Management Activity	Applicant Commits Provide Field-Based Services to/within Jurisdiction	For each jurisdictional option, ADD 1 point for each box checked	+5 (per question)

Scoring Category #4: Project Population Targeting and Resource Prioritization

Scoring Component(s):   Administratively <u>and</u> Manually Scored   **Weighting Factor: 4**

Application Section 1 of 4:   Section 6 - Target Population(s) and Services to Sub-Populations (read with Sections 3 and 4)

Affected Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Max/Min Pts. Awarded
Project Type = PSH All Activity Types	% of Units, Vouchers or Slots Dedicated for Chronically Homeless Individuals (Line 1)	Extent to Which Applicant Targets Housing and Service Resources Address HUD and CoC Priorities without Barriers	For each full 5% dedicated up to 75%, ADD 2 pts. For each full 5% above 75%, ADD 1 pt. (e.g., 25% = 10 points, 48% = 18 points, 85% = 32 pts.)	+35 pts.
Project Type = RRH All Activity Types	% of Units, Vouchers or Slots Dedicated for Families with Children or for Unaccompanied Youth (Line 2)		For each full 5% dedicated up to 75%, ADD 2 pts. For each full 5% above 75%, ADD 1 pts. (e.g.., 25% = 10 points, 48% = 18 points, 85% = 32 pts.)	+30 pts.
Project Type = TH-RRH All Activity	% of Units, Vouchers or Slots Dedicated for Crisis Housing or TH-RRH-Appropriate Housing Modality		If 100% dedicated to appropriate priority population, ADD 30	+30 pts.

Types	(Applicable Line #)			pts.	
				If less than 100% dedicated to appropriate priority population, ADD 0 pts	
Project Type = YTH	<mark>% of Units, Vouchers or Slots Dedicated for Youth</mark> (Line 3)			If 100% of units dedicated for youth, ADD 30 points If less than 100% dedicated for youth, ADD 0 points	+30 pts.
All Activity Types	% of Units, Vouchers or Slots Inclusive of Applicable Sub-Populations (Lines 2a, 3b, 3c, 4,4a 5,6,7,8,9)			For sub-populations: For each full 10%, ADD ½ pt. Example: 33% = 1½ pts., 100% = 5pts.) PSH: Chronically Homeless Families with Children, Chronically Homeless Veterans, Persons with Substance Abuse Disorders, Persons with Severe Mental Illnesses, Survivors of Domestic Violence RRH/YTH: Unaccompanied LGBTQ Youth, Youth Families with Children, Survivors of Domestic Violence/Victims of Human Trafficking, Persons with Substance Abuse Disorders, Persons with Severe Mental Illnesses TH-RRH: Refer to PSH or RRH/YTH sub-population list,	+5 pts. per applicable sub-population Maximum total = 25 pts.

All Projects and Activity Types	Reasons for Potentially Denying Admission to Population or Sub-Populations	Applicant Operates Using a Housing First/Zero-Barrier Approach	whichever is applicable	
			For each population or sub-population, reviewers** will evaluate applicant's reasons for potentially denying admission using the following scale: 0 = Explanation consistent with HUD and CoC Priorities -1 = Explanation neither fully consistent or inconsistent with HUD and CoC Priorities -2 = Explanation inconsistent with HUD and CoC Priorities Average all reviewer ratings, round to 1 decimal place and multiply by 10	Maximum total deduction = -20 pts.
			For the primary target population, reviewers** will evaluate applicant's reasons for potentially denying admission (using the same scale): PSH: Re: chronically homeless, multiply reviewer avg x 10 pts. RRH: Re: families with children, multiply reviewer avg x 10 pts. YTH: Re: youth, multiply reviewer avg. x 10 pts. For TH/PH-RRH Projects Re: primary target population, ADD reviewer average x10 pts. For all other project types & all other populations, ADD reviewer average x 5 pts. *Example:* *Explanation of for denial of chronically homeless clients in PSH Project*	Maximum total deduction = -20 pts.

			Avg. reviewer rating = -1.4 x 10 = -14 pts.	

Application Section 2 of 4:   **Section 7 - Housing First/Zero-Barrier Approach**

**   Method for Manually Scored Items:

Affected Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation/ Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Max/Min Pts. Awarded
All Project and Activity Types	Eligibility Chart: Denial or Determination of Ineligibility	Applicant's past or future denials of eligibility consistent with key Housing First principles	** - Reviewers score all explanations accompanying "No" responses For each "Yes" response, add + 2 pts. For each "No" response, reviewers evaluate explanations as follows: +2 pts. = Fully consistent or compatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach +1 pt. = Neither fully consistent or inconsistent with Housing First/Zero Barrier approach +0 pts. = Inconsistent or incompatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach Calculate total number of points for 15 items related to past	Max: + 30 pts.

All Project and Activity Types	Termination Chart: Termination of Service or Eviction from Housing	Applicant's past or future terminations or evictions consistent with key Housing principles	12 months and 15 items related to future expectations, and multiply grand total by ½.	

			** - Reviewers score all explanations accompanying "No" responses
			
			For each "Yes" response, add + 2 pts.
			
			For each "No" response, reviewers evaluate explanations as follows:
			
			    +2 pts. = Fully consistent or compatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach
			
			    +1 pt. = Neither fully consistent or inconsistent with Housing First/Zero Barrier approach
			
			    +0 pts. = Inconsistent or incompatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach
			
			Calculate total number of points for 5 items related to past 12 months and 5 items related to future expectations.
				Max:
				
				+ 20 pts

	Service Continuity	Applicant continues to link to services after eviction, etc.	Award 10 points for a "Yes" answer ** - Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "No" response**up to 10 points, where 10 points indicate full consistency or compatibility with a Housing First approach	+10 pts.

		Take average termination or discharge % across all applicants of the same project and activity type	
12 Month Discharge %	Applicant has discharged, evicted or discontinued only a small percentage of clients over the past year	+2 points if applicant is between one and two standard deviations below average +2.5 points if applicant is less than one standard deviation below average +5 points if applicant is less than one standard deviation above average (or if applicant is not current operating) +7.5 points if applicant is between one and two standard deviations above average +10 points if applicant is more than two standard deviations above average	+10 pts.
Partner Discharge Policies	Applicant does not defer to third party partner with power to terminate/evict in its stead	Award 10 points for a "No" response ** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "Yes" response** using scale above Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 5	+10 pts.
Service Intensity	Applicant allows changes in service intensity and duration	Award 10 points for a "Yes" response ** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "No" response using scale above Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 5	+ 10 pts
Location Limitation	Applicant promotes housing choice by	Award 10 points for a "No" response	

		limiting requirement to live in a particular area or structure	** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "Yes" response*using scale above Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 5	+10 pts.
	Additional Requirements	Applicant declines to require participation in services or other prerequisites	Award 10 points for a "No" response ** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "Yes" response*using scale above Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 5	+10 pts.
	Move Quickly Into Permanent Housing	Applicant prioritizes housing placement	Award 5 points for a "Yes" response ** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "No" response using scale above Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 2.5	+5 pts
	Housing First Self-Assessment	Applicant seeks to assure fidelity to housing first	Award 5 points for a "Yes" response ** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "No" response using scale above	+5 pts.

			Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 2.5	
	Client Satisfaction Surveys	Applicant solicits participant program feedback	Award 5 points for a "Yes" response ** Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "No" response using scale above Average scores of all reviewers, and then multiply by 2.5	+ 5 pts.
	Gender Inclusion/Non-Discrimination Policy	Applicant ensures inclusion and non-discrimination based on equal access criteria	Unscored for 2018 Application Process	N/A

Application Section 3 of 4 for Category 4:   **Section 8. Participation in Coordinated Entry System/Prioritization Based on Need**

Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Maximum Pts. Awarded
All Project and Activity Types	% CES Assignments & Explanation	Extent to which clients were assigned by CES	100% response in % CES Assignments = 50 pts. (or 5 or fewer) For every 10% below 100%, subtract 5 pts.	+50 pts.

			Then add back in reviewer score of explanation:	
			+0 pts. = Applicant's explanation is inconsistent or incompatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach	
			+5 pts. = Applicant's explanation is neither consistent/compatible nor inconsistent/incompatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach	
			+10 pts. = Applicant's explanation is fully consistent or compatible with a Housing First approach	
All Project and Activity Types	% CES Assignment & Selection Criteria	Use of other criteria besides CES/prioritization based on need	For each selection criterion, multiply the percentage given for each response by the following weights: "Never" = 0 "Seldom" = - ½ "Sometimes" = -1 "Often" = -1.5 Then add across all responses. Multiply the above amount by 2 for the following selection criteria: "First come, first served" and "Assessment as to how likely client is to succeed" Add all amounts to generate a total score.	Maximum deduction is -12 pts.
			0% response in % of CES Declines = 20 pts.	

