



Continuum of Care (CoC) Competition Evaluation Workgroup
 Meeting
 Agenda for August 21, 2024
 1:00 pm-3:00 pm Pacific Time

	Agenda Item	Time
	Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions	1:00pm
1.	Approve Agenda (ACTION ITEM)	1:05pm
2.	Approve Minutes (ACTION ITEM)	1:10pm
3.	2024 & 2025 CoC Competition NOFO Update	1:15pm
4.	CoC New Project Scoring Tool Approval (ACTION ITEM)	1:40pm
5.	Public Comment on Non-agendized Items	2:55pm

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Public Comment may be made via email or during the live zoom meeting. To submit an emailed public comment to the Committee email Araceli.Rivera@sonoma-county.org. Please provide your name, the agenda number(s) on which you wish to speak, and your comment. These comments will be emailed to all Committee members. Public comment during the meeting can be made live by joining the Zoom meeting. Available time for comments is determined by the Chair based on agenda scheduling demands and total number of speakers.



Sonoma County Continuum of Care (CoC)

**CoC Competition Evaluation Workgroup
Meeting Minutes for June 12th, 2024**

11:00am-2:00pm Pacific Time

Recording

Passcode:

Welcome and Roll Call and introductions

- Karissa White, CoC Continuum of Care Coordinator, and Dennis Pocekay Workgroup Chair called the meeting to order at 11:06am.
- Roll Call:
 - Present: Dennis Pocekay, Teddie Pierce, Rebekah Sammet, Kelli Kuykendall, Jessica Wolf, Sarah Vetter,
 - Absent: Angie Sebring, Amy Holter, Kirstyne Lange

1. Approve Agenda-

Approve agenda from for 6/12/2024
Agenda approved unanimously

Public Comment: None

2. Approve Meeting Minutes:

Approve meeting minutes from 5/14/2024
Minutes approved unanimously

Public Comment: None

- 3. Scoring Adjustment Recommendation for CES-** Karissa White CoC Coordinator, went over the measure request to adjust section "6. Coordinated Entry Participation," for the measure "Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry" with a total of three points currently allocated. Full details presented in staff report.

Recommendations for Approval:

1. Remove the scoring measure "Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry" completely from the scoring tool. This would leave a total of 97/97 points possible.
2. Remove the scoring measure "Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry" and allocate the three points originally allocated to this measure to the Coordinated Entry measure "Percentage of enrollments in the project with CES referrals." This change would increase the total

point value in this section to be 7/7 points. Full points possible on the scoring tool would remain 100 points possible.

Kelly Kuykendall Motions to accept staff recommendation number 1 Remove the scoring measure “Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry” completely from the scoring tool. Leaving a total of 97/97 points as total score., Teddie Pierce seconds.

Public Comment: None

Motion approved unanimously

- 4. Final Scoring Review-Site Visit Notes: Buckelew, Committee on the Shelterless (COTS), Sonoma County CDC Housing Authority (SCCDC HA):** Karissa White CoC Coordinator went over reports/ summaries of the additional information collected during each site visit attached to meeting packet (Attachment A). Workgroup members discussed additional information provided and made change recommendations.

Projects to be reviewed: Buckelew, Committee on the Shelterless (COTS), and West County Community Services (WCCS)

Buckelew:

- Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy- 0.5/1 increased to 1/1
- Coordination with Housing Providers- 0/1 increased to 1/1
- Client/lived experience feedback 3.5/4 increased to 4/4
- Racial Equity & Anti-Discrimination -5/6 increased to 6/6
- Change Management 4.5/5 increased to 5/5

Committee on the Shelterless:

- Cultural Competency & Disability Access 2.5/3 increased to 3/3
- Racial Equity & Anti-Discrimination 3.5/6 increased to 4.5/6
- Data-informed Program Research 3.5/4 increased to 4/4
- Change Management 4.5/5 increased 5/5

West County Community Services:

Elderberry Commons: The project has not started, therefore award will automatically fall in tier 1 and prioritized for funding per HUD.

