

Submission Summary

Page	Last Updated
1A. Identification	11/12/2015
1B. CoC Engagement	11/17/2015
1C. Coordination	11/17/2015
1D. CoC Discharge Planning	11/12/2015
1E. Coordinated Assessment	11/17/2015
1F. Project Review	11/16/2015
1G. Addressing Project Capacity	11/12/2015
2A. HMIS Implementation	11/13/2015
2B. HMIS Funding Sources	11/12/2015
2C. HMIS Beds	11/16/2015
2D. HMIS Data Quality	11/12/2015
2E. Sheltered PIT	11/16/2015
2F. Sheltered Data - Methods	11/12/2015
2G. Sheltered Data - Quality	11/12/2015
2H. Unsheltered PIT	11/16/2015
2I. Unsheltered Data - Methods	11/12/2015
2J. Unsheltered Data - Quality	11/16/2015
3A. System Performance	11/16/2015
3B. Objective 1	11/15/2015
3B. Objective 2	11/15/2015
3B. Objective 3	11/12/2015
4A. Benefits	11/12/2015
4B. Additional Policies	11/15/2015
4C. Attachments	Please Complete
Submission Summary	No Input Required

Evidence of the CoC's
Communication to Rejected
Projects

CA-522: Humboldt County CoC

1. Email communication to project applicant with rejected application (November 4, 2015)
2. Public posting of Priority Listing on CoC website, which includes public notice of rejected project application (November 4, 2015)
3. Email communication to general CoC listserv, with Priority List attached and public posting on CoC website linked (November 4, 2015)

HUD CoC Program FY2015 - HHC Notification of Rejected Project Application

1 message

Emily Salvaterra <emily@homebaseccc.org>

Wed, Nov 4, 2015 at 4:20 PM

To: Fox Olson <msfox12@suddenlink.net>, Shelley Mitchell <shelley990@suddenlink.net>

Dear Arcata House Partnership,

As part of this year's NOFA requirements, I am writing to formally notify you that the project application for Arcata House Partnership's Keys to Success Rapid Rehousing project was not selected for funding, as of the HHC Executive Board's approval of the preliminary Priority List yesterday.

The Keys to Success Rapid Rehousing project was not selected for funding on the basis of its score in the local competition: a score of 78 out of 100 possible points ranked it as the lowest-scoring new or renewal project, and the amount of funds applied for community-wide exceeded the amount of funding available.

Of the 22 points that your Keys to Success project did not obtain, 19 of those points were lost as a result of calculations performed by HomeBase in advance of the Review Panel meeting, per local policy. These points were lost in two scaled categories on the approved scoring tool: percentage of project budget devoted to housing activities and amount of leverage.

We want to offer sincere thanks for your participation in the CoC Program competition this year and congratulate you again on your renewal projects' exceptional scores.

Thank you,

--



HomeBase

Emily Salvaterra | Policy Analyst
870 Market Street | Suite 1228 | San Francisco CA 94102
ph 415.788.7961, ext. 318 | fax 415.788.7965
www.homebaseccc.org

Legal and Technical Assistance | *Advancing Solutions to Homelessness*
Policy | Advocacy | Planning

FY2015 Humboldt County Continuum of Care NOFA Competition Priority List

November 3, 2015

CoC ELIGIBLE AMOUNTS

Annual Renewal Demand: \$724,199.00

Eligible Amount for New CoC Planning Grant: \$21,726.00 (Excluded from Tiering)

Bonus Funding Available for New PSH/RRH: \$108,630.00

Tier 1 Amount: \$615,569.00

Tier 2 Amount: \$217,260.00

TIER 1 (\$0.00-\$615,569.00)

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Component</u>	<u>Grant Amount</u>
Arcata House Partnership	SVK (Renewal)	PSH	\$56,540.00
Arcata House Partnership	Apartments First! (Renewal)	PSH	\$259,953.00
County/DHHS	Humboldt Housing (Renewal)	PSH	\$42,331.00
County/DHHS	Project HART (Renewal)	PSH	\$43,331.00
County/DHHS	Humboldt Housing Expansion (First-Time Renewal)	PSH	\$52,062.00
County/DHHS	TAY Division (First-Time Renewal)	PSH	\$29,522.00
County/DHHS	HMIS (Renewal)	HMIS	\$69,500.00
HCAR/211	Coordinated Assessment (New/Reallocated Funds)	CE	\$31,549.00
County/DHHS	Best Chance RRH (New/Bonus Funds)	RRH	\$30,781.00
<i>Amount Remaining in Tier 1:</i>			<i>\$0.00</i>

FY2015 Humboldt County Continuum of Care NOFA Competition Priority List

November 3, 2015

TIER 2 (\$615,569.01-\$832,829.00)

Agency	Project	Component	Grant Amount
County/DHHS	Best Chance RRH (New/Bonus Funds) - Rollover from Tier 1	RRH	\$77,849.00
Humboldt Bay Hsg Devel. Corporation	MHSA Permanent Supportive Housing (Renewal)	PSH	\$27,721.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Launch Pad (Renewal)	TH	\$39,092.00
County/DHHS	Best Chance PSH (New/Reallocated Funds)	PSH	\$72,598.00
<i>Amount Remaining in Tier 2:</i>			\$0.00
<i>Total Amount Recommended for Funding:</i>			\$832,829.00

NOT RANKED PER NOFA GUIDELINES

Agency	Project	Component	Grant Amount
County/DHHS	2015 CoC Planning Grant	Planning	\$21,726.00

VOLUNTARILY REALLOCATED

Agency	Project	Component	Grant Amount
Redwood Community Action Agency	Multiple Assistance Center	TH	\$104,147.00

NEW PROJECTS NOT FUNDED

Agency	Project	Component	Grant Amount
Arcata House Partnership	AHP Keys to Success	RRH	\$105,442.00