All Project and Activity Types	% of CES-Referred Clients Denied or Declined for Service & Explanation	Extent to which clients assigned by CES were denied or refused service by Applicant	For every 5% above 0%, subtract 2 pts., up to a maximum of 20 pts. **Then add back in average reviewer score of explanation: +0 pts. = Applicant's explanation is inconsistent or incompatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach +3 pts. = Applicant's explanation is neither consistent/compatible nor inconsistent/incompatible with a Housing First/Zero Barrier approach +6 pts. = Applicant's explanation is fully consistent or compatible with a Housing First approach	+20 pts.
All Project and Activity Types	Prioritization in Provision of Project Housing & Services	Extent to which Applicant agrees to accept only clients through Coordinated Entry System (CES) Registry Management process using HUD and CoC prioritization	For a "Yes" response to each item below , award 2 pts. **- Reviewers score the explanations accompanying a "No" response using the following score: +2 pts. = Explanation consistent with HUD and CoC Priorities + 1 pt. = Explanation neither fully consistent or inconsistent with HUD and CoC Priorities + 0 pts. = Explanation inconsistent with HUD and CoC Priorities RRH/YTH: Re: Families with Children or Unaccompanied Youth PSH: Re: Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families Other: Re: Other relevant populations • Accept referral only through CES = +4 pts. • Align with prioritization based on highest needs and longest homelessness histories = + 4 pts.	+20 pts.

			• Agree to continue with prioritization = + 4 pts. All Project Types: • Equal Access – Does not separate family members = +2 pts. • Entered Into MOU with Coordinated Entry System = +2 pts. • Agreed to continue to continue to comply with CES MOU = +2 pts. • Assist CES with HUD-required recordkeeping = + 2 pts.	
All Applicants not exclusively using Coordinated Entry	Place Resided Immediately Prior to Program Entry	Residence Prior to Project Entry	If using CES exclusively = 4 pts. If table is not completed = 0 pts. If TH + Other > 10% = 0 pts. If TH + Other between 0.1% and 10% = 2 pts. If TH + Other is 0% = 4 pts.	+ 4 pts. (Using CES only = automatic 4 pts.)

Application Section 4 of 4 for Category 4: **Section 9. CoC Involvement and Engagement**

Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor to Be Scored	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Maximum Pts. Awarded
All Project and Activity Types	<mark>Past HMIS Participation</mark>	Applicant's Participation in HMIS	Yes = 20 points	+20 pts.
	General CES Participation	Applicant's	Yes = 6 points	+6 pts.

		Participation In the Coordinated Entry System		

Scoring Category #5: Applicant System Participation, Engagement and Coordination

Scoring Components: Administrative <u>and</u> Manual **Weighting Factor: 4**

Application Section 1 of 2: Section 9 - CoC Involvement and Engagement

Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Maximum Pts. Awarded
All Project and Activity Types	**# of Membership Meetings Attended**	Applicant's Membership and Participation in CoC *Subject to verification (Attachment A-1, #3)*	If "Yes" and # attended = 1-2, Add 2 pts. If "Yes" and # attended = 3-7, Add 4 pts. If "Yes" and # attended = 8 or more, Add 6 pts.	+ 10 pts.
	CoC Membership Status		If "Yes", Add 2 pts.	
	CoC Advisory Committee Participation		If "Yes", Add 2 pts.	
	Direct Practice Skills Training (e.g., Motivational Interviewing, Trauma-Informed Care, DV & Human	Applicant's Participation in Training & Percentage of Staff Participating	If "Yes", Add 5 points If 50% or more of direct practice and supervisory staff attended at least 1 training , Add 5 points OR If 50% or more of staff attended 2 or more trainings, Add an additional 5 points.	+ 15 pts.

	Trafficking)	*Subject to verification*		.
				+12 pts.
	Participation in HMIS	Applicant's Participant in a Robust and Responsive HMIS *Subject to verification (Attachment A-1, #12*)	For each "YES" response, Add 1 pt.: • Past HMIS Participation • Commitment to Future HMIS Continuity • Current Inclusion in HMIS Bed/Services Inventory • Commitment to Future HMIS Beds/Services Inventory • Signed HMIS Agency Partner Inventory Continuity • Designated HMIS Agency Administrator • Compliance with Requirement that End Users Have Licenses &Training • Commitment to End User Participation in Refresher Training • Commitment to Enter UDEs and PII into HMIS • Commitment to Work in Support of CoC Data Quality Plan • Commitment to Work in Support of Ongoing Available APR Data • Track Record of Recording Project Entry/Exits in HMIS For each percentage below, multiply by 2 pts. • % of Units/Beds/Slots in HMIS • % of Clients for which HMIS Update Assessments Completed • % of Clients for which HMIS Annual Assessments Completed	+6 pts.

	General CES Participation	Applicant's Participation In the Coordinated Entry System *Subject to verification (Attachment A-1, #14)*	If "Yes" to general CES participation= +2 pts. If # of Registry Management Meetings: = 1-3: +2 pts. = 4-14: + 4 pts =15+: + 6 pts If "Yes" to housing placements = + 2 pts. If "Yes" to completing CES 'Big 3' = +2 pts. If # of Big 3 = 1-10, Add additional +1 pt. If # of Big 3 = 11-50, Add additional +2 pts. If # of Big 3 = 51+, Add additional +3 pts.	+15 pts.
2018 Point-In-Time (PIT) 2019 Point-In-Time (PIT) 2019 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)	Applicant's Participation in the CoC's PIT and HIC *Subject to verification (Attachment A-1, #17)*	For each box checked (except N/A), add 1 pt. If "Yes" for 2019 PIT, add 1 pt. If "Yes" for 2019 HIC, add 1 pt.	+5 pts.	

	Subject to verification (Attachment A-1, #18)			
	Administrative Data		Participation in HIC , add 1 pt.	+ 1 pt.
	Administrative Data	Applicant's HMIS Data Completeness/Quality *Based on CoC Performance Scorecard Elements – Attachment A-1, #5-#11*	Use Quartile Method Pts. x 2 pts.	+ 8 pts.

Application Section 2 of 2 of Category 5:   Section 10 - Increasing Access to Mainstream Benefits

Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Maximum Pts. Awarded
Activity Type = Services	Commitment to Incorporating Strategies for Increasing Access to Mainstream Benefits into the Project	Applicant commits to promote and sustain access to mainstream benefits	If Yes, Add 4 pts.	+ 4 pts.

Activity Type = Services	Current Efforts to Increase Access to Mainstream Services	Applicant currently promotes and sustains access to mainstream benefits	If Yes, ADD 4 pts.	+4 pts.
	Facilitating Access to Mainstream Benefits as an ACCESS Community Partner	Applicant or project partner serves as DCF ACCESS community partner to ensure enrollment in mainstream benefits	If YES, ADD 4 pts. If NO, but will perform same function, ADD 2 pts.	+4 pts.
	Facilitating Access to Transportation	Applicant or project partner commits to providing transportation to mainstream and community resources	If YES, ADD 8 pts.	+8 pts.
	Description of Access to Transportation		Reviewer evaluates narrative response for consistency with policies and priorities and for assertiveness.	+ 4 pts.
	Facilitating Access to SSI and SSDI	Applicant or project partner will enter MOU with SOAR Provider	If YES, ADD 4 pts.	+4 pts.
	School Liaison	Project partner has committed to have a designated staff person whose responsibilities include ensuring children are enrolled in school and receive appropriate	If YES, ADD 4 pts.	+4 pts

Project or Activity Type	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Method for Awarding Pts.	Maximum Pts. Awarded
All	Mainstream MOUs	Project partner has entered agreements and partnerships facilitating access to mainstream benefits by program participants	IF YES, add 2 points	+2 pts.
All	Administrative Data	Enrollment in mainstream benefit programs (non-cash) (Attachment A-1, #11)	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A X 1 pt.	+4 pts.

Scoring Category #6: Applicant Current Capacity/Past Performance

Scoring Component(s):   **Administrative <u>and</u> Manual**   **Weighting Factor: 3**

Application Section 1 of 2:   **Section 12. Program and Financial Management**

Project or Activity Type	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Method for Awarding Pts.	Maximum Pts. Awarded
** - Manual Scoring: For each part under which points were NOT added to the Applicant's score in this category, review the explanation that follows. Under each part where 4 points were lost, add instead: +3pts., if the explanation fully resolved questions or concerns regarding the extent to which the applicant could successfully perform the activities described in and administer the funds requested in this application.				

+2 pts., if the explanation partially or incompletely resolved any such questions or concerns

+1 pts., if the explanation did little or nothing to resolve any such questions or concerns

+0 pts., if the explanation served to exacerbate or intensify any such questions or concerns

If 6 points were lost, add the above totals back after multiplying by 1½.

If 8 points were lost, add the above totals back after multiplying by 2.

All Project and Activity Types	Filing of APR	Applicant timely and successfully filed APR *Subject to verification* *(Attachment A-1, #20)*	If "Yes" or "N/A", Add 4 pts.	+4 pts.
	Filing of IRS Form 990	Applicant filed 990	If "Yes" and submitted with application, and includes a date within reporting period after December 31, 2016 (or N/A), ADD 4 pts. (For Each of the 2 components, +2 pts) If No, explanation addresses some concerns = 1 Explanation addresses all concern = 2 Explanation fails to provide satisfactory explanation = 0	+4 pts.
	Repay/Return Grant Funds	Applicant Returned funds to HUD or other federal or state agency within 2 years	NO – ADD 4 pts. If Yes, explanation addresses some concerns = 1	+4 pts.

