



**Sonoma County Continuum of Care  
Agenda for Thursday, April 11, 2024  
2:00 to 4:00 pm Pacific**

**Funding & Evaluation Committee Meeting**

**Zoom Link:**

<https://sonomacounty.zoom.us/j/95823901825?pwd=enlrS1Z6M2VKaUEyQmVSc1V3YXFSZz09>  
Meeting ID: 958 2390 1825 Passcode: 703495

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Packet Item</b>	<b>Time</b>
1.	Welcome/Call to Order	Chair		1:00-1:05 pm
2.	Consent Calendar (ACTION ITEM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda Review</li> <li>• March Minutes Approval</li> </ul>	Chair	F&E Agenda Minutes drafts	1:05-1:15 pm
3.	Staff Acknowledgement	Committee	n/a	1:15 – 1:25 pm
4.	Update on Youth Services Funding	Staff	Info only	1:25-1:30 pm
5.	CoC Funding Renewal Scoring Tool [Action Item]	Staff	Scoring Tool Review	1:30 – 1:45
6.	Sonoma Valley Street Outreach Projects [Action Item]	Chair/Vice Chair	Forward Sonoma Valley Street Outreach recommendation Coalition Board	1:45 – 2:10 pm
7.	Funding Cycle Debriefing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Overall experience</li> <li>b. What worked</li> <li>c. What needs improvement</li> <li>d. Committee structure</li> </ul>	Committee	Committee members be prepared to discuss items a-d with feedback from the public	2:10 – 2:50 pm
8.	Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda	Public		2:50 – 3:00 pm
	Adjourn <b>Next F&amp;E Regular Meeting May 9, 2024</b>	Chair		

**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 [Andrew.Akufo@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Andrew.Akufo@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 Funding and Evaluation Executive Summary

### Item 5: CoC Renewal Project Scoring Tool

**Meeting Date:** April 11, 2024

**Staff Contact:** Karissa White, Continuum of Care Coordinator, [Karissa.White@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Karissa.White@sonoma-county.org)

Araceli (Chelli) Rivera, Homeless Projects Specialist, [Araceli.rivera@sonoma-county.org](mailto:Araceli.rivera@sonoma-county.org)

---

### Agenda Item Overview

The attached FY 24 CoC Renewal scoring tool is being recommended for approval by the Funding and Evaluation Committee on Thursday, April 11<sup>th</sup>. On April 5<sup>th</sup>, the [CoC Competition Evaluation \(CCE\) Workgroup](#) met and was provided an overview of HUD's Continuum of Care (CoC) Program and renewing projects to be scored during the 2024 CoC Competition for funding.

Renewal projects are scored first (projects already existing through this funding stream), new project scoring will take place in the following months (TBD). Renewal project supplemental materials are extensively reviewed, and site visits are conducted by CoC Staff and CCE Workgroup prior to the release of the NOFO to ensure the CoC has enough time to thoroughly review all existing projects and develop Corrective Action Plans (if needed). The final ranking of renewal projects will not be completed until the Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) period opens when new project applications will be solicited. This year, all projects being scored in the renewal process are permanent supportive housing (PSH).

Projects are scored based on system performance, adherence to HUD guidelines, and local priorities.

### Scoring Sections:

- Housing Performance
- Income Performance
- Utilization
- Housing First Practices and Implementation
- Collaboration with Coordinated Entry
- Alignment with 10-year plan goals/HUD Priorities
- Financial Audits
- Contract Administration
- Spend down of funds and match
- Cultural Competency and Disability Access
- Client Lived Experience Feedback Process
- Racial Equity
- Non-Discrimination Policy
- Data-informed Program Research
- Change Management & Institutionalization of Knowledge
- Data Quality and Timelessness
- Housing and Healthcare Partnerships

The Sonoma County Homeless Coalition, as the CoC, is scored nationally in the CoC Competition on our scoring process. Scoring well as a community allows us the possibility of increasing our annual award amount via bonus funding. HUD released last year's scores from the competition (previously provided to this committee), and we scored perfectly in our process of scoring projects. According to the FY 2023 CoC Program Competition

Debriefing, we received a total of 27/27 points on the section for Project Capacity, Review, and Ranking section; this includes a total of 21/21 points total for our Project Review, Ranking, and Selection process. Given this information, the workgroup did not add or remove sections of the scoring tool. The workgroup did, however, adjust some point values in the scoring sections and removed the Housing First Assessment Tool.