Mill Street Supportive Housing:

- Client/Lived experience feedback 3.5/4 increased to 4/4
- Data-informed Program Research 3/4. Increased to 4

Public Comment: Dannielle Danforth, John Baxter, Kerensa Mora

- 5. Final Scoring Review -Site Visit Notes:** - Community Support Network (CSN), and Sonoma County CDC Housing Authority (SCCDC HA)

Community Support Network:

SAY Sponsor Based Rental Assistance- CSN responded to questions based on how they plan to operate the project once the transfer is completed. Staff noted that although APR data has been included in the larger scoring sheet, this was the previous operator's program data through Social Advocates for Youth.

- Housing First 6.5/7 increased to 7/7
- Change Management & Institutionalization of Knowledge-4/5 increased to 4.5/5

Stony Point Commons –*Will have the same points awarded as the SAY Sponsor Based Rental Assistance Program as most responses are CoC agency-wide.*

Sonoma County CDC Housing Authority (SCCDC HA)

- Cultural Competency 2.5/3 increased to 3/3
- Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies-5/6 increased to 5.5
- Change management & Institutionalization of Knowledge 4.5/5 increased to 5/5

Public Comment: Dannielle Danforth, Gregory Fearon

6. Final Scoring Review- Site Visit Notes: Catholic Charities (CCDSR), and St. Vincent de Paul (SVDP)

Catholic Charities: No changes made

St. Vincent de Paul (SVDP):

Workgroup voted to have partial APR included (zeros in shared sheet will be updated and sent out to workgroup)

- Evidence of Project's collaborations with corrections partners- 0/1 increased to 1/1
- Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio or other evidence--0/1 increased to 0.5/1
- Mainstream Resources .5/1 increased to 1/1
- Coordination with Housing Partners- 0/1 increased to 0.5/1
- Cultural Competency & disability access- 1.5/3 increased to 2/3
- Client/lived experience Feedback Process- 3.5/4 increased to 4/4
- Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies-3/6 increased to 4.5/6
- Data informed Research 3.5/4 increased to 4/4

Public Comment: Kimberly Luis

7. Renewal Final Scoring Recommendations and Approval: Karissa White, CoC Coordinator shared scoring sheet to show final scoring for all projects.

Public Comment: None

Teddie Pierce made motion to approve scores as adjusted, Jessica Wolfe seconds motion

Public Comment: Danielle Danforth

Roll Call Vote:

Approve: Dennis Pocekay, Teddie Pierce, Kelli Kuykendall, Jessica Wolf, Sarah Vetter,

- Absent: Angie Sebring, Amy Holter, Kirstyne Lange, Rebekah Sammet

Approved

8. Public Comment on Non-agendized Items- None

Meeting adjourned at 2:04pm



Sonoma County CoC Competition and Evaluation Workgroup Executive Summary

Item: FY 2024 CoC Competition New Project Scoring Staff Report

Date: August 21, 2024

Staff Contact: Karissa White, Continuum of Care Coordinator, Karissa.White@sonoma-county.org

CoC Program New Project Scoring Tool

On July 31, 2024, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) issued the Continuum of Care (CoC) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the 2024 & 2025 Continuum of Care Program Funds. Within the NOFO, HUD lays out specific scoring criteria in which CoC's are scored on how we score our projects, our CoC's System Performance/Homeless Count, commitment to the housing first model, and how well we do on the full CoC Application submitted by staff, as the CoC's Collaborative Applicant.

HUD Press release: https://www.hud.gov/press/press_releases_media_advisories/HUD_No_24_198

After a review of the NOFO, staff determined that most of the priorities from last year's New Project Scoring tool remain the same. There are specific sections in the NOFO in which certain criteria are weighted higher than others. Staff requests that the workgroup review the sections and their point values to determine if there should be any adjustments to the numerical scoring of each measure listed within the new project scoring tool. **The staff has updated certain scoring sections from last year's tool to align with some of the point values of the 2024 Renewal Project Scoring Tool, previously approved by the workgroup.** In addition, we have created two separate scoring tools, one that accounts for new permanent supportive housing (PSH) projects and another that accounts for rapid rehousing and joint transitional rapid rehousing (RRH/ Joint TH/RRH). As the Renewal Project Tool was approved targeting PSH measures as it relates to income and housing measures, these have been changed on the new tool for RRH/ Joint TH/RRH scoring Tool; the first two measures have been updated to reflect system performance measures related to these types of projects. In addition, the measures that were previously prorated have been adjusted based on points for proposed percentages. Last year, only one new project applied and scored 100% in all prorated sections. To mitigate this, staff has adjusted the way it is scored based on outcome percentages, rather than prorated in the instance only one new project applies.