			Explanation addresses all concern = 2	
			Explanation fails to provide satisfactory explanation = 0	
All Project and Activity Types	Unspent HUD Funds	Left HUD funds unspent within 2 years	NO - ADD 4 pts.	+4 pts.
			If Yes, explanation addresses some concerns = 1	
			Explanation addresses all concern = 2	
			Explanation fails to provide satisfactory explanation = 0	
	Outstanding HUD Obligation	Has outstanding obligation/debt to HUD in arrears or with payment schedule pending	NO - ADD 4 pts.	+4 pts.
			If Yes, explanation addresses some concerns = 1	
			Explanation addresses all concern = 2	
			Explanation fails to provide satisfactory explanation = 0	
	Unresolved Findings	Have any unresolved HUD Monitoring or OIG Audit findings	NO – ADD 4 pts.	+4 pts.
			If Yes, explanation addresses some concerns = 1	
			Explanation addresses all concern = 2	
			Explanation fails to provide satisfactory explanation = 0	
		Most recent independent financial audit and	Submitted with application, and includes a date in reporting period after December 31, 2016 (or N/A), ADD 4 pts.	+6 pts.

		management letter		
	Most Recent Audit		(For each of the 2 components, ADD 2 pts. each) ADD 2 points for management letter with no findings .	
	Findings/ Corrective Action	Found in serious or continuous non-compliance or had grant terminated	If "No", Add 4 pts.	+4 pts.
	Fair Housing Complaint	Fair Housing complaint within 2 years	If "No", Add 4 pts. If "Yes", but the complaint is no longer active or if no remediation/corrective action was required – ADD 2 pts.	+4 pts.

Administrative Data

All	Admin Data	Applicant's Drawdowns Rates using eLOCCS *(Attachment A-1, #21)*	Use Quartile Method x 2 pts. (Reverse Ranked)	+8 pts.
All	Admin Data	Applicant's relevant utilization rates for Project *(Attachment A-1, #22)*	Use Quartile Method x 2 pts. (Reverse Ranked)	+ 8 pts.

Scoring Category #7: Project Quality, Feasibility and Design (including Application Completeness and Consistency)

Scoring Component(s): Administrative and Manual   **Weighting Factor:** 5

Application Section 1 of 4: Section 4 - Supportive Services: Key Project Characteristics

Project or Activity Type	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Max. Pts.
All	Geographic Coverage: (by Services Provided)		ADD 1 point for each of East Orange, West Orange, Downtown/Central Orange, Seminole, Osceola for relevant part	+5 pts.
Applicants Providing Supportive Services	Field Based: (by Services Provided)	Yes = 5 pts		+5 pts.
	Scope of Work: (by Services Provided) Case Load Size for Housing Navigation	ONLY If YES to both questions, ADD 6 pts.	All other response combinations = 0 pts.	+6 pts.

	and/or Housing Stability Case Management			
	Standards & Policies ———— Education and Training Requirements	Yes = 3 pts Reviewer scored: Between 0 and 4 pts.	0 = Applicant fails to provide evidence of capacity to deliver quality housing and/or services 1 = Applicant provides limited evidence of capacity to deliver quality housing and/or services 2 = Applicant provides reasonable evidence of capacity to deliver quality housing and/or services 3 = Applicant provides strong evidence of capacity to deliver quality housing and/or services 4 = Applicant provides exceptional evidence of capacity to deliver quality housing and/or services	3 ———— +4 pts.
	Job Description	Between 0 and- 4 pts 0 = job description is for the position; -2 if job description isn't for the position (titles may fluctuate a little	Max = 0 Lowest = -4

		bit) ; -4 if job description isn't a job description (totally wrong document) or aren't uploaded.	
	Professional Oversight and Supervision	==Manually scored:== Between 0 and 4 pts. 0 = document is for the position; -2 if document isn't for the position (titles may fluctuate a little bit) ; -4 if document isn't relevant or aren't uploaded	Max = 0 Lowest = -4
	Cultural Competence	==Manually scored:== Between 0 and 4 pts. Projects that express efforts to address cultural competence of only one sub-population can score a maximum of 2 points.	+4 pts.
	Language barriers/Limited English Proficiency	==Manually scored:== Between 0 and 4 pts. Projects that express efforts to address language barriers with only one sub-population (language and/or literacy) can score a maximum of 3 points.	+4 pts.
	Core Trainings	Score .5 pts for each Yes	+4 pts.

Applicants Requesting Funding Case Management and Housing Stability Planning	Overall soundness of approach to housing with service provision	Manually scored: Between 0 and 6 x 2 pts.	Max: +12 pts.
Applicants Requesting Funding for Outreach and Engagement	Review together with Section III - Housing	Manually scored: Between 0 and 6 x 2 pts.	(Average manual scores of all sections pertaining to funding requests)
Applicants Requesting Funding for Other Supportive Services	See: Question "Supportive Services Provided" for anticipated services	Manually scored: Between 0 and 6 pts. x 2 pts.	

Project Type(s)	Issue/Factor	Method for Awarding Points	Max. Pts. Awarded
All	Applicant read Project Performance criteria	Yes = 6	+6
All	Timeliness of entry of data elements into HMIS	% of records entered into HMIS in 3 days or less (Interim CoC FL-507 Standard) (Attachment A-1, #5)	+4
All	Completeness of data entered into HMIS - PII	% error rate for all personally identifiable information (PII) entered into HMIS (Attachment A-1, #6)	+4 pts.
All	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – UDEs	% error rate for all Universal Data Elements (UDEs) entered into HMIS (Attachment A-1, #7)	+4 pts.
All	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – Income (Entry)	% error rate for all Income and Housing Data Quality (Entry Assessment) (Attachment A-1, #8)	+4 pts.
All	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – Income (Annual)	% error rate for all Income and Housing Data Quality (Annual Assessment) (Attachment A-1, #9)	+4 pts.
	Completeness of data entered into HMIS –		+4 pts.

Project Type(s)	Location/Question	Issue/Factor	Method for Awarding Points	Max. Pts. Awarded
All	Income (Exit)	% error rate for all Income and Housing Data Quality (Exit Assessment) (Attachment A-1, #10)		
All	Completeness of data – Chronic Homelessness	% error rate for Chronic Homelessness (Attachment A-1, #11)		+4 pts.

Application Section 3 of 4 in Category 7:   **Section 11. Proximity of Key Resources and Services to Housing**

Project Type(s)	Location/Question	Issue/Factor	Method for Awarding Points	Max. Pts. Awarded
All Projects	Average Distance from Housing Units to Resources and Services	Average distance to nearest public transportation stop	If ¼ mile or less, ADD 3 pts If at least ¼ mile but less than ½ mile., ADD 2pts If at least than ½ mile but less than 1 mile , ADD 1pt If at least 1 mile –ADD 0 pts	+3 pts.
	Average Distance from Housing Units to Resources and Services.	Average distance to nearest full-service grocery store (not a convenience store)	If ½ mile or less – ADD 3 pts If at least ½ mile but less than 1 mile, ADD 2 pts If at least 1 mile but less than 2 miles , ADD 1 pt If at least 2 miles, ADD 0 pts	+3 pts.
	Average Distance from Housing Units to Resources and Services	Average to nearest full-service pharmacy	If ½ mile or less, ADD 3 pts If at least ½ mile but less than 1 mile, ADD 2 pts If at least 1 mile but less than 2 miles, ADD 1 pt.	+3 pts.

		If at least 2 miles, ADD 0 pts	
Average Distance from Housing Units to Resources and Services	Average distance to location where case management services are provided	If 1 mile or less, ADD3 pts At least 1 mile but less than 2 miles, ADD 2 pts. At least 2 miles but less than 5 miles, ADD 1 pt. At least 5 miles, ADD 0 pts.	+3 pts.

Application Section 4 of 4:   **Sections 15, 16, 17 – New Project Information**

Project Type(s)	Issue/Factor	Method for Awarding Points	Max. or Min. Pts. Awarded
New Projects		Divide all applications into one of 6 types: PSH Housing, PSH Services, RRH Housing, RRH Services, Youth Transitional Housing and CoC-wide System Supports. Within each type, reviewers rank the proposals from highest (1st) to lowest overall in terms of soundness of design, experience, feasibility and The highest ranking proposal of each type receives 24 pts. The lowest ranked receives 0 pts., unless there is only one new application of that type. If there are *n* new applications of a particular type, the kth –ranked application earns (24-*(24(k-1)/(n-1))* pts., rounded to one decimal place.	Max: +24 pts

Renewal Projects		All renewals get 12 pts. (i.e., held harmless)		Max: +12 pts.

Scoring Category #8: Project Budget: Reasonableness, Cost-Effectiveness and Value

Scoring Component(s):   **Administrative <u>and</u> Manual**   **Weighting Factor: 4**
Application Section 1 of 2:   **Section 13. Applicant's Portion of the Project Budget (Review together with Sections 3 & 4)**

Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Method for Awarding Points	Max Pts.
All	All	Are all budget sections completed and does the budget information provided make sense?	Are the budget line items completed? Do they make sense - For example, do line item descriptions for expenses make sense for the amount of funds requested? Do housing project request no more than FMR for each unit? ==Reviewer scored:== Between 0 and 5 pts.	+ 5 pts.
All	All	Does Applicant budget appear to be reasonable and necessary to accomplish the activities described in the application?	==Reviewer scored:== Between 0 and 10 pts. Budget drastically insufficient = 0 pts. Budget drastically excessive = 0 pts.	+10 pts.