CoC Program FY 2023 Competition Debriefing Excerpt (HUD's Scoring of Project Review, Ranking, and Selection)

- Section: 1E-2. Project Review and Ranking Process Your CoC Used in Its Local Competition.
- Section: 1E-2a. Scored Project Forms for One Project from Your CoC's Local Competition.
- Section: 1E-2b. Addressing Severe Barriers in the Local Project Review and Ranking Process.
- Section: 1E-3. Advancing Racial Equity through Participation of Overrepresented Populations in the Local Competition Review and Ranking Process.

These questions assessed whether your CoC used objective criteria and past performance to review and rank projects based on required attachments.

1. At least 33 percent of the total points were based on objective criteria for the project application (e.g., cost-effectiveness, timely draws (draws meaning requesting funds from HUD for their project), utilization rate, match, leverage, performance data, type of population served (e.g., DV, youth, Veterans, chronic homelessness), or type of housing proposed (e.g., PSH, RRH).
2. At least 20 percent of the total points were based on HUD's system performance criteria for the project application (e.g., exits to permanent housing destinations, increasing income, retention of permanent housing, length of time homeless, returns to homelessness).
3. Used data from a comparable database to score projects submitted by victim service providers.
4. Used objective criteria to evaluate how projects submitted by victim service providers improved safety for the population they serve.
5. Used a specific method for evaluating projects based on the CoC's analysis of rapid returns to permanent housing.
6. Specific severity of needs and vulnerabilities your CoC considered when ranking and selecting projects.
7. Considerations your CoC gave to projects that provide housing and services to the hardest to serve populations that could result in lower performance levels but are projects your CoC needs in its geographic area.
8. How your CoC advanced racial equity in its local competition review and ranking process.

To view HUD's breakdown of our CoC's scoring from the FY 2023 Competition, please use the following Link: <https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/Ut10FCUKAd4/>

### Renewal Project Scoring Tool CCE Workgroup Revisions

Over the years, there have been slight modifications of the scoring due to new scoring information included within the annual CoC Program NOFO, adjustments to the local priorities section, and points allocated to each section. Prior to submitting the tool for the CCE Workgroup to review, staff did not make any changes from the previous year with the perfect score. There were no new HUD priorities listed within the NOFO last year, so we continued to use the same scoring tool and application questions. We recently solicited feedback from the Lived Experience Advisory Planning (LEAP) Board, which requested agencies include five client feedback forms, with names redacted for confidentiality purposes. This has been added to the list of materials renewal applicants must provide.