Given the timeline associated with these funds, the Funding and Evaluation Committee has been invited to participate in the New Project Scoring discussion at the August 21st meeting to provide their input via public comment.

New NOFO Timeline

This year, HUD has released a 2-year NOFO for FY 2024 and 2025. The application and selection process for FY 2024 funds will proceed much like prior year competitions. As the CoC, we will only have to submit one Consolidated Application, which will be applicable to both 2024 and 2025 funding. HUD currently only has money in its budget for 2024. HUD does not yet know what will be in their budget for 2025, but if new competitive funding becomes available for 2025, the NOFO may be amended, and the 2024 2025 COC Application score will be used for the FY 2025 project application selection process.

HUD Homeless Policy Priorities

The following are HUD Homeless Priorities outlined with the 2024 & 2025 NOFO. All of these are the same priorities listed in the competition last year with the addition of building an effective workforce.

1. Ending homelessness for all persons;
2. Use a Housing First Approach;
3. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessness;
4. Improving System Performance;
5. Partnering with Housing, Health, and Service Agencies;
6. Racial Equity;
7. Improving Assistance to LGBTQ+ Individuals;
8. Persons with Lived Experience;
9. Building an Effective Workforce; and
10. Increasing Affordable Housing Supply.

The new priority, building an effective workforce, includes a Cost of Living Adjustment to awards funded through this program. Prior to this, budget line items pertaining to HMIS and Supportive Services costs did not increase over time. On the other hand, rental assistance, leasing, and operating budgets do increase. HUD recognizes that for providers to retain and recruit qualified staff, a cost of living adjustment is needed to allow CoC's to better keep up with rising costs. HUD noted during the Competition Webinar that this isn't something that CoCs need to do anything about; HUD will be applying this cost to Supportive Services and HMIS budget line items.

Next Steps

After the workgroup has approved the scoring tool, staff will include the scoring tool in the required Local Request for Proposals (RFP). Our release date for the RFP is August 26th, 2024. As with the scoring tools, the RFP is used from the previous years and updated with any new information in the NOFO, outlining our CoC's local process with pertinent information about the competition, eligible components (project types), updating timelines, any new priorities, and amounts of funding available.

In addition to our New Project Scoring Tool, applicants must meet HUD's Project Quality Threshold Requirements (Page 59, NOFO). HUD's requirements are specific to the eligible project component, this includes Supportive Services Only- Coordinated Entry, Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing, Joint Transitional Rapid Rehousing, and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS Lead only). This will be provided to applicants in the Local Request for Proposals. Applicants must meet a certain number of points in their application in the E-snaps grant submission system to pass this threshold requirement with HUD; this is in addition to our scoring (page 60, NOFO). A supplemental questionnaire

will be utilized to score new projects and will be included in the required attachments for new project applications in the RFP.

CoC Staff will run a competition for funding within the timeline required outlined in the CoC NOFO. Once we have received all new project applications, those applications will then be brought forth to the workgroup to score and rank with the renewal projects. To provide as much time as possible to potential new applicants with this complex funding stream, the F&E Committee shall be invited to this meeting to provide their feedback through public comment as well.

All projects will be evaluated and put on a list based on their scores, also known as the "Priority Listing." This NOFO is unique as most of the funding available is for projects that are already existing (Renewal Projects). However, the CoC can reallocate funding for underperforming projects and place a new project in their place (if this project meets the needs of community/threshold requirements).

As approved by the workgroup, the Final Priority Listing recommendations will be submitted to the Homeless Coalition Board for final approval.

This year, HUD has announced that up to 10% of our Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) is at risk. In terms of the CoC Program Renewal projects already scored, this means that we could potentially lose a couple of renewing projects this year.

Sonoma County CoC's Estimated ARD: \$4,384,714

Estimated ARD potentially at risk: \$438,471.40

HUD has not yet released the final Estimated Renewal Demand Report, which outlines how much potential bonus funding we may be eligible for in the competition. Additional information will be provided and announced widely once the Local RFP has been updated and released.