			Budget reasonable and appropriate = 10 pts.	
All	All	Does TOTAL Project budget appear to be reasonable and necessary to accomplish the activities described in the application?	Between 0 and 5 pts. Budget drastically insufficient = 0 pts. Budget drastically excessive = 0 pts. Budget reasonable and appropriate = 5 pts.	+5 pts.
Housing Projects	All & Section 3	Does budget request match the number of units identified in Section 3 for which the applicant noted HUD funds would be sought?	Subtract 5 pts for each non-matching amount, with maximum of negative 15 pts	Max Deduction: -15 pts.
Services Projects	All & Section 4	Does budget request match the number of FTEs identified in the first half of Section 4 for which the applicant noted HUD funds would be sought?	Subtract 5 pts for each non-matching amount, with maximum of negative 10 pts	Max Deduction: -10 pts.
Services Projects	All & Section 4	Does the budget request match the "Other Supportive Services" and "Detail for other Supportive Services Request" for which the applicant noted HUD funds would be sought?	Subtract 3 pts for each non-matchinga mount, with maximum of negative 9 pts	-9

Application Section 2 of 2 for Category 8: Section 14. Project Performance, Cost-Effectiveness and Alignment with System Performance Measurement Initiatives

Project and Activity Type(s)	Issue or Factor	Situation or Scenario	Basis for Awarding Points	Max. Pts. Awarded
All	Admin Data	Applicant's Drawdowns Rates using LOCCS (Attachment A-1, #21)	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A x 1 pt.	+ 4 pts.
All	HMIS (APR)	Utilization - Applicant's % of available housing or service unit slots in use during the period (Attachment A-1, #22)	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A x 1 pt.	+ 4 pts.
All	HMIS (APR)	Applicant's Project exits to permanent housing destinations (Attachment A-1, #23)	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A x 1 pt.	+ 4 pts.
All	HMIS/ Admin Data	Applicant's # of days from assignment to case management to placement into permanent housing (Attachment A-1,#26)	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A x 1 pt.	+ 4 pts.
All	HMIS (APR)	Applicant's Project exits – % returning to	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A x 1 pt.	+ 4 pts.

		homelessness (Attachment A-1,#27)		
All	HMIS (APR)	Applicant's Project increases in income (Attachment A-1, #28)	Use Quartile Method in Appendix A x 1 pt.	+ 4 pts.
All Projects	Sections 3, 4, 14,15 (see Appendix B)	Applicant's Proposed Per-Unit Leveraging of Proposed Investment of HUD $ (X3 from Appendix B)	Use Quartile Method within Applicant Type x 1 pts.	+4 pts.
		RRH: Applicant's Proposed Investment of HUD $ Per individual or Household Served PSH: Applicant's Proposed Investment of HUD $ Per 6-Month and 12-Month Housing Retention (X5 from Appendix B)	Use Quartile Method within Applicant Type x1 pt.	+4 pts.
		Project's Proposed Per-Unit Leveraging of Proposed Investment of HUD $ (Y3 from Appendix B)	Use Quartile Method within Applicant Type x 1 pts.	+4 pts.
		RRH: Project's Proposed Investment of HUD $ Per individual or Household Served PSH: Project's Proposed Investment of HUD $ Per 6-Month and 12-Month Housing Retention (Y5	Use Quartile Method within Applicant Type x 1 pt.	+4 pts.

		from Appendix B)		

Note: For all scoring categories, whenever external or administrative data is to be used, if information about the Applicant's activity/performance pertaining to the Project are not available (e.g., with a new Project), scoring may instead be based on any of the Applicant's current (or most recent) homelessness assistance activity.

Appendix A
Quartile Method for Scoring Applicants Using Administrative Data

Project or Activity Type	Issue or Factor	Basis for Awarding Points
All Project and Activity Types	Admin Data	If the data to be analyzed pertains to a particular Project, calculate/determine each Project-specific value of the performance indicator using the appropriate data from the relevant source(s) whenever possible.** ** - If a new or reallocation Project, the measure may be calculated instead based on another Project for which the applicant enters data into HMIS. If the data pertains to a specific Applicant, calculate/determine the value of the performance indicator for each applicant using the appropriate data from the relevant source(s) whenever possible. ++ Applicants will then be rank-ordered from highest–performing to lowest-performing, except for those in Groups 1 and 2 below. ● Group 1 includes applicants that began entering data into HMIS prior to January 1, 2017, and for which the system performance measure cannot reliably be calculated. ● Group 2 includes applicants that began entering data into HMIS on or after January 1, 2017 (or have not entered data into HMIS), and for which the system performance measure cannot reliably be calculated. Applicants in Group 1 will be assigned the identical arbitrary value that ensures that they are ranked as lower performing than all other applicants for which the measure can reliably be calculated. Applicants in Group 2 will be assigned the identical arbitrary value that ensures that they are ranked as lower performing than all other applicants for which the measure can reliably be calculated, but higher than the applicants in Group 1. ++

		Divide the ranked list of into 4 equal groups (using the Quartile.Inc function in Microsoft Excel): ● For applicants with measures below at or below the 25th percentile, ADD 0 pts. ● For applicants with measures above the 25th percentile, but at or below the median, ADD 1 pt. ● For applicants with measures above the median, but at or below the 75th percentile, ADD 2 pts. ● For applicants with measures above the 75th percentile, ADD 4 points. If the applicants with identical value straddle a quartile, all such applicants receive the greater number of pts.

Appendix B
CoC Method for Calculating Applicant- and Project-Level Cost-Effectiveness

Define U as the total number of housing units, vouchers or slots proposed for the Project, per Section III, part a., OR the total number of units, vouchers or slots that are currently on-line, per Section III, part f., Line (1), whichever is greater.

Applicant-level cost-effectiveness is calculated as follows:

APPLICANT Total (Either Housing or Supportive Services Project Component)		
Proposed Investment of HUD $ Per Housing Unit/Voucher/Slot (X1)	Proposed Investment of All $ Per Housing Unit/Voucher/Slot (X2)	Applicant's Per-Unit Leveraging of Proposed Investment of HUD $ (X3)
Section XIII, Line 1 in Income Table ÷ U	Section XIII, Line 5 in Income Table ÷ U	(X2) ÷ (X1), rounded to 2 decimal places

1. Project-level cost-effectiveness is calculated by aggregating all applicant-level costs into project-wide costs and performing the same calculations.

PROJECT Total		
Proposed Investment of HUD $ Per Housing Unit/Voucher/Slot (Y1)	Proposed Investment of All $ Per Housing Unit/Voucher/Slot (Y2)	Applicant's Per-Unit Leveraging of Proposed Investment of HUD $ (Y3)
Sum all values of Section XIII, Line 1 in Income Table from all HUD-funded housing and service components (project-wide) ÷ U	Sum all values Section XIII, Line 5 in Income Table from all HUD-funded housing and service components (project-wide) ÷ U	(Y2) ÷ (Y1), rounded to 2 decimal places

Attachment A-1

Applicant and Project Performance Measurement Using HMIS and Other Administrative Data Sources

<u>**Notes:**</u>

1) Unless otherwise specified, the time period referenced is July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.
2) If data specific to the Project is unavailable, data will be drawn from the most recent, relevant source of homelessness assistance activity recorded by the Applicant.

#	Factor to be to be assessed or measured through administrative/external data	Performance Indicator or Measure	Source(s) of Data Used to Measure

Section VII.   Housing First/Zero Barrier Approach

#	Factor	Performance Indicator or Measure	Source(s) of Data Used to Measure
1		% of clients with zero income upon Project entry (APR 8b)	HMIS
2	Applicant's service to high needs populations	% of client population that meets chronic homelessness definition (PSH) or high barrier threshold	HMIS and program data generated by Coordinated Entry and Grants Management

Section IX., CoC Membership and Participation

#	Factor	Performance Indicator or Measure	Source(s) of Data Used to Measure
3	Applicant representative's attendance at CoC Membership Meetings	Number attended during year	CoC Planning
4	Applicant representative's participation in CoC advisory committee meetings	Number Attended during year	CoC Planning

Section X., HMIS Data Quality

#	Factor	Performance Indicator or Measure	Source(s) of Data Used to Measure
5	Timeliness of entry of data elements into HMIS	% of records entered into HMIS in 3 days or less (Interim CoC FL-507 Standard) (from APR 6e)	HMIS
6	Completeness of data	% error rate for all personally identifiable	HMIS

	entered into HMIS - PII	information (PII) entered into HMIS (from APR 6a)	
7	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – UDEs	% error rate for all Universal Data Elements (UDEs) entered into HMIS (from APR 6b)	HMIS
8	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – Income (Entry)	% error rate for all Income and Housing Data Quality (Entry Assessment) (from APR 6c)	HMIS
9	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – Income (Annual)	% error rate for all Income and Housing Data Quality (Annual Assessment) (from APR 6c)	HMIS
10	Completeness of data entered into HMIS – Income (Exit)	% error rate for all Income and Housing Data Quality (Exit Assessment) (from APR 6c)	HMIS
11	Completeness of data – Chronic Homelessness	% error rate for Chronic Homelessness (from APR 6d)	HMIS