HUD CoC Program FY2015 - Humboldt County Priority Listing

14 messages

Emily Salvaterra <emily@homebaseccc.org>

Wed, Nov 4, 2015 at 4:23 PM

To: Humboldt <humboldt@homebaseccc.org>

Bcc: amyj@hafoundation.org, aholcomb@foodforpeople.org, brewbarb@northcoast.com, Beth Matsumoto <bmatsumoto@housinghumboldt.org>, bbuckman@eureka-humboldt-hsg.org, Bill Rodstrom <planning@rcaa.org>, ameri@rcaa.org, CBogardus@co.humboldt.ca.us, Bonnie Hughes <bhughes@housinghumboldt.org>, bgekler@vietvets.org, newoak@suddenlink.net, director@hdvs.org, bryan@rcaa.org, Brian.Olson@stjoe.org, bruce.lebel@worldshelters.org, cmcneill@opendoorhealth.com, Caroline.Haug@stjoe.org, chanda.ulmer@crihb.net, Charles.Bean@yahoo.com, Charlotte McDonald <charlotte@eurekamainstreet.org>, wiyotone@yahoo.com, cfernandez@srcharities.org, cynthia@tilinet.org, kcounts@co.humboldt.ca.us, PCrandall@co.humboldt.ca.us, JCulleton@co.humboldt.ca.us, ERM.Director@sbcglobal.net, dloya@cityofarcata.org, watkins1218@gmail.com, dmcullen@opendoorhealth.com, sunnybee2@sbcglobal.net, xroads9898@sbcglobal.net, dsjostrand@rcaa.org, Bdubose@vetsresource.org, everbeck@cityofarcata.org, econner@humboldt1.com, egomez@co.humboldt.ca.us, eric6017@suddenlink.net, ergoingraham@aol.com, Fox Olson <msfox12@suddenlink.net>, AFrayer@co.humboldt.ca.us, Frederick.Sautter@va.gov, jfreitas@co.humboldt.ca.us, asgeorge@co.humboldt.ca.us, Georgia H Trehey <gtrehey@rcaa.org>, hvoight@yurokhousing.com, heathere@hafoundation.org, execasst@worldshelters.org, JHenson@co.humboldt.ca.us, "Hewitt, Sally" <SHewitt@co.humboldt.ca.us>, DHickenbottom@co.humboldt.ca.us, KJack@co.humboldt.ca.us, paquinjames@yahoo.com, jturner@lsnc.net, jh91@humboldt.edu, jayme@humboldt1.com, Jeanette Hurst <jeanette@211humboldt.org>, jeanne.reilly@stjoe.org, shelter_ysb@sbcgobal.net, jholmes@srcharities.org, jk_ables@yahoo.com, jenr@hafoundation.org, jrodes@co.humboldt.ca.us, jhenry@vietvets.org, tempas@humboldt1.com, onedogpooping@yahoo.com, jschmitz@rcaa.org, johnboy95501@yahoo.com, katiemoo@yahoo.com, kkitna@ci.fortuna.ca.us, BLaHaie@co.humboldt.ca.us, lancejacobs22@gmail.com, loetker@cityofarcata.org, ALarum@co.humboldt.ca.us, Latrice.Prater@stjoe.org, Lshikany@ci.eureka.ca.gov, mamacher@srcharities.org, wish@asis.com, mee12@humboldt.edu, Maura Eastman <meastman@rcaa.org>, mpetersen@ci.eureka.ca.gov, melissa.furbee@unitedwayhumboldt.org, michelle@wiyot.us, micki@ncsheadstart.org, mnewman@ci.eureka.ca.gov, HMuller@co.humboldt.ca.us, "Mushrush, Paula" <PMushrush@co.humboldt.ca.us>, thompson@humsenior.org, now1@suddenlink.net, nboyes@cityofarcata.org, prose@asis.com, peterlav@sbcglobal.net, wracer12@aol.com, JRhodes@co.humboldt.ca.us, fcshart@suddenlinkmail.com, MRichardson@co.humboldt.ca.us, KRobinson@co.humboldt.ca.us, WRowan@co.humboldt.ca.us, rampturn@tidepool.com, alcoholdrugcareservices@yahoo.com, Riverlifefoundation@gmail.com, sharonpcusa@yahoo.com, hshelton@co.humboldt.ca.us, NStarck@co.humboldt.ca.us, apartmentsfirst@gmail.com, horwitz@hughes.net, svkirk@humboldt1.com, Tamara.Jenkinson@stjoe.org, timothydoty@suddenlink.net, tlowrey24@yahoo.com, tracy.crutchfield@crihb.net, RTrochtenberg@co.humboldt.ca.us, socialworker2@twofeathers-nafs.org, valmartinez@rcaa.org, "Weiss, Michael" <MWeiss@co.humboldt.ca.us>, Wesley Weir <wweir@eureka-humboldt-hsg.org>, DWheeler@co.humboldt.ca.us, KYancheff@co.humboldt.ca.us, narroyo@ci.eureka.ca.gov, latkins@ci.eureka.ca.gov, ra913@humboldt.edu, VBass@co.humboldt.ca.us, kbergel@ci.eureka.ca.gov, beyer.mfrc@gmail.com, YBowdoin@co.humboldt.ca.us, mbrady@ci.eureka.ca.gov, jab191@humboldt.edu, bryanleehall@yahoo.com, rburns@redwoodtc.com, vrccsaracagle@gmail.com, NChapman@co.humboldt.ca.us, blchinn@sbcglobal.net, mciarabellini@ci.eureka.ca.gov, ews.eureka.sbell@gmail.com, mycommunitychurch@yahoo.com, RGolec@humboldt.k12.ca.us, lgottermann@opendoorhealth.com, rholmlund@ci.eureka.ca.gov, hachr707@gmail.com, ljackson@co.humboldt.ca.us, ajensen@partnershiphp.org, akanouse@humboldt.k12.ca.us, Lorey Keele <lkeele@rcaa.org>, mkirby@ci.eureka.ca.gov, "Knopp, Linda" <lknopp@co.humboldt.ca.us>, david.koerner@va.gov, donnamatthews39@gmail.com, JMcCubbrey@co.humboldt.ca.us, jbmadcsdirector@gmail.com, cmessinger@co.humboldt.ca.us, AMills@ci.eureka.ca.gov, pmillsap@ci.eureka.ca.gov, pam@mikkimoves.com, jmolofsky@opendoorhealth.com, sarah@redwoodtc.com, ereynolds@opendoorhealth.com, dotti@dotti.com, dotticbi@gmail.com, graham@dotti.com, slfranklin@partnershiphp.org, Don Smullin <don@eurekachamber.com>, gtarbell@yurokhousing.com, Joy.Victorine@stjoe.org, nancywhe@suddenlink.net, dwidmark@co.humboldt.ca.us, Humboldt <humboldt@homebaseccc.org>

Dear Humboldt Housing & Homeless Coalition,

Yesterday, the Executive Committee approved our CoC's Priority Listing, which ranks all projects that will be included in our consolidated application for the HUD FY2015 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program competition. Our community will be applying for a total of \$832,829 in new and renewal projects for homeless housing and services.

The Priority Listing is posted on the [CoC website](#) (see link under 'Reports' section) and is attached below.

Please contact humboldt@homebaseccc.org if you have any questions.

Thank you,
HomeBase

--



HomeBase

Emily Salvaterra | Policy Analyst
870 Market Street | Suite 1228 | San Francisco CA 94102
ph 415.788.7961, ext. 318 | fax 415.788.7965
www.homebaseccc.org

Legal and Technical Assistance | Advancing Solutions to Homelessness
Policy | Advocacy | Planning



2015 Humboldt Award Announcement Final.pdf

26K

Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
To: emily@homebaseccc.org

Wed, Nov 4, 2015 at 4:23 PM

Delivery to the following recipient failed permanently:

apartmentsfirst@gmail.com

Technical details of permanent failure:

Google tried to deliver your message, but it was rejected by the server for the recipient domain gmail.com by gmail-smtp-in.l.google.com. [2607:f8b0:400d:c06::1b].

The error that the other server returned was:

550-5.1.1 The email account that you tried to reach does not exist. Please try

550-5.1.1 double-checking the recipient's email address for typos or

550-5.1.1 unnecessary spaces. Learn more at

550 5.1.1 <https://support.google.com/mail/answer/6596> b66si2552971qhb.33 - gsmtpt

----- Original message -----

DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed;
d=homebaseccc_org.20150623.gappssmtp.com; s=20150623;
h=mime-version:date:message-id:subject:from:to:content-type;
bh=k7Bu3ZPSdvxKff42ILyTUPklsQNw1xQFYTfYO5TkEqk=;
b=RjnR07q/A/kH8mcfM04M9aBzKufs5zKsz+Uq8fPDvSE0/9IQmYZilNMFfH7IAEi0pK
rIVNJBBER8F/TtGUumADA+FebIhgH658T1kWTzaXG8RoncY2s7GFAGqj8mGG86tVGv+sa
6gDg6zm++H+gvad09ibj0DKaE4WtyMHkO2T4/38rmKRCKIX2xl16kdO8fiNyXQxupip4
1aZbg/n5QJc/C2K/luf7ugJFYZ+WoLVwwwx6pd+cg8Nb007V0HpSzKqZ/96vj/E5IJX1
eL7aRTVw5MC2X8zNGR+gZUjg5plUf/MwymULNHknXLVWEQ3M8G5oJD6/nnD3iSApIObA

CoC Rating and Review Procedure

Humboldt County Continuum of Care

HUD CONTINUUM OF CARE PROGRAM

**Technical Assistance Workshop
2015 NOFA Competition**

LOCAL COMPETITION INFORMATION

October 6, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2015 Local Community Review Process	3
Tiering Policy	6
Appeals Process	9
Scoring Tools	11
Renewal Housing Project Scoring Tool	11
Renewal HMIS Project Scoring Tool	15
New Permanent Housing Project Scoring Tool	17
New HMIS Project Scoring Tool	21
New Coordinated Entry Project Scoring Tool	23
Supplemental Application Forms	25
Where To Get The Documents or Help You May Need	38

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
2015 LOCAL COMMUNITY REVIEW PROCESS

This section is intended to explain the Review and Rank Process that is used to review and evaluate all project applications submitted in the local competition.