Staff Recommendation:

Approve the scoring for projects for the 2024 CoC Competition as is or as adjusted workgroup members – New Projects.

Optional Review

The following information is being provided for transparency, and for those who wish to review the materials, it is not required that you review these documents.

CoC Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/CPD/documents/FY2024_FY2025_CoC_and_YHDP_NOFO_FR-6800-N-25.pdf

Quick comparison on scoring from last year to this year: https://endhomelessness.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/2024-2025_NOFO_ScoringChartComparison.pdf

2023 CoC New Project Scoring Tool and Request for Proposals

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/health-and-human-services/health-services/divisions/homelessness-services/sonoma-county-homeless-coalition/continuum-of-care-competition/2023-continuum-of-care-competition>

See the section “Request for Proposals” to download last year’s RFP, which includes the 2023 scoring criteria for new projects.



Sonoma County 2024 Continuum of Care Competition Permanent Supportive Housing New Project Scoring Tool

Section	Measure	Scoring Methodology	Points Possible
1.	Housing Stability (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome. Highest percentage of project participants remaining permanently housed at year-end earns full points. Scoring: 100-95%= 6 points, 94-85%= 4 points, 84-75%= 2 points, 74% and below= 0 points	6– staff will calculate
2.	Exits to Permanent Housing (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome. Highest rate of proposed exits to permanent housing destinations earns full points. Scoring: 100-95%= 6 points, 94-85%= 4 points, 84-75%= 2 points, 74% and below= 0 points	6– staff will calculate
3.	Increase in Earned Income (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project to meet this outcome. Highest rate of income growth for participants at annual assessment and exit earns full points. Scoring: 100-80%= 6 points, 79-60%= 4 points, 59-40%= 2 points, 39% and below= 0 points	3– staff will calculate
4.	Increase in Non-Employment Income (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome Highest rate of other income growth for participants at annual assessment and exit earns full points. Scoring: 100-80%= 6 points, 79-60%= 4 points, 59-40%= 2 points, 39% and below= 0 points	7– staff will calculate
5.	Maximizing the use of mainstream resources (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project receiving outcome mainstream health, social, and employment programs. (e.g., regular monthly benefits: examples-cash benefits provided outside the provider’s project such as calfresh, Housing Voucher, TANF, child care services, government paid cell phone, monthly bus passes provided by another agency, employment services, etc.) Scoring: 100-95%= 6 points, 94-85%= 4 points, 84-75%= 2 points, 74% and below= 0 points	7– Staff will calculate
6.	Housing First Approach and Coordinated Entry	A Housing First approach identifies, engages, and connects homeless persons with the highest level of need; and works to eliminate any barriers to housing in front of the people that need our help the most, utilizing the Coordinated Entry System as the sole source for referrals. The extent to which the narrative reflects how the agency is working to implement a Housing First approach and the use of Coordinated Entry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplemental Scoring questionnaire 6 points • 	6

7.	Improving Assistance for LGBTQ+ Individuals	<p>Addressing the service needs of LGBTQ+, transgender, gender non-conforming, and non-binary individuals and families in agency planning process, employment, and agency anti-discrimination policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for addressing service needs, employment opportunities at the organization, training for current staff, hiring practices, and having an agency anti-discrimination policy; • Half points for addressing the needs, but do not have an anti-discrimination policy; and • zero points for no action/work pertaining to meeting the needs of this population. 	4
8.	Racial Equity	<p>Emphasizing system and program changes to address racial equity using proven approaches and partnerships with racially diverse stakeholders who have experience serving underserved populations. The extent to which the narrative reflects how agency is working to eliminate barriers to improve racial equity and to address disparities. Such as review procedures, and processes with attention to identifying barriers that result in racial disparities and taking steps to eliminate barriers to improve racial equity and to address disparities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for reviewing data and implementing a plan to address these needs as an agency; • half points for reviewing the data without implementing a plan; and • zero points for no action/work completed to address racial inequities in the agency's programming. 	5
9.	Persons with lived Experience	<p>Incorporating Persons with lived experience or those who have formerly experienced homelessness in program planning, policy development, employment, decision-making bodies, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for the inclusion of those with lived experience on decision-making bodies and with employment opportunities at the organization, training for current staff; • half points for only meeting one of the two options for full points; • and zero points for no participation from those with lived experience. 	4
10.	Project Narrative/Design	<p>Narrative is understandable; project design reflects the experience of applicant in working with proposed population; applicant understands client needs, type and scale, and location of the housing fit population being served, how clients are assisted in receiving mainstream benefits, performance measurement indicators for housing and income meet HEARTH benchmarks, plan to assist clients with rapidly obtaining permanent housing is clear and accessible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>*Domestic violence projects will be evaluated based on the degree they improve safety for the population they serve and employ trauma-informed victim-centered approaches to service delivery.</i> 	8
11.	Coordination with Housing Partners	<p>Housing Partners (create new permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing projects that coordinate with housing providers not funded through ESG/CoC Program)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 Points if the project/agency has no planned/committed partnerships with housing providers directly related to the proposed project • 2 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a housing provider to provide subsidies (other than ESG/CoC) to the proposed units for PSH/participants served for RRH, but it is less than 25% of units/participants served proposed 	4