Section IX., Participation in HMIS

12	Applicant's active and continuous participation in HMIS generally	Whether HMIS data entered in each of 4 quarters Whether Applicant has signed HMIS Agency Agreement and assigned HMIS Agency Administrator	HMIS
13	Applicant's bed coverage rate in HMIS	Whether 100% of funded beds are covered under HMIS	HMIS

Section IX., Participation in the Coordinated Entry System

14	Applicant's active and continuous participation in CES generally	Registry intake, navigation or placement activity in each of 2 quarters	Coordinated Entry System
15	Applicant representative's attendance at Registry Management meetings	Number of meetings attended	Coordinated Entry System
16	Applicant's Participation in CES	Applicant's placement of individuals/households Into housing through CES (Housing providers)	Coordinated Entry System
		Applicant's active navigation of individuals/households referred into CES (Supportive Service providers)	Coordinated Entry System

Section IX., Participation in PIT and HIC

17	Applicant's participation in 2016 CoC Point-in-Time Count (PIT)	Types of activities performed in relation to event	HMIS/CoC Planning
18	Applicant's participation in 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC)	Types of activities performed in relation to event	HMIS

Section X. Access to Mainstream Benefit Programs

19	Extent to which individuals/households served by Applicant are enrolled in mainstream benefit programs	% of individuals/families enrolled in at least one mainstream benefit program (non-cash) (from APR 20b)	Data draw from HMIS

Section XII., Filing of Annual Progress Reports (APRs)

20	Applicant's timely and successful filing of most recent applicable APR	Whether Applicant filed or facilitated successful filing of APR within 90 days of the end of the most recently expired grant year	Grants Management

Section XV., Applicant Past HUD Administrative Performance

21	Applicant's funding draw downs (Spend Downs) from LOCCS	% of award drawn down vs. % of award of period elapsed during snapshots during the most recent award period	Grants Management

Section XV, Applicant Past HUD Program Performance

22	Applicant's utilization rate for Project housing and/or services	% of available housing or services based on quarterly snapshots (PIT) (APR 8b)	HMIS and program data generated by Coordinated Entry/Grants Management
23	Applicant's Project Participant exits to permanent housing destinations	RRH, TH and TH/PH-RRH: % of exits made to permanent housing destinations (based on APR 23a, 23b) PSH: % of exits made to permanent housing destinations or retained (based on APR 23a, 23b, 5a)	HMIS

24	Applicant's Project Participant increases in income	% of adult participants with income at latest update or exit (based on APR 19a3)	Data draw by HMIS

Section XV.c., Alignment with System Performance Measurement Initiative

25	Extent to which applicant meets or exceeds system performance measure benchmarks (Project-specific analogs)	RRH, TH and TH/PH-RRH: % of exits made to permanent housing destinations (based on APR 23a, 23b) PSH: % of exits made to permanent housing destinations or retained (based on APR 23a, 23b, 5a) - System Measures 3 and 7	Data draw by HMIS
26		# of days from project entry to placement into permanent housing -System Measures 1 and 3) (based on Length of Stay)	
27		% returning to homelessness during period (from SPM 0701)	
28		% of participants with income growth since project entry - System Measures 2, 4 and 7 (based on APR 24.b.1,24.b.2.,24.b.3)	

Section XV.d.,   Cost-Effectiveness

29a 29b	Extent to which HUD funding is leveraged by Applicant and Project	Applicant's and Project's proposed per-unit leveraging of investment of HUD $	CoC Planning analysis of application data
30a 30b	HUD funds to be spent by Applicant and Project per successful housing outcome	RRH, TH and TH/PH-RRH: Applicant's and Project's proposed investment of HUD $ per individual or family projected to be served PSH: Applicant's proposed investment of HUD $ per housing retention	

Section IV. Racial Disparity

31	Racial and ethnic disparity in exits to permanent housing	Applicant and project racial and ethnic breakdown of enrollments compared to exits to permanent housing	HMIS

Attachment B
Central Florida Continuum of Care (CoC FL-507)
Steps in the Review, Ranking and Selection of Projects for Inclusion in the 2018 Submission to HUD

1. **Development of the Application Scoring by the CoC Resource Allocation and Coordination Committee, with the Input of CoC Stakeholders**

All eligible applications will be reviewed using a Scoring Framework approved by the CoC FL-507 Resource Allocation and Coordination Committee. The Scoring Framework lists and defines all of the scoring categories that reviewers will use in evaluating applications, as well as specifies the maximum number of points that an application can earn in each category. The elements of the Application and Scoring were developed with input from CoC FL-507 stakeholders across the region, the CoC FL-507 Resource Allocation and Coordination Committee and the CoC FL-507 Board.

The categories, point assignments and weights included in the Scoring process incorporate the input received the broad CoC FL-507 membership. It is important to note, however, that a number of the factors considered and the weights they are assigned are a function of the priorities and policies of HUD and the U.S Interagency Council on Homelessness. Specific steps were taken to address factors uniquely or disproportionately impacting CoC participation by victim service providers and to hold them harmless with respect to those factors.

2. **Scoring of Each Application Based on Multiple Independent Reviews as well as Evaluation of Performance and Administrative Data**

Each of the sub-scores in the eight major scoring categories will be based on a combination of scoring by trained and qualified reviewers (including key CoC FL-507 stakeholders such as victim service providers, jurisdictional representatives, individuals who have experienced homelessness, etc.) as well as administrative and external data, as described in the Application Scorecard. Each reviewer will evaluate the application independently. Reviewers will be randomly assigned applications, except that steps will be taken to minimize the potential for reviewer bias on the basis of population served, service provided, or geography represented. Performance and administrative data will be generated using HMIS reporting tools. All scores will be compiled and submitted to the CoC FL-507 Community Ranking and Selection Committee, together with additional information about the proposed projects, HUD's priorities and other relevant factors.

3. **Development of Recommendations by the Community Ranking and Selection Committee**

The Community Ranking and Selection Committee, a group of independent community representatives from across the region, will review the compiled scores for all of the applications, along with other relevant information, such as geographic coverage as well as the priorities and goals identified by CoC FL-507 and HUD. The Community Ranking and Selection Committee process will collectively develop a recommended slate of funded projects and amounts for consideration by the CoC FL-507 Board.

4. Approval of Final Slate of Projects and Funding Amounts

The CoC FL-507 Board, the governing body for the Central Florida Continuum of Care, will approve a final slate of projects and funding amounts for inclusion in the Central Florida CoC's application to HUD.

****

A copy of the FY 2018 Application Scorecard as well as Attachment A-1 to the Request for Applications (list of sources of external or administrative data included in the scoring process) will be available on the CoC FL-507 website at: http://www.centralfloridacoc.org

Attachment C
Activities Eligible and Prioritized for Funding Under the 2018 CoC FL-507 Request for Applications

IMPORTANT NOTE: Many activities that are theoretically eligible to be funded under the Interim CoC Rule nevertheless cannot be funded or are extremely unlikely to be funded through the FY 2018 CoC Program regional application process, either as a result of HUD policies, directives and incentives, or of CoC FL-507/jurisdictional policies, priorities and funding constraints. These activities are denoted with a double-asterisk (**) below.

Prospective Applicants should carefully review the HUD NOFA, the Interim Application (Attachment A) and Key CoC FL-507 Policies and Priorities (Attachment D), together with this list of eligible activities. References provided are to 24 CFR Part 578 (HUD's Interim CoC Rule).

Program Components and Uses of Assistance (§578.37)
Key Definitions:
- **Permanent Housing (PH)** means community-based housing without a designated length of stay, and includes both Permanent Supportive Housing and Rapid Rehousing.
- **Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)** means permanent housing in which supportive services are provided to assist homeless persons with a disability to live independently.
- **Rapid Rehousing (RRH)** means the provision of supportive services and tenant-based rental assistance in keeping with CoC FL-507 standards, as necessary to help a homeless individual or family, with or without disabilities, move as quickly as possible into permanent housing and achieve stability in that housing.

Rental assistance (§578.51)
- Rental assistance is an eligible cost for permanent housing and transitional housing (TH)**.
- Program participants must enter into a lease agreement for a term of at least one year, which is terminable for cause. The leases must be automatically renewable upon expiration for terms that are a minimum of one month long, except on prior notice by either party.
- Three types of rental assistance configurations are eligible:
  a) Tenant Based Rental Assistance is scattered-site rental assistance, in which Program Participants choose housing of an appropriate size in which to reside.
  b) Sponsor-based rental assistance is provided through contracts between the recipient and sponsor organization. Program participants must reside in housing owned or leased by the sponsor.
  c) Project-based rental assistance is provided through a contract with the owner of an existing structure, where the owner agrees to lease the subsidized units to program participants. Program participants will not retain rental assistance if they move.

Supportive services (§578.53)
- Grant funds may be used to pay the eligible costs of supportive services that address the particular needs of Program Participants.