The process will proceed as follows:

- All applicants prepare Project Applications (formerly Exhibits 2) and supplemental information.
- Non-conflicted Review and Rank Committee members are oriented to process and receive applications and scoring materials.
- Review and Rank Committee members review and tentatively score the applications.
- Review and Rank Committee meets to jointly discuss each application and conduct short in-person sessions with applicants to have questions answered and to comment on ways to improve the application. Committee discusses merits of each proposal, scores all projects, and turns in score sheets to staff. Staff combines scores to achieve overall raw scores for new projects.
- Review and Rank Committee considers adjustments for such issues as HUD incentives or requirements. Review and Rank Committee considers proposal changes or project budget adjustments that may be required to meet community needs.
- Review and Rank Committee finalizes and tells agency its rank and approved funding level. Reserve right to adjust rank order when final proposals read, if inadequate (violates threshold requirement; shoddily prepared) for consolidated application.
 - In 2015, it is allowable to reallocate renewal project funds. In the event that the Review and Rank Committee identifies a renewal project (or projects) whose funding should not be renewed (or funding should be decreased) due to substandard performance, the Committee will then determine whether any new project will utilize any reallocated funds and proceed with reallocation (see detail below).
 - In 2015, renewal projects scoring below 60 points out of a total possible of 100 points must be reallocated to a new permanent housing project. If a renewal project scores between 60 and 70 points, the Review and Rank Committee may recommend reallocation at its discretion.
 - In 2015, renewal Transitional Housing projects choosing to reallocate their funds to new permanent housing will receive priority for those funds in a new permanent housing application, and may be placed in Tier 1. (The agency operating the former Transitional Housing project will be awarded the reallocated funds as long as the application is comparable to other new project applications submitted.)
 - In 2015, though HUD is requiring that CoCs rank renewal and/or new projects totaling 15% of the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) in a second, lower-priority tier, which will be at increased risk to lose funding. Within

Tier 2, it is HUD's priority to fund renewal and new permanent housing projects first.

- Appellate hearings are held, if requested.
- Non-conflicted Executive Committee considers/approves Review and Rank process outcome, which is then included in the County's Consolidated NOFA Application.
- If requested after the close of the competition, projects are given feedback from Review and Rank Panel on quality of application and ways to improve.

All renewal projects must meet a number of "threshold" criteria, as determined by HUD; if it so decides, the Review and Rank Committee may choose not to recommend any project for renewal if it fails to meet any HUD Project Renewal Threshold. These factors include:

- Whether the project applicant's performance met the plans and goals established in the initial application as amended;
- Whether the project applicant demonstrated all timeliness standards for grants being renewed, including the standards for the expenditure of grant funds have been met;
- The project applicant's performance in assisting program participants to achieve and maintain independent living and record of success, except HMIS-dedicated projects;
- Whether there is evidence that project applicant has been unwilling to accept technical assistance, has a history of inadequate financial accounting practices, has indications of project mismanagement, has a drastic reduction in the population served, has made program changes without prior HUD approval, or has lost a project site;
- Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;
- Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
- History of inadequate financial management accounting practices;
- Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
- History of other major capacity issues that have significant affected the operation of the project and its performance;
- History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly; and,
- History of serving ineligible program participants, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes.

Renewal projects are reviewed for capacity, eligibility, timeliness, and quality. When considering renewal projects for award, the Review Panel will focus on identifying performance issues, TA needs, and strengthening our HUD-funded programs with questions like:

- What barriers are you facing?
- What help do you need?

- What are your next steps?
- Are you having difficulties with fundraising? Staff turnover? Long-term strategic planning? Sustainability?

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants TIERING POLICY

Background

For the first time in 2012, anticipating that the total Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) for all CoCs nationwide exceeded the funding allocated by Congress, HUD required that CoCs rank projects within two tiers: Tier 1 projects were those high-performing projects most in line with CoC priorities, while Tier 2 projects were those of lower priority. In 2013, Tier 1 was equal to the CoC's ARD minus 5 percent, while Tier 2 was equal to the remaining 5% of the ARD plus a designated amount for a planning project. In 2014, Tier 1 was equal to the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand less 2%; Tier 2 was equal to 2% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand plus the HUD-approved amount for a planning application. HUD allowed CoCs discretion on how to rank projects (while reserving authority to fund based on its own priorities), but has specified that that all projects, including those in Tier 2, should be high-performing projects meeting CoC needs. Projects that are low-performing or that do not align with CoC priorities should be reallocated in favor of new permanent housing projects.

In 2015, HUD has made significant changes to the tiering process. Tier 2 is much larger than previous years, and HUD will prioritize projects within the tiers differently when determining renewal funding. HUD has indicated that it will be de-funding the lowest ranking Tier 2 projects nation-wide to create funding for Permanent Housing Bonus Projects.

In 2015, the CoC will be required to rank projects in tiers. Tier 1 is equal to the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand less 15%; Tier 2 is equal to 15% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand plus the HUD-approved amount for Permanent Housing Bonus funding.

In 2015, projects in Tier 2 will be selected and funded based on a score related to the overall CoC score, the project's ranked order, project type, and Housing First implementation. Therefore, depending on the Humboldt Continuum of Care's Consolidated Application score and the characteristics of the projects, Tier 2 projects may again receive funding. However, if Tier 2 projects do not receive funding, the CoC's ARD (on which amounts for Bonus and Planning project applications are based) will permanently decrease. Therefore, it is important to ensure that Tier 1 be utilized to the greatest extent possible.

In 2014 HUD did not allow any project to fall in both Tiers 1 and 2. If a project fell partly in Tier 1 and partly in Tier 2, HUD considered the whole project as falling in Tier 2. To discourage CoCs from taking projects out of priority order, this year if a project straddles tiers, the Tier 1 portion will be funded in accordance with Tier 1 processes and the Tier 2 portion will be funded in accordance with Tier 2 processes. HUD may award project funds for just the Tier 1 portion, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

Tiering Policy

Based on the above considerations, the Humboldt Continuum of Care Executive Committee will implement the following strategy:

- In general, projects should be assigned to tiers based on the score assigned by the Review and Rank Committee scoring process. This includes new project applications for reallocated funds, which will compete with renewal projects for Tier 1 placement. However, the following special cases (those projects for which comparable scoring and ranking against housing and services projects is not possible) should be treated as follows:
 - If a new project application scores marginally higher than (within 1 point of) a renewal project, causing that renewal project to fall into Tier 2, the renewal project will be prioritized and funded in Tier 1 above the new project application.
 - If reallocated funds become available and the Review and Rank Committee determines that funds should be reallocated to new project application for a Supportive Service Only project for Coordinated Entry, the new project will be placed as the lowest ranked project in Tier 1.
 - HMIS: Humboldt has one HMIS project renewing in the 2015 competition. HMIS (with a budget of approximately \$69,500) will be placed as the lowest ranked project in Tier 1, or as the second lowest ranked project in Tier 1 if there is a Supportive Services Only new project application for Coordinated Entry.
 - Renewal projects with less than one year of data available for the time period measured (in 2015, these projects are SVK Renewal 1, TAY Division, and Humboldt Housing Expansion) will be reviewed by the Review and Rank panel, but will be automatically placed in Tier 1 immediately above the HMIS projects.