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a housing provider to provide subsidies other than ESG/CoC to the proposed units for PSH/participants served for RRH that will cover at least 25% of the units/participants served being proposed. 	
12.	Coordination with Healthcare Partners	<p>Healthcare Partners (create new permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing services projects that coordinate with healthcare providers to provide services to participants not funded through CoC or ESG Program):</p> <p>Scoring methodology (Healthcare):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Points If the project/agency has no planned/committed partnerships with healthcare providers directly related to the proposed project 2 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a healthcare provider to provide in-kind services to the proposed project, but it is less than 25% of the total amount of application 4- Points if the agency has a written commitment from a healthcare provider to provide in-kind services match with services totaling 25% of the total amount of the application or full points if the provider has a written commitment from a substance abuse provider to provide services to all program participants. 	4
13.	Project Readiness	Plan for opening services and housing is understandable, realistic, and timely (e.g., open within 90 days of contract execution- 2025/2026 term). The extent to which the narrative addresses expedited plan for housing placement after technical submission of contract (within 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days)	5
14.	Budget	Up to 5 points for a budget that is reasonable and meets threshold requirements for eligible expenses. Line item narratives document how CoC funds requested are essential to helping people become permanently housed. Required 25% match (cash or in-kind) is adequate, from appropriate sources, and accurately calculated.	4
15.	Cost Effectiveness	<p>Total Project Budget (including estimated match) ÷ number projected to achieve housing performance measures defined in the project application.</p> <p>Less than \$5,000 per outcome = 6 points, \$5,000 - \$9,999 = 5 points, \$10,000 - \$14,999 = 4 points, \$15,000 - \$19,999 = 3 points, \$20,000 -24,999 = 2 points, \$25,000-29,999= 1 point, 30,000+ = 0 points</p>	5
16.	Financial Audit and Health	<p>Scoring based on most recent audit including identification of agency as “low risk”, number (if any) of findings, documented match, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 points = no findings, timely audit, and documented match 2-3 points = 1 finding in the past 3 years, inaccurate/inconsistent match; 0-1 points = multiple findings, late audit, etc. 	4- staff will calculate
17.	Organizational capacity and	New Projects : If you are new to the CoC Program HUD notes that demonstrating capacity may include a description of other funds the project receives, which are either federal or state funding.	5

	experience/ Demonstrated Capacity to Manage CoC Awards	Scores will be drawn from the 2024 CoC Project Evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal Providers: cumulative rankings from past 3 CoC Competitions. Full points awarded to agencies scoring in the Top 5 of the previous 3 CoC Competitions with no projects falling into At-Risk Tier in past 3 competitions. 	
18.	Local & Other HUD Priorities	Alignment with 10-year plan goals and HUD priorities. 1 point for each goal this is in the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Project’s collaborations with corrections/Justice partners • Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy. • Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases • Staff training/screening for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance) • Promotion of/supporting volunteering, community engagement, and employment services 	5
19.	HMIS data quality, timeliness and coverage of all programs serving homeless	There are 3 criteria: 1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race & ethnicity) are at least 95% complete; 2) Data Quality Score: Income and Benefits health insurance 3) Timeliness Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **For Victim Services providers, this will be measured by analysis of data quality submitted by victim services providers that does not contain identifying information. • Providers that are not currently participating in HMIS will only receive up to half points in this section 	5- staff will calculate
	Total Points Possible		
			97