- Although supportive services are essential, as the federal housing agency, HUD does not prioritize the use of CoC Program funding for supportive services. As a result, the amount that can be requested in the Submission to HUD is limited.
- Supportive services must be made available to Program Participants throughout the duration of their enrollment in the Project.
- Because of the limited supportive service dollars and the activities critical to housing retention and stability, CoC FL-507 has prioritized the use of HUD supportive services funding for case management (particularly Housing Stability Case Management and Housing Navigation as defined in the Housing Navigation Case Management Scope of Work (Attachment E).
- RRH, PSH and TH projects must ensure that Case Managers meet with each Program Participant not less than once per month to assist the program participant in maintaining long-term housing stability.
- Staff training and the costs of obtaining professional licenses or certifications needed to provide supportive services are not eligible costs.
- Additional information about additional types of supportive services that are potentially eligible but nevertheless unlikely to be funded can be found at: https://tinyurl.com/yabgwqc8
- CoC FL-507 has determined that particular sets and configurations of supportive services are integral to the effective operation of a regional system of housing and services, and are therefore priority uses for Other Coalition-Administered Grant (OCAG) funding. These include:
  - PSH Intensive Case Management with Wrap-Around Supports, which includes the provision of Housing Stability Case Management services, peer support, housing specialists and SOAR case management.
  - Integrated System-wide Landlord Services, including housing identification and placement activities, post-housing service to and support for landlords, and support of administration of rental subsidies.
  - RRH Housing Stability Case Management services accompanied by flexible financial assistance.

Operating costs (§578.55)
- Grant funds may be used to pay the costs of the day-to-day operation of permanent housing and transitional housing in a single structure or individual housing units.
- Program funds may not be used for rental assistance and operating costs in the same project. Program funds may not be used for the operating costs of emergency shelter- and supportive service-only facilities. Program funds may not be used for the maintenance and repair of housing where are included in the lease agreement.
- Eligible costs include maintenance and repair of housing; property taxes and insurance; scheduled payments to a reserve for replacement of a major system of housing; building security; electricity, gas, and water; furniture; and equipment.

Leasing (§578.49)
- Grant funds may be used to pay the costs of leasing a structure or structures, or portions of structures, to provide housing (or supportive services**).

- Under leasing activity, the lease agreement is between the recipient of funds and the landlord, and units are not owned by the recipient. Occupancy agreements or subleases are required for participants.
- Terms of lease must be for at least 12 months and be automatically renewable upon expiration, for a maximum of 24 months.
- Eligible costs include: leasing structures**, leasing individual units, utilities, security deposits and first and last month's rent

§ 578.43 Acquisition   **§ 578.45 Rehabilitation**   **§ 578.47 New construction**

July 15, 2018

Attachment D

Central Florida Continuum of Care (CoC FL-507)

Selected Policies and Priorities Re: the 2018 Application for HUD CoC Program Funding

A. Projects and Applications

1. Types of Projects Eligible for Consideration through the Community Process

The HUD regional application review and selection process should score and rank submitted applications for funding to form projects within the following six (6) categories:

a. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

b. Rapid Rehousing (RRH)

c. Youth-Specific Transitional Housing (TH) or Supportive Services Only (SSO) Renewals

d. Transitional Housing- Rapid Rehousing (TH-RRH)

e. Essential System Supports – Coordinated Entry System (CES)

f. Essential System Supports – Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

CoC FL-507 should include at least one project in each of the above categories on its list of highest-priority (Tier 1) projects in the Submission to HUD (assuming at least one eligible project is submitted in each category), with the exception of TH-RRH.

2. Types of Projects Ineligible for Consideration through the Regional Application Process

The following types of projects should be ineligible for consideration through the CoC FL-507 regional application process:

a. All other TH projects

b. All other SSO projects, unless they are or can be directly bundled with a PSH, RRH or are linked to a youth TH project

c. Safe Haven projects

d. Expansion CES or HMIS projects

3. Types of Projects Eligible for Consideration through the Regional Application Process, but Unlikely to be Included in the Submission to HUD

The following types of projects should be eligible for review through the regional application process, but ineligible for inclusion in the Application to HUD without the express approval of the CoC FL-507 Board:

a. Projects that propose to use HUD funding for acquisition, new construction or rehabilitation activity.

b. Projects that propose to use HUD funding for project- or sponsor-based rental assistance, where the housing units are not yet on-line.

c. Projects proposed in applications that do not meet threshold (i.e., do not meet the basic criteria to be eligible for consideration by HUD).

****

B. Jurisdictional Issues

1. Option for Jurisdictions to Express Preference for Jurisdiction-Specific Projects

a. The regional application process should include a mechanism whereby each participating jurisdiction has the option to indicate a preference among all Applicants dedicated to serving a particular county, in the event that the CoC receives an application for a single-jurisdiction application.

b. As a secondary option, a jurisdiction should have the opportunity to verify and quantify its history of investing or leveraging funds for Projects administered by the Applicant in the past. This information may be helpful in determining if a jurisdiction is choosing to develop capacity for a specific agency and/or if the HUD funds will be leveraged in a way that reduces the service per HUD dollar ratio.

2. **Option for Jurisdictions to Corroborate Applicant Claims that a Project Will Serve the**

a. Each jurisdiction should be afforded the opportunity to confirm (or deny) jurisdiction-specific activities that an Applicant claims in its proposal. Specifically, if in its application, the Applicant asserts that it has "served" households in/from a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction should have the opportunity to confirm the assertion. If the jurisdiction is not aware of any activity, the Applicant would have to provide verification to the jurisdiction.

b. The definition of "served" will vary based on the nature of the Project. In many cases, however, the determination of whether the jurisdiction will be served will be immediate.

c. An Applicant that expresses the intent to serve a jurisdiction without a documented history of doing so would not receive points that another applicant with an established history would receive.

****
*****

C. **Specific Project Factors Relevant to the Application Process**

1. **Project "Bundling"**

a. Given the flexibility afforded by an approach that "bundles" housing with supportive services - both with regard to budgeting and programming - application bundling should continue to be the preferred approach to building housing-services linkages within PSH and RRH projects, subject to HUD's expectation that no more than 20 percent of a Project's funding be provided for services.

b. Notwithstanding a., no consensus has emerged on the issue of whether an attempt should be made to reduce the number of applicants receiving funding for supportive services (depth vs. breadth). Instead, the recommendation was that, if existing bundled projects are selected for renewal, the renewal will incorporate the same general distribution of funding among agencies, unless an Applicant chooses not to renew or has already-documented performance issues.

2. **Administration of Scattered-Site Rental Assistance**

In light of the fact that the administration of scattered-site rental assistance/leasing funds across the CoC is such a specialized and complex function, HSN should continue to administer these resources CoC-wide. Because of the increased efficiency and reduced regional confusion associated with having a single point of contact, these funds should continue to be administered on a consolidated basis across the region. This recommendation was also based on a recognition that rental assistance funds are pass-through dollars to landlords, stretch an agency's cash flow capacity, and do not tend

to build organizational capacity.

3. **Funding Request Limits for Renewal Projects**

Applicants submitting renewals should be discouraged (but are not prohibited) from seeking funding to expand their projects in 2018, because: a) many of these projects have only recently become operational, and 2) the source of any additional funding would likely be a reduction in funding for another renewal Project.

4. **Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus Project**

CoC FL-507 should include at least one and perhaps all (but not more one of each) of the following Project types as a DV Bonus Project serving survivors of domestic violence and/or human trafficking in the Submission to HUD: 1) Rapid ReHousing 2) Joint Transitional Housing – Permanent Housing/Rapid ReHousing, 3) Coordinated Entry for Domestic Violence (Victim Services).

5. **Permanent Housing Bonus Project**

CoC FL-507 should include at least one of the following as a Permanent Housing Bonus Project in the Submission to HUD, all other things being equal: 1) a TH-RRH Project serving youth, 2) a RRH project serving families with children and/or youth, or 3) a Permanent Supportive Housing Leasing project serving chronically homeless individuals and/or families (particularly if securing matching funds proves challenging.)

****

D. Application Ranking and Project Selection Process

1. Grouping of Applications for Initial Ranking

Each Application should be scored so that it competes only with other projects within the same Project and activity type, at least for purposes of generated the initial ranked project list. For example, all Applicants proposing to provide supportive services to RRH Projects should be scored and ranked as a separate and distinct group, and none would be evaluated in comparison with Applicants proposing to provide services to PSH projects.

2. Baseline Assumptions for Use in the Community Ranking and Project Selection Process

Because many of the Projects awarded funding in FY 2015 were newly configured re-allocations that have not yet completed two full years of operation, declining to renew them would be disruptive to the system. Absent compelling circumstances (e.g., serious performance concerns with performance on the part of Applicants with regard to their current projects.) Therefore, the baseline assumption for the FY 2018 scoring and selection process should be that:

a. The distribution of FY 2017 awards should generally favor the current mix of PSH vs. RRH project funding (approximately 75%-25%) and housing vs. supportive services funding (80%-20%). The latter split is also an implicit expectation of HUD. This distribution will be reflected in the publication of baseline renewal amounts by Project and activity type.

b. All other things being equal, particularly while CoC FL-507 is in the process of collecting more and better performance data, projects funded in FY 2017 should be prioritized for renewal.

c. Notwithstanding a. and b., the need for some adjustments could become clear through the Community Ranking and Project Selection process in the form of documented system and project performance concerns.