## Scoring Adjustments and Changes Recommended by CCE Workgroup:

1. **Section 2 Income performance/ 2b1 Increasing Income from Employment:** This measure is a HUD System Performance Measure (SPM) that accounts for those who increased income from employment (either at annual assessment or exit). The CCE workgroup understood that a part of our scoring should include SPM's, but did note that with PSH disability requirements, this measure was harder to achieve for these types of projects. Last year, this section was worth 5 points total, the CCE Workgroup changed this section to be a total of 3 points, adding a point to section 2b2 increasing income from other sources (e.g., SSI/SSDI) and adding another point to section 3 Accessing Mainstream Resources (e.g., non-cash benefits such as CalFresh, government-issued phones, monthly bus passes, etc.).
2. **Section 5 Housing First Practice and Implementation:** The Workgroup removed the requirement to submit the HUD Housing First Assessment Tool, noting this tool was not effective and had many issues during the 24/25 Consolidated Homeless Services NOFA applications. All 7 points in this section will be awarded in the application narrative responses for housing first.
3. **Section 12 Client Lived Experience Feedback Process:** This section was 3 points previously and was adjusted to 4. The workgroup highlighted the importance of this section and wanted to ensure there was more weight included in the scoring.
4. **Section 13 Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies:** This section was 4 points previously and was adjusted to 6 points. The workgroup highlighted the importance of this section and wanted to ensure there was more weight included in the scoring.
5. With the changes to the weight of the scoring in sections 12 and 13, the workgroup removed points from sections 14 and 16 as follows:
  - a. **Section 14 Data-informed Program Research:** previously 5 points, and changed to 4.
  - b. **Section 16 Data Quality and Timeliness:** previously 8 points, and changed to 6.

You can access the scoring tool in tracked changes by using the following link. The scoring tool attached to this report is no longer in tracked changes: [https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/Im\\_GfxwMs1Y/](https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/Im_GfxwMs1Y/)

## Scoring Tool and Renewal Project Listing (Review Required)

The following pages include the Renewal Project Scoring Tool set for approval by the Committee during the upcoming meeting. We have also attached a list of projects that will be scored during this process with agency names, project names, award amounts, and total unit/bed numbers.

## Additional Materials (Optional Review)

All CoC Competition FY 2024 materials and up-to-date information can be located on our website:

<https://sonomacounty.ca.gov/development-services/community-development-commission/divisions/homeless-services/continuum-of-care/continuum-of-care-competition>

2024 CoC Competition Evaluation Workgroup meeting materials and presentation: <https://share.sonoma-county.org/link/2b-YxnaQ0RE/>

## Recommendation:

Approve the Scoring tool for the 2024 CoC Competition – Renewal Projects recommended by the CoC Competition Evaluation Workgroup.