According to these guidelines, a sample ranked list would appear as follows:

- **Tier 1:**
 - High performing renewal projects and new permanent housing projects aligned with CoC priorities
 - Renewal projects with less than one year of data for the time period measured
 - HMIS
- **Tier 2:**
 - High performing renewal projects and new permanent housing projects less aligned with CoC priorities

The HMIS project, and the new SSO project for Coordinated Entry if applicable, will be placed in Tier 1 to reflect their importance as primary funding sources for HUD-mandated HMIS and Coordinated Entry.” According to HUD’s 2015 priorities, transitional housing is at relatively high risk in Tier 2.

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants APPEALS PROCESS

The Review and Rank Committee reviews all applications and ranks project proposals for funding recommendations to HUD. That review and ranking decision is communicated to all applicants by email within 24 hours of the ranking decision and determination. All applicants are hereby instructed to contact HomeBase (humboldt@homebaseccc.org) if no email notice is received.

Who May Appeal and What May Be Appealed

Projects that are reallocated or not funded are eligible to appeal the result of the Review and Rank Committee. Applicants that have been found not to meet the threshold requirements are not eligible for an appeal.

In order to succeed, the appeal must:

- Prove their score is not reflective of the application information provided; or
- Describe bias or unfairness in the process, which warrants the appeal.

Note that appeals cannot be based upon the judgment of the Review and Rank Committee alone. All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed.

The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final.

Initiating the Formal Appeal

Notice of intent to appeal must be filed with HomeBase (humboldt@homebaseccc.org) AND Sally Hewitt (SHewitt@co.humboldt.ca.us) by noon on November 3, 2015. The notice of appeal must include a written statement specifying in detail the grounds asserted for the appeal. The appeal must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency (i.e., Executive Director). The notice of appeal is limited to one single spaced page in 12-point font.

Any and all appeals must be received in writing by noon on November 4, 2015. All notices of appeal (one original and four copies) must be submitted to:

Sally Hewitt
930 6th Street
Eureka, CA 95501
(707) 441-4628

The appeal must include a copy of the application and all accompanying materials submitted to the Review and Rank Committee.

The Appeal Process, Including Involvement of Other Affected Agencies

- All valid appeals will be read, reviewed and evaluated by the Appeal Committee.
- The Appeal Committee will meet to deliberate.
 - All applicants will be invited to attend any appeal and may make a 10-minute statement regarding the appeal.
 - The panel will review the rankings made by the Review and Rank Committee only on the basis of the submitted project application, the one page appeal, any statements made during the appeal process, and the material used by the Review and Rank Committee. No new information can be submitted by the applicant or reviewed by the Appeal Committee.
 - The decision of the appellate panel must be supported by a simple majority vote.
- The appealing agency will receive, in writing, the decision of the Appeal Committee within 2 business days of the Appeal Committee Meeting. The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final.

Members of the Appeal Panel

The Appeal Committee will be made up of non-conflicted members of the HHC Executive Committee (and additional non-conflicted HHC members as necessary) and one non-voting member of the original Review and Rank Committee. No member of the Appeal Committee may have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney funding and must sign a conflict of interest statement. The role of the Appeal Committee is to read and review only those areas of the application that are being appealed.

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
RENEWAL HOUSING PROJECT SCORING TOOL

Project Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

THRESHOLD CRITERIA	Yes or No
Threshold Criteria These factors are required, but not scored.	
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency.	
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry, when it is available for the project type.	
Standing with HUD: The project applicant is in good standing with HUD, meaning that the applicant does not have any open monitoring findings or history of slow expenditure of grant funds.	
Mainstream Services: Applicant demonstrates a connection to mainstream services.	
Participant Eligibility: All program participants meet the category of homelessness applicable to this program component type and all program participants are eligible in conformity with particular grant requirements.	
Eligibility Documentation: Programs comply with all HUD requirements regarding the documentation of disability and homeless status.	
Any Other HUD Threshold Criteria: Any other HUD threshold criteria. See FY 2015 CoC NOFA and Local Materials for additional information.	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
1	Outcomes Has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed? Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower for projects serving populations that have additional barriers (including chronically homeless persons, and persons with mental and/or addictive illnesses).	45 points	
1a	Utilization: Is the project at capacity and serving the number of homeless persons that it is designed to serve?	10 points 92-100% = 10 points 84-91.9% = 8 points 76-83.9% = 6 points 68-75.9% = 4 points 60-67.9% = 2 points 0-59.9% = 0 points	Scored by HomeBase
1b	Housing Stability: The percentage of project participants who achieve housing stability by obtaining or maintaining permanent		

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
	housing.		
1b1	<p>If Permanent Housing (PSH):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 80% of formerly homeless persons who enter the project remain in the permanent housing project (for at least 12 months) or exit to other permanent housing. • If the project has failed to meet objectives in previous years, how is the project changing to improve success rates? 	<p>Up to 20 points</p> <p>>=12 points: Projects meet minimum benchmarks, taking into consideration the population served</p>	
1b2	<p>If Transitional Housing (TH):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 80% of homeless persons who exit the project exit to a form of permanent housing. • If the project has failed to meet objectives in previous years, how is the project changing to improve success rates? 	<p>Up to 20 points</p> <p>>=12 points: Projects meet minimum benchmarks, taking into consideration the population served</p>	
1c	<p>Mainstream Services (Including Employment): Project demonstrates success connecting clients with employment and non-employment income, as well as mainstream benefits. Consider the population served and the project type in determining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did average income increase or stay the same? At least 20% of participants should increase income at follow-up or exit to score 8 or more points for most projects. • Have project participants gained employment between entry and follow-up/exit? • Are project participants receiving all benefits for which they are eligible? • Are project participants receiving financial literacy and employment assistance? 	<p>Up to 15 points</p>	
2	Budget & Cost Effectiveness	20 points	
2a	<p>Budget: The project's budget is clearly articulated, with no unnecessary or unexplained items.</p>	5 points	
2b	<p>Cost Effectiveness: The project is cost-effective compared to other like projects (e.g., permanent housing, transitional housing). Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the special needs of clients being served? Some populations are more expensive to serve than others. • Are project salaries/benefits competitive (i.e., are staff fairly compensated)? 	10 points	
2c	<p>Amount of Leverage: The percentage of the size of the grant that project is able to leverage.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>>300% = 5 points 200-300% = 3 points 100-200% = 1 points <100% = 0 points</p>	Scored by HomeBase
3	Agency Capacity	35 points	
3a	<p>Administrative Capacity: The agency has the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there outstanding HUD findings (regarding another 	15 points	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
	<p>project) and/or financial audit findings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has HUD de-obligated any of the agency's other program grant funds? • Are the agency's HUD grant funds being drawn down regularly throughout the grant year? • Has the project drawn down funds at least quarterly? • Has the project submitted all HUD-required reports on time (e.g., APRs)? 		
3b	<p>Participation in HMIS: The agency/project is actively participating in HMIS. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What percentage of required Data Elements has the project entered for all participants? • What percentage of HMIS Committee meetings has the project attended? 	10 points	
3c	<p>Community Participation: The agency actively participates in Continuum of Care-related planning meetings.</p>	<p>5 points</p> <p>30 meetings = 5 points 25 meetings = 4 points 20 meetings = 3 points 15 meetings = 2 points 10 meetings = 1 point <10 meetings = 0 points</p>	Scored by HomeBase
3d	<p>Policies and Procedures: The agency and/or project maintains policies, procedures, and actions that ensure continuous quality improvement. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the agency train its staff to ensure high quality of care? • Does the agency assess quality of service and consumer satisfaction through surveys, focus groups, etc.? • Does the agency monitor project performance using data? 	5 points	
4	Bonus Points	5 possible points	
4a	<p>If Permanent Housing: Project uses a Housing First approach to minimize barriers to entry and place the most vulnerable participants. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project admit participants without requiring any of the following prior to project entry: sobriety, minimum income, background checks, or credit checks? (Note: this refers to project policy and not to landlord/property management policy; however, projects should also demonstrate efforts to work with landlords to minimize landlord-imposed barriers) • Does the project prioritize placement of chronically homeless persons into units as they become available through turnover (provided there are chronically homeless potential participants)? 	5 bonus points	
4b	<p>If Transitional Housing: Consider whether the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves a HUD priority population for transitional housing 	3 bonus points	