5. Baseline Tier 1 Assumptions

Because of the expectation that a PSH unit be made available to a resident for as long as it may be needed, the cost to the region of losing a PSH unit is significantly greater than the cost of losing a RRH unit. Consequently, all other things being equal, PSH renewals should be funded in Tier 1 and in front of RRH projects in order to reduce the likelihood that these resources are imperiled.

6. Baseline Tier 2 Assumptions

In order to maximize the competitiveness of the Submission to HUD based on published criteria, CoC FL-507 should include only one Project in Tier 2. Assuming consistency with CoC FL-507 priorities, such a Project would be a RRH Project straddling Tier 1 and Tier 2, so that even in a scenario under which Tier 2 is not funded, a portion of the RRH Project would be preserved.

7. Baseline Permanent Housing Bonus Assumptions.

Given the manner in which HUD has structured the Permanent Housing Bonus opportunity, funding requests by all Applicants associated with a particular proposed Permanent Housing Bonus Project should not exceed a total of $100,000, of which no more than 20 percent should be proposed for supportive services.

****

E. CoC FL-507 Prioritization

1.   Definition of Homelessness

In order to be eligible to receive housing assistance and/or supportive services through a HUD CoC Program- or OCAG-funded Project, a Program Participant must meet the definition of homelessness found in either Category 1 (i.e., is literally homeless) or Category 4 (i.e., fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence) of the HUD definition of homelessness (24 CFR §578.3).

Category 1:   Any individual or family who lacks, regular and adequate nighttime residence, meaning:
- Has a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings, including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground;
- Is living in a public or privately operated shelter (congregate shelters, transitional housing and hotels and motels are paid for by charitable organizations or federal, state and local government; or
- Is exiting an institution where (s) he has resided for 90 days or less and who resided in an emergency shelter or place not meant for human habitation immediately before entering that institution.

Category 4:   Any individual or family who:

- Is fleeing, or is attempting to flee domestic violence, human trafficking, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault;
- Has no other residence; and
- Lacks the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.

2. Income

Any individual or family with household income exceeding 50 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) most recently published by HUD for the Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford MSA is assumed to have sufficient resources to obtain other permanent housing and is not eligible for HUD CoC Program- or OCAG-funded PSH, RRH or TH assistance.

3. Chronicity

PSH housing assistance and supportive services are prioritized for individuals and families experiencing the longest histories of homelessness histories and most severe needs.

Attachment E
CoC FL-507 Requirements Related to Adoption of a Housing First Approach

1.   Housing First Generally.

a. For purposes of this RFA, "Housing First" means a model of housing assistance that prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing that does not have service participation requirements or preconditions, as explained in the 2018 HUD NOFA.

b. Instructions for the Project application that were incorporated into the 2018 HUD NOFA and that serve as the basis for this RFA further specify that:

i.   Housing First is an approach to quickly and successfully connect individuals and families experiencing homelessness to permanent housing, without barriers to entry, and without related preconditions that might lead to the Program Participant's termination from the Project.

ii. Under a Housing First approach, supportive services are offered to maximize housing stability and prevent returns to homelessness as opposed to addressing pre-determined treatment goals prior to permanent housing entry; however, participation in supportive services is based on the needs and desires of Program Participants.

2.   Denial of Eligibility for Service under a Housing First Approach.

Applicant agrees that eligibility for or access to the Project will not be made contingent on any condition or restriction that is not essential for eligibility, including but not limited to:

a. Failure to meet minimum income requirements;
b. Poor credit or problematic financial history;
c. Poor rental history or no rental history;
d. Perceived lack of housing readiness;
e. Current or past history of mental illness;
f. Current or past history of substance use;
g. Criminal record, with the exception of state- or federally-mandated restrictions;
h. Failure to complete treatment or make progress on a service plan;
i. Failure to participate in supportive services;
j. Current or past history of domestic violence (e.g., lack of protective order, period of separation from abuser, law enforcement involvement);
k. Disability or type of disability;
l. Composition of the family, as defined by HUD for Equal Access purposes;
m. Sexual orientation;
n. Gender identity;
o. Lack of transportation;
p. Possessions or belongings;

q. Project hours of intake or operation;

r. Accompaniment by pets; or

s. Any other activity not covered in a typical lease agreement executed in accordance with Florida landlord-tenant laws.

3.   Termination of Service under a Housing First Approach.

Applicant agrees that eligibility for the Project will not be contingent on any condition or restriction that is not essential for eligibility, including those listed at Paragraph 2 above and the following:

a.   Loss of income or failure to increase income;

b.   Decision on the part of a domestic violence survivor to reunite with abuser; or

c.   Eviction, displacement, or relocation from a housing unit.

4.   Additional Housing First Requirements.

Applicant further agrees to take all reasonable steps to:

a. Adjust or modify service intensity and duration as appropriate based on changes in Program Participants' needs or circumstances;

b. Provide prospective and current Program Participants with disabilities with clear opportunities to request reasonable accommodations as part of the service delivery process;

c. If providing Case Management services, in the event of an eviction, displacement, or relocation of a Program Participant from a housing unit, continue the service relationship and the provision of appropriate and necessary services unless/until Program Participant is transferred or terminated from service via the Registry Management process of the Coordinated Entry System (CES);

d. Notify the CES-designated Point of Contact and assigned Case Manager within two (2) business days of becoming aware that:
    i)   an eviction action has been filed against any Program Participant, or
    ii) a notice has been provided to any Program Participant that, without resolution, will imminently result in the filing of an eviction against the Program Participant; and

e. Notify the CES-designated Point of Contract and assigned Case Manager within two (2) business days of becoming aware of an impending vacancy in any housing unit currently occupied by a Program Participant or the impending availability of a housing voucher or slot currently used by a Program Participant.

5. Exceptions to Housing First.

Notwithstanding Paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 above, actions taken by the Applicant in direct response to the following shall not be considered incompatible with or a violation of a Housing First approach:

a.   Requirements imposed by local, state or federal laws;

b.   Documented, imminent threats to health and safety; or

c.   Exceptions mutually agreed upon in advance between Applicant and recipient.

Central Florida Continuum of Care (CoC FL-507)
FY 2018 Regional Application for HUD CoC Program Funding
Minutes from Community Ranking and Project Selection Committee

Present: Dawn Haynes (Community Resource Network), Ron Piccolo (University of Central Florida), Thelisha Thomas (Healthy Start Coalition of Seminole County), Cynthia Schmidt (Center for Law and Policy), David Jeczala (Florida Department of Children and Families), Sandi Vidal (Central Florida Foundation)

Staff: Martha Are, Greg Mellowe, Brian Postlewait

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Martha Are convened the meeting and welcomed the Committee members, who then introduced themselves. Ms. Are then provided some background for the CoC regional application process for CoC Program funding as well as the process for the submission of the application to U.S. HUD. She then reviewed the regional application scoring criteria and weighting, HUD's decision-making process, the CoC Board-adopted policies and priorities regarding application ranking and project selection, and the bundling of projects.

The committee reviewed its charge, namely to submit a proposal regarding the ranking of applications received, the selection of projects and the recommendation of funding amounts to the CoC Board, which makes the final decisions regarding inclusion in the application to HUD.

Ms. Are explained that the applications under review pertain to FFY 2018; contracts awarded will therefore not be effective until late 2019. Given that lag, the Committee agreed that award amounts for individual applicants within selected projects should be considered preliminary and subject to future adjustment based on applicant performance, spending, etc., prior to the start date of FY 2018 agreements.

Ms. Are explained that the Annual Renewal Demand (HUD-calculated expected maximum renewal funding for CoC-funded Projects) for FY 2018 is $7,326,489, 94% of which falls into Tier 1 (somewhat competitive) and Tier 2 (highly competitive). In addition, the CoC may appropriately include in its submission to HUD both applications for Permanent Housing (PH) Bonus projects totaling up to $479,404, and up to 3 type-specific projects under a first-ever Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus Project.

PROJECTS FILLING TIERS 1 and 2

The Committee then proceeded to review the preliminary ranking of applications to determine recommended funding amounts (see attached). The ranked list included 30 applications proposing activities that upon bundling into 17 projects that would fill Tiers 1 and 2. These were all renewal projects, although in some cases adjustments were made with respect to the applicants included.

The Request for Applications process included a plan for potential reallocation of funding from a lower-performing project to a higher-performing project if its total score was 1.5 standard deviations below

the average score. However, no currently funded applicants scored so low as to be subject to be reallocation.

PERMANENT HOUSING BONUS PROJECT

Of the remaining applications that were not ranked highly enough to displace any applicant selected for inclusion in a project placed in Tier 1 or Tier 2, the committee reviewed any that were eligible for potential inclusion as part of a Permanent Housing (PH) Bonus Project.

These projects in rank order included the Coalition for the Homeless' Rapid Rehousing expansion proposal ("grossed up" with rental assistance to match the services amount), Ability Housing's new PSH Rental Assistance project (with Wayne Densch providing services), and IMPOWER's new TH/RRH for youth project ("grossed up" with rental assistance to align with the services and TH operations amounts), and Transition House's proposed new PSH Leasing project.