## Scoring for the 2024 CoC Competition – Renewal Projects Project Performance Measurement and Local Priorities

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
<i>1. Housing performance</i>			
1a. PSH Housing Outcome: % of living leavers + stayers stably housed at contract year end (HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7)	From APR: (Q5a. total number of clients - (Q23a + Q23b subtotal temporary + institutional + Other destinations)) ÷ Q5a., total number of clients. Prorated up to 5 points for 89% or higher. - Staff scored	6	Pro-rated by % stably housed Ex: 89% = 5 pts 67% = 3.75 pts 50% = 2.5 pt
1b. % of PSH beds dedicated to chronically homeless people \RRH prioritizing Chronic Homeless	From APR Q2, Actual Bed & Unit Inventory, CH beds ÷ (total) Beds. Prorated up to 5 points for 100% of beds. - Staff scored	6	Pro-rated by % CH dedication Ex: 100% =5 pts 50% = 2.5 pts
1c. Cost Per PSH/RRH Outcome	From APR Measured by total project expenditures (project expenditures + match) ÷ total number of successful stable housing outcomes (Retention of or Placement into PSH/RRH)- Staff scored	6	Less than \$5,000 per outcome = 6 points \$5,000 - \$9,999 = 5 points \$10,000 - \$14,999 = 4 points \$15,000 - \$19,999 = 3points \$20,000 -24,999 = 2 points \$25,000-29,999= 1 point 30,000+ = 0 points
<i>2. Income performance</i>			
2b1. % who increased income from employment from program entry to exit (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From HMIS APR:(Q19a.1+2) Number of Adults with Earned Income: Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Follow-Up/Exit + Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Follow-Up/Exit) ÷ Q5a Total Adults - Staff scored	3	Pro-rated by % exiting w/ increased income Ex: 100% =5 pts; 50% =2.5 pts
2b2. % who increased income from sources other than employment (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From HMIS APR:(Q19a. 1+2) Number of Adults with Other Income: Retained Income Category and Increased \$ at Follow-Up/Exit + Did Not Have the Income Category at Entry and Gained the Income Category at Follow-Up/Exit) ÷ Q5a Total Adults - Staff scored	7	Pro-rated by % increased other income Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
3. Mainstream resources: % of clients accessing mainstream resources (HUD System Performance Measure 4)	From APR: (1 - (Q20b. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources, Adults with No sources) ÷ Q5a., total number of adults. - Staff scored	7	Pro-rated by % #of sources gained Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
4. Year-end Utilization	From APR Q2 & 5a stayers/total beds, prorated up to 5 points. - Staff Scored	5	Pro-rated by % #of beds utilized Ex: 100% = 5pts; 50% = 2.5 pts
5. Housing First Practice and Implementation	Full points awarded for compliance with responses to <i>Questionnaire Section 2: Housing First Practice</i>	7	7pts total Housing First Practice Section;
6. Coordinated Entry Participation (Total 6pts)	Percentage of accepted eligible referrals from Coordinated Entry- Reporting Period- 2022-2023  (HMIS Coordinator will score)	3	3 pts- 100% accepted 2 pts- 99-80% accepted 1 pt 79-70% accepted 0 pt less than 70% accepted
	Percentage of enrollments in the project with CES referrals- Reporting Period- 2022-2023  (HMIS Coordinator will score)	4	3 pts- 100% referrals accepted from CES- in compliance; 2 pts- 99-90% of referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed; 1 pt- 89-80% of referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed; 0 pt- 79% or below referrals accepted from CES- not in compliance CAP needed
<b>Local &amp; HUD Priorities</b>			
7. Alignment with 10-year plan goals and priorities in the HUD NOFO	<i>Questionnaire Section 4: Local and HUD Priorities</i> - 1 point for each goal that is a focus of the project, up to 6 points. Goals include (options a-f below):	6	Full pts for detailed examples of collaboration in each component.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Evidence of Project's collaborations with corrections partners</li> <li>b. Evidence of SSI/SSDI Outreach Access &amp; Recovery (SOAR) benefits advocacy.</li> <li>c. Alignment with Upstream Investments as evidenced by agency practices on the Upstream portfolio, or other evidence-based practice databases</li> <li>d. Staff training/screening for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance)</li> </ul>			

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
e. Promotion of/supporting volunteering, community engagement, and employment services			
f. Coordination with Healthcare			
g. Coordination with Housing Partners			
<b>Total Points for Performance/Local Priorities</b>		<b>60</b>	

### Agency Management and Capacity

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
8. Financial/Audit: process, timeliness; findings/management letter, overall fiscal health	Review of financial documents by CoC Coordinator/ Accounting staff & <i>Questionnaire Section 5: Financial Management Section</i>	4	4 pts: No findings, timely audit, etc 2-3 pts: Findings in past 3 years, late audit 0-1 pts: Lack of audit
9. Contract administration: CoC APR Review – accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	Review of APR by CoC Staff & <i>Questionnaire Section 6: Contract Administration</i>	4	4 pts: timely submission & no inaccuracy of reporting 3 pts: Timely submission and 1 error 2 pts: 2-3 errors in submission 1 pts: late submission no errors 0 pts: late submission & errors
10. Spend down of funds/match	Review of APR by CoC Coordinator (staff scored)  <i>Questionnaire Section 7: Contract Spenddown of Funds and Match</i> Informational Review only	4	4 pts: full spenddown 3pts: 85-99% spend 2 pts: 75-84% spend 1 pts: 65-74% 0pts: < 65%
11. Cultural Competency – INCLUDE which attachments to be reviewed	<i>Questionnaire Section 8: Cultural Competency &amp; Disability Access</i>	3	.5 pt per question total of 3 pts. Includes answering the questions as well as the required attachments
12. Client/lived experience Feedback Process	<i>Questionnaire Section 9: Lived Experience Feedback Process</i>	4	1 pt per question, full pts for having a client advisory board, full explanation, and examples
13. Racial Equity and Anti-discrimination Practices & Policies	<i>Questionnaire Section 10: Racial Equity and Anti-Discrimination Practices &amp; Policies</i>	6	1.5 pt per question, full pts for having a Anti-discrimination policy (with required Equal Access/Gender Identity Final Rules), examples to review/address disparities