SCORED CRITERIA	2015 Points	Points
<p>(youth, survivors of domestic violence, or substance abuse recovery); or,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is working toward transitioning to CoC-funded permanent housing (PSH/RRH); or, • Is seeking alternative funding to support the transitional housing project. 		

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
RENEWAL HMIS PROJECT SCORING TOOL

Project Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

THRESHOLD CRITERIA	Yes or No
Threshold Criteria These factors are required, but not scored.	
Standing with HUD: The project applicant is in good standing with HUD, meaning that the applicant does not have any open monitoring findings or history of slow expenditure of grant funds.	
Any Other HUD Threshold Criteria: Any other HUD threshold criteria. See FY 2015 CoC NOFA and Local Materials for additional information.	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
1	Outcomes Has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed?	50 points	
1a	Implementation and Improvement: Is the project consistently implementing and improving HMIS?	10 points	
1b	High Quality Data: Is the project taking steps to ensure high quality data? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the data quality within the system within an acceptable range? • Does the HMIS collect all Universal Data Elements? • Does the HMIS un-duplicate client records? 	10 points	
1c	Required Reporting: Are the reports produced for the Continuum of Care and for HUD useful and satisfactory to meet the requirements for the CoC obligations (AHAR, PIT, HIC, APR, etc.)?	10 points	
1d	Data Use: Has the HMIS provided data in a form that can be used and analyzed to assist the Continuum of Care in assessing homeless needs, allocating resources, and coordinating services?	10 points	
1e	User Satisfaction: What is the satisfaction level of the agencies participating in the HMIS from a program management and administrative point of view? Does the project provide training to participating agencies, when desired?	10 points	
2	Budget & Cost Effectiveness	10 points	
2a	Budget: The project's budget is clearly articulated, with no unnecessary or unexplained items.	5 points	
2b	Amount of Leverage: The percentage of the size of the grant that project is able to leverage.	5 points >300% = 5 points 200-300% = 3 points 100-200% = 1 point <100% = 0 points	Scored by HomeBase

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
3	Agency Capacity	30 points	
3a	<p>Administrative Capacity: The agency has the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there outstanding HUD findings (regarding another project) and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD de-obligated any of the agency's other program grant funds? • Has the project submitted all HUD-required reports on time (e.g., APRs)? 	20 points	
3b	Unspent Grant Funds: Has the project left any grant funds unspent in the past three years? Has it made regular, quarterly drawdowns?	5 points	
3c	Community Participation: The agency actively participates in Continuum of Care-related planning meetings.	5 points 30 meetings = 5 points 25 meetings = 4 points 20 meetings = 3 points 15 meetings = 2 points 10 meetings = 1 point <10 meetings = 0 points	Scored by HomeBase
4	Consistent with Community Needs	10 points	
4a	Required Component: HMIS is a required component in our Continuum of Care. Award 10 points.	10 points	

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
NEW PERMANENT HOUSING PROJECT SCORING TOOL

Project Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

Instructions:

This application is submitted to compete for reallocated and bonus funding for:

- New permanent supportive housing (PSH); or,
- New rapid rehousing (RRH).

THRESHOLD CRITERIA	Yes or No
Threshold Criteria These factors are required, but not scored.	
Eligible Project Type: Projects must be one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent Supportive Housing, serving only chronically homeless individuals and families; • Rapid Rehousing (RRH), serving individuals, families, or unaccompanied youth who come directly from the streets, shelters, or are fleeing domestic violence or otherwise meet the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness. 	
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency.	
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry, when it is available for the project type.	
Participant Eligibility: Permanent housing projects must serve one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent Supportive Housing: Only chronically homeless individuals or families. <i>(Definition: individuals from streets, emergency shelters, safe havens, or an institution for less than 90 days and was chronically homeless at entry into the institution that has been homeless in such places for at least one year or at least four times in three years and that has a diagnosed disability, or families with a head of household that meets the definition of chronic homelessness)</i> • Rapid Rehousing: Only individuals, families, or unaccompanied youth who come directly from the streets, emergency shelters, or are fleeing domestic violence or other persons who meet the criteria of Paragraph 4 of the definition of homelessness. <i>(Definition: Individuals and families who are fleeing, or are attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence against the individual or a family member)</i> 	
Standing with HUD: The project applicant is in good standing with HUD, meaning that	