Sonoma County 2024 Continuum of Care Competition Rapid Rehousing and Joint Transitional Rapid Rehousing New Project Scoring Tool

Section	Measure	Scoring Methodology	Points Possible
1.	Successful Housing Placement (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project to meet this outcome. The highest percentage of project participants who exit to permanent destinations year-end earns full points. For the Joint TH/RRH projects, this accounts for the placements in permanent housing through the RRH component. Scoring: 100-95%= 6 points, 94-85%= 4 points, 84-75%= 2 points, 74% and below= 0 points	6– staff will calculate
2.	Length of Time Homeless (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project to meet this outcome. Days from Program start to Permanent housing move-in date. For the Joint TH/RRH projects, this accounts the length of time in the TH component in permanent housing through the RRH component. Scoring: <30 days= 6 points, 31 – 40 days= 4.5 points, 41-50 days = 3 points, 51-60 days= 1.5 points, >61= 0 points	6– staff will calculate
3.	Increase in Earned Income (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project to meet this outcome. Highest rate of income growth for participants at annual assessment and exit earns full points. Scoring: 100-80%= 6 points, 79-60%= 4 points, 59-40%= 2 points, 39% and below= 0 points	7– staff will calculate
4.	Increase in Non-Employment Income (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome Highest rate of other income growth for participants at annual assessment and exit earns full points. Points prorated for the highest percentage of project participants increasing other income at annual assessment and exit. Scoring: 100-80%= 6 points, 79-60%= 4 points, 59-40%= 2 points, 39% and below= 0 points	3– staff will calculate
5.	Maximizing the use of mainstream resources (System Performance Measure)	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project receiving outcome mainstream health, social, and employment programs. (e.g., regular monthly benefits: examples-cash benefits provided outside the provider’s project such as calfresh, Housing Voucher, TANF, child care services, government paid cell phone, monthly bus passes provided by another agency, employment services, etc.) Scoring: 100-95%= 6 points, 94-85%= 4 points, 84-75%= 2 points, 74% and below= 0 points	7– Staff will calculate
6.	Housing First Approach and Coordinated Entry	A Housing First approach identifies, engages, and connects homeless persons with the highest level of need; and works to eliminate any barriers to housing in front of the people that need our help the most, utilizing the Coordinated Entry System as the sole source for referrals. The extent to which the narrative reflects how the agency is working to implement a Housing First approach and the use of Coordinated Entry. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplemental Scoring questionnaire 7 points • 	6

7.	Improving Assistance for LGBTQ+ Individuals	<p>Addressing the service needs of LGBTQ+, transgender, gender non-conforming, and non-binary individuals and families in agency planning process, employment, and agency anti-discrimination policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for addressing service needs, employment opportunities at the organization, training for current staff, hiring practices, and having an agency anti-discrimination policy; • Half points for addressing the needs, but do not have an anti-discrimination policy; and • zero points for no action/work pertaining to meeting the needs of this population. 	4
8.	Racial Equity	<p>Emphasizing system and program changes to address racial equity using proven approaches and partnerships with racially diverse stakeholders who have experience serving underserved populations. The extent to which the narrative reflects how agency is working to eliminate barriers to improve racial equity and to address disparities. Such as review procedures, and processes with attention to identifying barriers that result in racial disparities and taking steps to eliminate barriers to improve racial equity and to address disparities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for reviewing data and implementing a plan to address these needs as an agency; • half points for reviewing the data without implementing a plan; and • zero points for no action/work completed to address racial inequities in the agency's programming. 	5
9.	Persons with lived Experience	<p>Incorporating Persons with lived experience or those who have formerly experienced homelessness in program planning, policy development, employment, decision-making bodies, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full points for the inclusion of those with lived experience on decision-making bodies and with employment opportunities at the organization, training for current staff; • half points for only meeting one of the two options for full points; • and zero points for no participation from those with lived experience. 	4
10.	Project Narrative/Design	<p>Narrative is understandable; project design reflects the experience of applicant in working with proposed population; applicant understands client needs, type and scale, and location of the housing fit population being served, how clients are assisted in receiving mainstream benefits, performance measurement indicators for housing and income meet HEARTH benchmarks, plan to assist clients with rapidly obtaining permanent housing is clear and accessible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>*Domestic violence projects will be evaluated based on the degree they improve safety for the population they serve and employ trauma-informed victim-centered approaches to service delivery.</i> 	8
11.	Coordination with Housing Partners	<p>Housing Partners (create new permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing projects that coordinate with housing providers not funded through ESG/CoC Program)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 Points if the project/agency has no planned/committed partnerships with housing providers directly related to the proposed project • 2 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a housing provider to provide subsidies (other than ESG/CoC) to the proposed units for PSH/participants served for RRH, but it is less than 25% of units/participants served proposed 	4