Performance Measurement	Scoring Methodology	Points	Scoring Key
			within their programming in, full explanation and examples
14. Data-informed program research; use of HMIS & other local data to guide program development & delivery. Use of documented best practices; outcomes information is used as an indicator of how well the project is accomplishing its goals	<i>Questionnaire Section 11: Data Informed Program Research</i>	4	Full pts for complete description of data informed practices and examples of project performance review, 2.5 pts for each question
15. Change Management & Institutionalization of Knowledge: Procedures are in place to ensure transmission of program and grants management knowledge when staff changes take place.	<i>Questionnaire Section 12: Change Management and Institutionalization of Knowledge</i>	5	Full pts for plan and procedure for management change and turnover and evidence of Interim Rule training; Pro-rated pts for lack of formal procedures
16. High data quality and timeliness of assessments.	HMIS Coordinator Score	6	<p>There are 3 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Universal Data Elements (Name, SSN, DOB, gender, race &amp; ethnicity) are at least 95% complete;</li> <li>2) Data Quality Score: Income and Benefits health insurance</li> </ol> <p>2) Assessment data is entered in HMIS 6 days or less after assessments are administered;</p> <p>3) Data Validation Reports from HMIS are reasonable for project type.</p> <p>Full pts for meeting all 3 criteria; pro-rated pts for missing one or more criteria</p>
<b>Total Agency &amp; Management Capacity points</b>		<b>40</b>	
<b>Total Possible Points</b>		<b>100</b>	





## Sonoma County 2024 CoC Competition List of Projects

Below is a list of the 11 projects up for renewal, 9 of which will be evaluated during the 2024 CoC Competition.

1. **Sonoma County Community Development Commission (CDC)**– Renewal Rental Assistance- Persons with HIV/Aids, Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Renewal,
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$721,918
  - b. Units: 38, 39 beds
2. **West County Community Services (WCCS)** – Mill Street Supportive Services, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$106,744
  - b. Units: 2, 8 beds
3. **West County Community Services (WCCS)**- Elderberry Commons, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$290,828
  - b. Units: 29, beds 29
4. **Committee on the Shelterless (COTS)** – Community Based Permanent Supportive Housing, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$320,575
  - b. Units: 13, beds 18
5. **Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Santa Rosa (CCDSR)** – Catholic Charities Permanent Supportive Housing Santa Rosa, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$806,167
  - b. Units: 45, beds: 52
6. **Community Support Network (CSN)** - Grant transferring from Social Advocates for Youth (SAY) - Sponsor-Based Rental Assistance project serving transitional age youth ages 18-24
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$327,217
  - b. Units: 16, beds 16
7. **Community Support Network (CSN)** – Stony Point Commons, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$63,666
  - b. Units: 16, beds: 16
8. **St. Vincent de Paul Sonoma County**- St Vincent de Paul Commons PSH, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$310,429
  - b. Units: 20, beds 30
9. **Bucklew Programs** – Sonoma SCIL, PSH Renewal
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$289,012
  - b. Units: 11, beds 11
10. **County of Sonoma, Department of Health Services** – Coordinated Intake Expansion Project, CES/SSO Renewal, subcontracted to HomeFirst (evaluated outside this process)
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$549,993

11. **County of Sonoma, Department of Health Services** – Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Expansion, HMIS Renewal (evaluated outside this process)
  - a. 24/25 Award: \$327,157