THRESHOLD CRITERIA	Yes or No
the applicant does not have any open monitoring findings or history of slow expenditure of grant funds.	
Rapid Implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant not receiving acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation funding must demonstrate a plan for rapid implementation of the project; the project narrative documents how the project will be ready to begin housing the first project participant within 12 months of the award. Projects receiving acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation funding must demonstrate site control within two years of the announcement of funding awards, begin construction within 9 months of the grant award letter, and complete construction within 24 months of the grant award letter. Supportive services or operations must begin within 3 months of completion of construction/rehabilitation and all activities that can be conducted 	
Mainstream Services: Applicant demonstrates a connection to mainstream services.	
Any Other HUD Threshold Criteria: Any other HUD threshold criteria. See FY 2015 CoC NOFA and Local Materials for additional information.	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
1	Consistency with Community Needs	30 points	
1a	Permanent Housing: Permanent housing (PSH/) using CoC funds for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leasing; Rental Assistance; or, Operations 	10 points	Scored by HomeBase
1b	Housing Activities: The percentage of the grant the project utilizes for “housing activities” as opposed to supportive services. Housing activities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leasing Rental Assistance; Operations. 	15 points 96-100% = 15 points 91-95.9% = 12 points 86-90.9% = 9 points 80-85.9% = 6 points 70-79.9% = 3 points	Scored by HomeBase
1c	Alignment with Housing First Principles: Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project provide housing without preconditions (including sobriety, minimum income, criminal background, or poor credit history)? Does the project require participants to participate in serves for entry or continuation in the program? Does the project prioritize rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing? 	5 Points	
2	Project Quality, Appropriateness, and Readiness Consider the overall design of the project in light of its outcome objectives, and the Continuum of Care’s goals that permanent housing programs for homeless people result in stable housing and increased income (through benefits or employment).	30 points	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
2a	<p>Design: The project design includes provision of appropriate supportive services. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project staffed appropriately to provide the services? • Are staff trained to meet the needs of the population to be served? • Are clientele involved in designing and operating the project? • Does the method of service delivery described include culturally-specific/sensitive elements appropriate to the population? • Do the project application materials reflect cultural competency appropriate to the population to be served? • Does the project demonstrate a plan for programmatic accessibility to persons with disabilities? 	10 points	
2b	<p>Housing Quality: Housing where participants will reside is fully described and appropriate to the project design proposed. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project staffed appropriately to operate the housing? • Are staff trained to meet the needs of the population to be served? • Will the project be physically accessible to persons with disabilities? 	5 points	
2c	<p>Policies and Procedures: The project has policies and procedures to ensure that all homeless participants will be individually assisted to identify, apply for, and obtain benefits under mainstream health and social services programs. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the agency demonstrate a track record of enrolling clients in all mainstream services for which they are eligible? • Does the project indicate specific activities to identify and enroll all Medicaid-eligible program participants and does the project include Medicaid-financed services (including case management, tenancy supports, behavioral health services, or other services important to supporting housing stability)? • For projects serving families: Does the project have a plan for policies and procedures that are consistent with, and that do not restrict the rights of children and families under the McKinney-Vento Education subtitle and other laws regarding education and homelessness? Does the project have a designated staff person responsible for ensuring children are enrolled in school and connected to appropriate services? 	5 points	
2d	<p>Outcomes: Projected outcomes are realistic but sufficiently challenging given the scale of the of project. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are outcomes measurable and appropriate to the population to be served? • Does the project indicate intent to meet minimal outcomes (including: 80% maintaining permanent housing for at least 6 months and at least a 20% increase in income through employment or benefits). 	5 points	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
2e	Linkages: Linkages to other services or agencies are described and confirming letters of support are provided.	5 points	
3	Budget & Cost Effectiveness	10 points	
3a	Budget: The project's budget is clearly articulated, with no unnecessary or unexplained items.	2 points	
3b	Cost Effectiveness: The project is cost-effective compared to other new permanent housing activities.	8 points	
4	Agency Capacity	20 points	
4a	<p>Administrative Capacity: The agency has the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the agency successfully handled federal or other major grants of this size without difficulty or problems? • Are there outstanding HUD findings (regarding another project) and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD de-obligated any of the agency's other program grant funds? • Are the agency's HUD grant funds being drawn down regularly throughout the grant year? • Does the application packet that was submitted reflect an agency with capacity that is sufficient to carry out the HUD administrative requirements? 	10 points	
4b	<p>Past Performance: The agency has demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to successfully carry out the work they propose and has successfully served homeless persons as a particular group. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the experience of the agency in handling a like project (e.g., if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with relocation)? 	4 points	
4c	Community Participation: The agency actively participates in Continuum of Care-related planning meetings.	6 points	
5	Leverage	10 points	
5a	Amount of Leverage: The percentage of the size of the grant that project is able to leverage.	10 points >300% = 10 points 200-300% = 6 points 100-200% = 3 points <100% = 0 points	

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
NEW HMIS PROJECT SCORING TOOL

Project Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

Instructions:

This application is submitted to compete for reallocated and bonus funding for:

- New Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) projects

THRESHOLD CRITERIA	Yes or No
Threshold Criteria These factors are required, but not scored.	
Eligible Project Type: Project must be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) 	
Standing with HUD: The project applicant is in good standing with HUD, meaning that the applicant does not have any open monitoring findings or history of slow expenditure of grant funds.	
Any Other HUD Threshold Criteria: Any other HUD threshold criteria. See FY 2015 CoC NOFA and Local Materials for additional information.	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
1	Program Quality, Appropriateness, and Readiness	60 points	
1a	Program Design: The program is well-defined and the applicant is eligible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the project increase HMIS capacity and functionality? • Has the agency indicated its intent to improve agency and CoC access to data in a form that can be analyzed and assist the Continuum of Care in assessing homeless needs, allocating resources, and coordinating services? 	15 points	
1b	Data Quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Has the agency indicated that the Data Quality for the system will be within an acceptable range? • Will the reports produced for the Continuum of Care and for HUD be useful and satisfactory to meet the requirements for the CoC obligations (AHAR, PIT, HIC, APR, etc.)? • Does the HMIS collect all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the HMIS Data Standards? • Does the HMIS un-duplicate client records? 	25 Points	
1c	Training and Support: Has the agency indicated its intent to conduct trainings and otherwise assist projects to move into compliance with	15 points	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
	HUD HMIS Data Standards?		
1d	Readiness: Will the project be ready to start by HUD's statutory guidelines?	5 points	
2	Leverage	5 points	
2a	Leverage Amount: Has the project leveraged sufficient funding?	Up to 5 points >300% = 5 points 200-300% = 3 points 100-200% = 1 point <100% = 0 points	
3	Agency/Collaborative Capacity	30 points	
3a	Managing Critical and Confidential Data: Has the agency demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to manage confidential data?	10 points	
3b	Past Performance: Have the agencies/has the agency submitting this application demonstrated – through past performance – the ability to successfully carry out the work they propose and have they/has it successfully served homeless people as a particular group? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The experience of the agency in handling a like-project (e.g., if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with relocation). • If the agency has other programs, has the agency left CoC project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? 	5 points	
3c	Agency Capacity: The agency has the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the agency have any outstanding HUD findings and/or financial audit findings? • Has HUD de-obligated any of the agency's grant funds in the past three operating years? • Does the entirety of the application reflect an agency with the capacity sufficient to meet HUD administrative requirements? 	5 points	
3d	Alignment with CoC Priorities: Do the project and agency align with and support CoC priorities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Program model and philosophy <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals <input type="checkbox"/> CoC participation (meeting attendance) • Other factors 	10 points	
4	Consistency with HUD and Local Priorities	5 points	
4a	Required Component: HMIS is a required component in our Continuum of Care and HMIS projects will be awarded 5 bonus points to demonstrate the CoC's funding priorities.	5 points	

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
NEW COORDINATED ENTRY PROJECT SCORING TOOL

Project Name: _____

Reviewer: _____

Instructions:

This application is submitted to compete for reallocated and bonus funding for:

- New Supportive Services Only (SSO) for Coordinated Entry

THRESHOLD CRITERIA	Yes or No
Threshold Criteria These factors are required, but not scored.	
Eligible Project Type: Projects must be one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive Services Only (SSO) for Coordinated Entry 	
Standing with HUD: The project applicant is in good standing with HUD, meaning that the applicant does not have any open monitoring findings or history of slow expenditure of grant funds.	
Any Other HUD Threshold Criteria: Any other HUD threshold criteria. See FY 2015 CoC NOFA and Local Materials for additional information.	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
1	Program Quality, Appropriateness, and Readiness	60 points	
1a	Program Design: The program is well-defined and the applicant is eligible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the project, as designed, efficiently and effectively facilitate the design and implementation of a functional Coordinated Entry system? • Does the program ensure that participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs? 	25 points	
1b	Geographic Accessibility: Is the Coordinated Entry system easily accessible for all persons within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking information regarding homeless assistance?	10 Points	
1c	Advertising to Persons with Highest Needs: Is there a strategy for advertising the program that is specifically designed to reach homeless persons with the highest barriers within the CoC's geographic area?	10 points	
1d	Standardized Assessment Process: Is there a standardized assessment process or a well-defined plan to develop one?	10 points	
1e	Readiness: Will the project be ready to start by HUD's statutory guidelines?	5 points	