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a housing provider to provide subsidies other than ESG/CoC to the proposed units for PSH/participants served for RRH that will cover at least 25% of the units/participants served being proposed. 	
12.	Coordination with Healthcare Partners	<p>Healthcare Partners (create new permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing services projects that coordinate with healthcare providers to provide services to participants not funded through CoC or ESG Program):</p> <p>Scoring methodology (Healthcare):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 Points If the project/agency has no planned/committed partnerships with healthcare providers directly related to the proposed project 2 Points if the agency has a written commitment from a healthcare provider to provide in-kind services to the proposed project, but it is less than 25% of the total amount of application 4- Points if the agency has a written commitment from a healthcare provider to provide in-kind services match with services totaling 25% of the total amount of the application or full points if the provider has a written commitment from a substance abuse provider to provide services to all program participants. 	4
13.	Project Readiness	Plan for opening services and housing is understandable, realistic, and timely (e.g., open within 90 days of contract execution- 2025/2026 term). The extent to which the narrative addresses expedited plan for housing placement after technical submission of contract (within 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days)	5
14.	Budget	Up to 5 points for a budget that is reasonable and meets threshold requirements for eligible expenses. Line item narratives document how CoC funds requested are essential to helping people become permanently housed. Required 25% match (cash or in-kind) is adequate, from appropriate sources, and accurately calculated.	4
15.	Cost Effectiveness	<p>Total Project Budget (including estimated match) ÷ number projected to achieve housing performance measures defined in the project application.</p> <p>Less than \$5,000 per outcome = 6 points, \$5,000 - \$9,999 = 5 points, \$10,000 - \$14,999 = 4 points, \$15,000 - \$19,999 = 3 points, \$20,000 -24,999 = 2 points, \$25,000-29,999= 1 point, 30,000+ = 0 points</p>	5
16.	Financial Audit and Health	<p>Scoring based on most recent audit including identification of agency as “low risk”, number (if any) of findings, documented match, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 points = no findings, timely audit, and documented match 2-3 points = 1 finding in the past 3 years, inaccurate/inconsistent match; <p>0-1 points = multiple findings, late audit, etc.</p>	4- staff will calculate

17.	Organizational capacity and experience/ Demonstrated Capacity to Manage CoC Awards	New Projects : If you are new to the CoC Program HUD notes that demonstrating capacity may include a description of other funds the project receives, which are either federal or state funding. Scores will be drawn from the 2024 CoC Project Evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal Providers: cumulative rankings from past 3 CoC Competitions. Full points awarded to agencies scoring in the Top 5 of the previous 3 CoC Competitions with no projects falling into At-Risk Tier in past 3 competitions. 	5
18.	Local & Other HUD Priorities	Alignment with 10-year plan goals and HUD priorities. 1 point for each goal this is in the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Project’s collaborations with corrections/Justice partners • Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access & Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy. • Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases • Staff training/screening for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance) • Promotion of/supporting volunteering, community engagement, and employment services 	5
19.	HMIS data quality, timeliness and coverage of all programs serving homeless	There are 3 criteria: 1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race & ethnicity) are at least 95% complete; 2) Data Quality Score: Income and Benefits health insurance 3) Timeliness Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **For Victim Services providers, this will be measured by analysis of data quality submitted by victim services providers that does not contain identifying information. • Providers that are not currently participating in HMIS will only receive up to half points in this section 	5- staff will calculate
	Total Points Possible		
			97