The Committee then discussed competing principles related to sizing the Permanent Housing Bonus Project request(s). Given the PH Bonus Project ceiling of $479,002, the size of the adjusted request amounts, and the Coalition's expressed willingness in its application to scale the project as needed, the Committee recommended that the Coalition be asked bifurcate its project and submit the two parts separately.

If the Coalition did not agree to bifurcate, the Committee agreed that this action was to be construed as an indication that the Coalition wished to forego further participation in the FY 2018 process, and IMPOWER was to be moved into the 2nd Bonus slot.

The Committee's recommendation therefore incorporated two distinct scenarios for ranking applications for the PH Bonus:

Scenario 1:   Coalition agrees to bifurcate its project

#1	Coalition for the Homeless/HSN	RRH for Families - A
	$160,081 *	
#2	Ability Housing PSH	$102,514 *
#3	Coalition for the Homeless/HSN	RRH for Families - B
	$215,054 *	
Total		
		$477,648 *

Scenario 2:   Coalition declines to bifurcate its project

#1	Ability Housing PSH	
		$102,514 *
#2	IMPOWER/HSN Youth TH-RRH	
	$263,494 *	**Total**
		$366,008 *

DV Bonus Project

Four applications were received from DV/victim services providers, each of which proposed to provide case management services to survivors in Rapid Rehousing, and all of which received scores that ranked them below their Tier 1 and 2 counterparts. One DV-specific application for rental assistance and one application proposing a small DV-focused expansion to the Coordinated Entry System were also received from HSN. The DV Bonus Project was then assembled as a bundle of these applications, which was to include case management for DV clients along with 55 rental assistance vouchers to be administered by HSN, plus a small set-aside to increase Coordinated Entry System capacity to administer the parallel DV system.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Three applicants (Family Promise of Greater Orlando, Catholic Charities and IMPOWER) that were not recommended for any specific award amount were nevertheless recommended for pre-qualification as additional potential sub-recipients that could provide their proposed services in HUD-funded RRH bundles as/if the need arises. Three additional applications were unable to meet all threshold criteria, and so were considered to be non-qualifying in terms of eligibility for further consideration. The only other application under consideration was a "placeholder" PSH Leasing application from HSN to be bundled as part of a PH Bonus Project. This was unnecessary and so had been withdrawn by HSN.

FINAL SUMMARY:

By unanimous consent, the Committee agreed to forward the following recommendations to the CoC Board for immediate consideration:

- Recommend inclusion of the list of proposed projects and funding amounts to fill Tiers 1 and 2 in the 2018 submission to HUD, in the rank order and with funding amounts as presented to the Committee, after corrections, and with the caveat that small adjustments to funding amounts may be necessary to fit within the constraints of the HUD project budget framework. Actual award amounts at the time sub-recipient agreements are executed in 2019 may be adjusted based on factors including, but not limited to, project performance, spending rates and funding availability.

- Further recommend inclusion in the HUD submission the three Permanent Housing Bonus projects and the DV Bonus project described above (in the order that maximizes regional access to CoC funding), with corrections, and again subject to slight adjustment for project sizing.

As all scheduled business was completed, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes Recorded by Greg Mellowe

Exhibit C to CoC Application Scorecard

Sample CoC FL-507 Project Evaluation Reporting Tool

About the CoC Emergency Shelter Evaluation Scorecard

CoC FL 507 has designed a scorecard to help all projects evaluate their perfomacne year round. This tool will also be used as part of the evaluation of any CoC competition application proces.

Getting Started

Step 1.
Each project type (Emergency Shelter(ES), Rapid Rehousing(RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing(PSH), Street Outreach (SO), has its own scorecard. Make sure you are using the correct scorecard for your project type.

Step 2.
Run CoC APR

Step 3.
Enter the information below based on your CoC APR report the only data element used that is not found in the CoC APR is the HIC number if applicable and that number is found in (HUD HDX) submitted HIC. Make sure to read the data source on the left column completley before transposing data values. Entering the incorrect data value in this section will change the overal score for the scorecard.

General Information

Organization Name / Reporting Group :

Project Contact / Agency Admin :

APR Report Start Date :

APR Report End Date :

Reviewed By :

Data Source	Enter Data in this column	Description	How its used
APR 5a - Q1:	208	Total Number of Clients Served	
APR 5a - Q5:	113	Number of Leavers	
APR 5a - Q2:	83	Number of Adults (Age 18+)	
APR 6a - Overral Score:	5%	Data Quality: Personally Identifiable Information	
APR Question 6b			
APR 6b - Veteran Status (3.7):	1%	Data Quality: Universal Data Elements	
APR 6b - Project Entry Date (3.10):	0%	Data Quality: Universal Data Elements	
APR 6b - Relationship to Head of Household (3.15):	6%	Data Quality: Universal Data Elements	
APR 6b - Client Location (3.16):	0%	Data Quality: Universal Data Elements	
APR 6b - Disabling Condition (3.8):	3%	Data Quality: Universal Data Elements	
APR 6c - Income and Sources (4.2) at Entry (% of Error Rate):	19%	Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality (Income and sources at entry)	
APR 6c - Income and Sources (4.2) at Annual Assessment (% of Error Rate):	100%	Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality (Income and sources at annual assessments)	
APR 6c - Income and Sources (4.2) at Exit (% of Error Rate):	-	Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality (Income and sources at exit)	
APR 6d Total:	9%	Data Quality Chronic Homelessness	
APR Question 6e (Number of Project Entry Records)	32%	Data Quality: Timeliness	
0 days:	0		Calculate percentage of timelines rec 0 + 1-3 - conapre to total number of person served
1 - 3 days:	24		

Field	Value	Description
APR 6f:	0	Data Quality: Inactive Records: Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter (If Applicable)
APR 8b		Point-in-Time Count of Households on the Last Wednesday
January Total:	24	Only used for SO and ES
April Total:	22	
July Total :	18	
October Total:	20	
APR Q 13a2		Minimum percent of participants with more than one disability type
None:	167	This will help determine the vulnerabilty of clients entering the project
1 Condition:	24	
2 Conditions:	6	
3+ Conditions:	0	
Condition Unknown	3	
Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused	0	
Date not collected	5	
APR Q15 - Living Situation - Homeless Situation - Place not meant for human habitation :	34	Minimum percent of participants entering project from place not meant for human habitation. This will help determine the vulnerability of clients entering the project. Calulation....
APR 16:	35	Cash income - ranges - No Income at Entry. Client Cash Income Change - Income Source - by Entry and Latest Status/Exit - Performance Measure: Percent of Persons who Accomplished this Measure.
APR 19a3:	21%	Length of Participation - CoC Projects Total
APR Q 22a1		
30 days or less	50	
60 days	16	
90 days	0	
91 to 180	60	
181 to 365 days	84	
366 to 730 Days (1-2 Yrs)	13	
731 to 1,095 Days (2-3 Yrs)	5	
1,096 to 1,460 Days (3-4 Yrs)	0	
1,461 to 1,825 Days (4-5 Yrs)	0	
More than 1,825 Days (>5 Yrs)	0	
Data not collected	0	
APR 22b	15	Average Length of participation in days leavers
APR 22b	5	Average Length of participation in days stayers
APR Q 23a		Exit Destination - More than 90 days
Permanent Destination Subtotal:	65	
APR Q 23b		Exit Destination - 90 Days or Less
Permanent Destination Subtotal:	12	23a + 23b will be used in combination to calculate % of clients exiting to permanent housing
APR Q26a:	1	Chronic Homeless Status - Number of Households w/at least one or more CH person

Emergency Shelter(ES)_Project Evaluation Scorecard_v2.5

Project Name:
Date:
Revewed By:
Project Contact / Agency Admin:

	TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE	TOTAL POINTS EARNED	OVERALL SCORE
	100	10.0	10.0%

	100%	80%	60%	40%	0%
	High Performance	Good	Average	Below Average	Very Poor Performance

Category 1: Data Quality

Description/ Rating factor	Data Source	Point value	A	B	C	D	F	Your Score
Timeliness	APR 6e - Data Quality: Timeliness % of records between 0-3 days	8	Example - 85% + Between 0 to 3 days	70% to 84 % Between 0 to 3 days	55% to 69 % Between 0 to 3 days	40% to 54 % Between 0 to 3 days	40% and under Between 0 to 3 days	0
Data completeness	APR 6a - Data Quality: Personally Identifiable Information Overall Score % of Error Rate	6.5						0
	APR 6b - Data Quality: Universal Data Elements Overall Score % of Error Rate	6.5						0
Income (Entry)	APR 6c - Data Quality: Income and Housing Data Quality (Entry) % error rate	0.5						0
Income (Annual)	APR 6c - DQ: Income and Housing Data Quality (Annual) % error rate	1.5						0
Income (Exit)	APR 6c - DQ: Income and Housing Data Quality (Exit) % error rate	0.5						0
	APR 6d - Data Quality Chronic Homelessness % error rate	6.5						0
	Total Points Available in This Category:	**30**					**Total Points In This Category:**	**0.0**