SCORED CRITERIA		2015 Points	Points
2	Leverage	5 points	
2a	Leverage Amount: Has the project leveraged sufficient funding?	Up to 5 points >300% = 5 points 200-300% = 3 points 100-200% = 1 points <100% = 0 points	
2	Agency/Collaborative Capacity	30 points	
3a	Past Performance: Have the agencies/has the agency submitting this application demonstrated – through past performance – the ability to successfully carry out the work they propose and have they/has it successfully served homeless people as a particular group? Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The experience of the agency in handling a like-project (e.g., the extent to which the agency has led/facilitated community-wide planning processes). ● If the agency has other programs, has the agency left CoC project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years? 	10 points	
3b	Agency Capacity: The agency has the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all grant audit, administrative, and reporting requirements. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the agency have any outstanding HUD findings and/or financial audit findings? ● Has HUD de-obligated any of the agency’s grant funds in the past three operating years? ● Does the entirety of the application reflect an agency with the capacity sufficient to meet HUD administrative requirements? 	10 points	
3c	Alignment with CoC Priorities: Do the project and agency align with and support CoC priorities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Program model and philosophy <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals <input type="checkbox"/> CoC participation (meeting attendance) ● Other factors 	10 points	
4	Consistency with HUD and Local Priorities	5 points	
4a	Required Component: Coordinated Entry is a required component in our Continuum of Care and Coordinated Entry projects will be awarded 5 bonus points to demonstrate the CoC’s funding priorities.	5 points	

2015 Continuum of Care Program Grants
SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION FORM

Applicant(s) Name(s):		
Project Name:		
Person to contact concerning this application:		
Phone:	Email:	Fax:
Total grant amount requested:		

All applicants - Please submit **scanned electronic copies via email** of the following documents **PER PROJECT**:

- 2015 Supplemental Application Form (i.e., this form)
- Project Application (formerly known as Exhibit 2) from e-snaps (DO NOT hit submit until after the local competition)
 - **Renewal Projects:**
 - Submit two documents:
 - The full application for technical review by HomeBase and Collaborative Applicant AND
 - Only the following charts for the Review and Rank Committee
 - 3B Project Description
 - All project budgets charts, including match/leveraging (Section 7)
 - **New Projects (Housing, HMIS, and Coordinated Entry):**
 - Submit the full application.
- HUD Monitoring Letter and correspondence about outstanding findings/sanctions (if applicable)
- Documentation of grant amendments made since last NOFA competition (if applicable)
- All match & leverage letters that your agency has gathered with respect to the proposed application. **Do NOT provide the originals**; those should go on file at your agency.

All applicants - please submit **one (1) copy** of the following documents **PER AGENCY**:

- Your agency's most recent financial audit and management letter (if you've not already done so)

2015 Continuum of Care Grants
RENEWAL APPLICANTS – SUPPLEMENT TO RFI

THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the scoring criteria, all renewal projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to clarify baseline requirements. In order to be scored in the 2015 competition, all renewal projects must meet the following thresholds. **Please check each box to confirm each of the following is true:**

- Project participates in HMIS, unless the project is a victim services agency

- Project agrees to participate in Coordinated Assessment, unless the project is a victim services agency.

- Project meets HUD threshold requirements for renewal projects including that the project has **none** of the following:
 - Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;
 - Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
 - History of inadequate financial management accounting practices;
 - Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
 - History of other major capacity issues that have significantly impacted the operation of the project and its performance;
 - History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly; and
 - History of serving ineligible persons, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes.

If you are unable to check one of the boxes above, please provide an explanation (no more than one page).

SCORING FACTOR: AGENCY/COLLABORATIVE CAPACITY

Factor 3B In the most recent grant year, what was the total amount expended of HUD CoC funds for this grant?

Factor 3D Does your agency have the following HEARTH required policies and procedures in place?

Yes	No	N/A	Policies
-----	----	-----	----------

Yes	No	N/A	Policies
			Conflict of interest
			For agency conflicts
			For individual conflicts
			Homeless person participation
			In policy making bodies
			In project operations
			Faith based activities
			Equal treatment of program participants
			Separation of explicitly religious activities
			Fair housing
			Non-discrimination and equal opportunity
			Affirmatively furthers fair housing
			Accessibility for disabled persons
			Age and gender of a child under age 18 must not be used as a basis for denying any family's admission to a project

2015 Continuum of Care Grants

RENEWAL APPLICANTS (HMIS)

SCORING FACTOR: PROJECT QUALITY, APPROPRIATENESS, AND READINESS

Please include a brief narrative (no more than two pages) addressing the following questions:

Factor 1A Please describe the ways in which your project implements and improves HMIS.

Factor 1B Please describe:

- Your efforts to ensure high data quality.
- Whether the data quality within the system is within an acceptable range.
- The extent to which the HMIS collects all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the HMIS Data Standards.
- The extent to which the HMIS un-duplicates client records.

Factor 1C Does the HMIS produce reports satisfactory to meet the requirements for the CoC obligations (AHAR, PIT, HIC, APR, etc.).

Factor 1D Please describe the ways in which the HMIS produces data in a form that can be used to and analyzed to assist the Continuum of Care in assessing homeless needs, allocating resources, and coordinating services.

Factor 1E Please describe:

- What trainings the project will provide, and how the project will otherwise assist others in complying with HUD HMIS Data Standards.
- Your process for assessing “customer satisfaction” among the agencies who participate in HMIS from a program management and administrative vantage.

SCORING FACTOR: AGENCY/ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

Factor 3A Are there any unresolved HUD monitoring findings or concerns or outstanding HUD audit findings related to any project of your agency?

- Yes
 No

Has HUD instituted any sanctions on any project of your agency, including, but not limited to, suspending disbursements (e.g. freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues?

- Yes
- No

If yes to either of the above above, please attach the written communications between HUD and the project concerning those matters and describe the issue and status here, including the extent to which you have advised the Collaborative Applicant of the outstanding HUD findings or concerns (no more than 1 page).

Has the project submitted all HUD-required reports on time (e.g., AHAR, PIT, HIC< APR, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

If no, please provide additional detail.

Factor 3B Has the project left any grant funds unspent in the past three years?

- Yes
- No

Has the project's HUD grant funds been drawn down regularly (e.g., at least quarterly) throughout the grant year?

- Yes
- No

If no to either above, please provide additional detail.

Factor 3C Please indicate the number of Continuum of Care planning meetings attended by your agency and any other activities performed by your activity to support CoC priorities/activities.

2015 Continuum of Care Grants

NEW APPLICANTS (HOUSING)

Is this application for reallocated funding, Permanent Housing Bonus funding or would you like it to be considered for both opportunities?

- Reallocated funding
- Bonus funding
- Consider for both reallocated funding and bonus funding
- Transfer of an existing grant

THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the scoring criteria, all Permanent Housing Bonus projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to clarify baseline requirements. **Please check each box to confirm each of the following is true:**

The application proposes:

- Permanent Supportive Housing (serving only chronically homeless individuals and families);
- Rapid Rehousing (serving individuals, families, or unaccompanied youth who come directly from the streets, shelters, or are fleeing domestic violence or otherwise meet the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness)
- This application is submitted by a project applicant that is eligible and in good standing with HUD, which means that the project applicant does not have any open monitoring Findings, or history of slow expenditure of grant funds
- This application demonstrates a plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant within one year of the award
- This application demonstrates a connection to mainstream service systems
- The project agrees to participate in the CoC's coordinated assessment system, when it becomes available for the project type.
- The project agrees to participate in the CoC's HMIS, which must already be implemented prior to HUD executing a grant agreement.

SCORING FACTOR: CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY NEEDS

Factor 1A Are you proposing using grant funds for renewable activities (e.g. leasing, rental subsidies, housing operations as opposed to nonrenewable funds for acquisition, construction or rehabilitation)?

Yes

No

Factor 1B What percentage of the grant award will your project utilize for “housing activities” (leasing, rental assistance, or operations only)?

Factor 1C Will your project provide housing without preconditions (such as sobriety, minimum income, criminal background, or poor credit history)?

Yes

No

Will your project require participants to participate in services for entry or continuation in the program?

Yes

No

If yes to either of the above, please briefly describe (less than 1/3 of a page).

How will your project prioritize rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing? (please briefly describe in less than 1/3 of a page).

SCORING FACTOR: PROJECT QUALITY, APPROPRIATENESS, AND READINESS

Factor 2A-2C If not included in your HUD application, please briefly describe (no more than two, single-spaced pages):

- b. The services you propose to provide for this project
- c. The number and type of staff you propose for this project (services and operations staff)
- d. How staff will be trained to meet the needs of the population to be served (services and operations staff)
- e. If unhoused or formerly unhoused people will be involved in designing the program; how tenants will be involved in policy decisions related to the program and in operating the program
- f. How the program will be accessible to those of different abilities and cultures
- g. How the program will be physically accessible to persons with disabilities

- h. The project's policies and procedures to ensure that all homeless clients will be individually assisted to identify, apply for and obtain benefits under mainstream health and social service programs.
- i. The agency's track record in enrolling participants in all mainstream services for which they are eligible.
- j. The agency's specific activities to identify and enroll all Medicaid-eligible participants in Medicaid-financed services (e.g., case management, tenancy supports, behavioral health sciences, or other services).

Factor 2D If not included in your HUD application, please state the goals and/or outcome objectives for your project.

Minimal project outcomes should include:

- The percentage of formerly homeless individuals who remain housed in the HUD permanent housing project at the end of the operating year or exited to other permanent housing is at least 80%
- The percentage of leavers that increase employment income from entry to exit
- The percentage of leavers that increase non-employment income from entry to exit
- The percentage of adult leavers and stayers in all CoC-funded projects that have non-cash mainstream benefits

Factor 2E What linkages to other services or agencies will your project establish? Please provide a description and letters of support where appropriate.

SCORING FACTOR: AGENCY CAPACITY

Factor 4A Are there any unresolved HUD monitoring findings or concerns or outstanding HUD audit findings related to any project of your agency?

- Yes
- No

Has HUD instituted any sanctions on any project of your agency, including, but not limited to, suspending disbursements (e.g. freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues?

- Yes
- No

If yes to either of the above above, please attach the written communications between HUD and the project concerning those matters and describe the issue

and status here, including the extent to which you have advised the Collaborative Applicant of the outstanding HUD findings or concerns (no more than 1 page).

Does the agency have the following HEARTH required policies and procedures in place?

Yes	No	N/A	Policies
			Conflict of interest
			For agency conflicts
			For individual conflicts
			Homeless person participation
			In policy making bodies
			In project operations
			Faith based activities
			Equal treatment of program participants
			Separation of explicitly religious activities
			Fair housing
			Non-discrimination and equal opportunity
			Affirmatively furthers fair housing
			Accessibility for disabled persons
			Age and gender of a child under age 18 must not be used as a basis for denying any family's admission to a project

Factor 4B In the past five years, has the lead agency previously managed a significant state/federal grant, for example, a grant for at least \$200,000 per year for a three-year period?

- Yes
- No

Please describe your agency's experience in handling a like project (e.g., if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with that activity, etc.).

Factor 4C Please indicate the number of Continuum of Care planning meetings attended by your agency and any other activities performed by your activity to support CoC priorities/activities.

2015 Continuum of Care Grants

NEW APPLICANTS (HMIS)

SCORING FACTOR: PROJECT QUALITY, APPROPRIATENESS, AND READINESS

Please include a brief narrative (no more than two pages) addressing the following questions:

- Factor 1A** Please describe:
- How the project will improve HMIS capacity and functionality.
 - The ways in which you will generate reports from HMIS that the CoC or individual agencies can analyze to assess needs, allocate resources, and/or coordinate services and meet HUD requirements.
 - How this project will provide data in a form that can be analyzed to assist the Continuum of Care in assessing homeless needs, allocating resources, and coordinating services.

- Factor 1B** Please describe:
- Your efforts to ensure high data quality.
 - How reports produced for the Continuum of Care and for HUD will be useful and satisfactory to meet the requirements for the CoC obligations (AHAR, PIT, HIC, APR, etc.).
 - The extent to which the HMIS collects all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the HMIS Data Standards.
 - The extent to which the HMIS un-duplicates client records.

- Factor 1C** Please describe:
- What trainings the project will provide, and how the project will otherwise assist others in complying with HUD HMIS Data Standards.
 - Your process for assessing “customer satisfaction” among the agencies who participate in HMIS from a program management and administrative vantage.

- Factor 1D** Will the project be ready to start by HUD’s statutory guidelines?

SCORING FACTOR: AGENCY/ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

- Factor 3A** In the past five years, has the lead agency previously managed a significant state/federal grant requiring management of confidential and critical data?

- Yes
- No

Factor 3B In the past five years, has the lead agency previously managed a significant state/federal grant, for example, a grant for at least \$200,000 per year for a three-year period?

- Yes
- No

Please describe your agency's experience in handling a like project.

Factor 3C Are there any unresolved HUD monitoring findings or concerns or outstanding HUD audit findings related to any project of your agency?

- Yes
- No

Has HUD instituted any sanctions on any project of your agency, including, but not limited to, suspending disbursements (e.g. freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues?

- Yes
- No

If yes to either of the above above, please attach the written communications between HUD and the project concerning those matters and describe the issue and status here, including the extent to which you have advised the Collaborative Applicant of the outstanding HUD findings or concerns (no more than 1 page).

Factor 3D Does the project and the agency align and support CoC priorities, including through: program model and philosophy, performance goals, CoC participation (meeting attendance, etc.), or other factors?

Note: This is scored based on the overall application, but if you wish, you may also submit a brief essay (no more than one page) answer demonstrating CoC alignment.

2015 Continuum of Care Grants
NEW APPLICANTS (COORDINATED ENTRY)

SCORING FACTOR: PROJECT QUALITY, APPROPRIATENESS, AND READINESS

Please include a brief narrative (no more than two pages) addressing the following questions:

- Factor 1A** Please describe:
- How the project will conduct the process of developing and implementing Coordinated Entry.
 - The ways in which a functioning Coordinated Entry system will improve provision of housing and service to the homeless population.
 - How this program will develop a system that ensures that participants will be directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs.
- Factor 1B** How will the Coordinated Entry system be made easily accessible for all persons within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking information regarding homeless assistance?
- Factor 1C** How will the Coordinated Entry system advertise to reach homeless persons with the highest barriers within the CoC's geographic area?
- Factor 1D** Please describe:
- Whether there is a standardized assessment process in place.
 - If not, how the project will develop a standardized assessment process.
- Factor 1E** Will the project be ready to start by HUD's statutory guidelines?

SCORING FACTOR: AGENCY/ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

Factor 3B In the past five years, has the lead agency previously managed a significant state/federal grant, for example, a grant for at least \$200,000 per year for a three-year period?

- Yes
- No

Please describe your agency's experience in handling a like project (e.g., has your agency led other collaborative planning processes?).

Factor 3C Are there any unresolved HUD monitoring findings or concerns or outstanding HUD audit findings related to any project of your agency?

- Yes
- No

Has HUD instituted any sanctions on any project of your agency, including, but not limited to, suspending disbursements (e.g. freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues?

- Yes
- No

If yes to either of the above above, please attach the written communications between HUD and the project concerning those matters and describe the issue and status here, including the extent to which you have advised the Collaborative Applicant of the outstanding HUD findings or concerns (no more than 1 page).

Factor 3D Does the project and the agency align and support CoC priorities, including through: program model and philosophy, performance goals, CoC participation (meeting attendance, etc.), or other factors?

Note: This is scored based on the overall application, but if you wish, you may also submit a brief essay (no more than one page) answer demonstrating CoC alignment.