# S A C R A M E N T O STEPS FORWARD **CoC Board Agenda** Wednesday, June 10, 2020 || 8:10 AM – 10:00 AM Zoom

I. Welcome & Introductions:	Sarah Bontrager, Chai	r	
II. Review and Approval of May 13, 2020 Minutes: Emily Halcon, Secretary			
III. Chair's Report			
IV. CEO's Report: Lisa Bates			
V. New Business			
A. COVID-19 Response Team Update	- Presenters: Ya-yin	8:20 AM (10 minutes)	Information
B. Approval of FY2020 CoC NOFA Competition Review and Rank Scoring Tools & Policies	-Presenter: Emily Halcon, Project Review Committee Co-Chair & Michele Watts, SSF Chief Planning Officer	8:30 AM (40 minutes)	Action
C. 2021 Point-in-Time Count Preparation - PIT Subcommittee - Researcher RFP - Timeline	-Presenter: Noel Kammermann, System Performance Committee Chair & Michele Watts	9:10 AM (10 minutes)	Information
D. Planning for CoC Workshop on Encampments - Overview - Schedule & Format - Member Survey	Presenters: Sarah Bontrager & Tamu Nolfo Green, SSF Systems Performance Advisor	9:20 AM (20 minutes)	Discussion
VI. Announcements	1	1	1
VII. Meeting Adjourned			



## **CoC Board Meeting**

Wednesday, May 13, 2020 | 8:10 AM – 9:00 AM Zoom

Member	Area of Representation	Present
Alexis Bernard	Mental Health Service Organization	Yes
Amani Sawires Rapaski	Substance Abuse	Yes
Angela Upshaw	Veterans	Yes
April Wick	People with Disabilities	Yes
Bridgette Dean	Law Enforcement	Yes
Christie M. Gonzales	Mental Health Service Organization	Yes
Cindy Cavanaugh	County of Sacramento	Yes
Emily Halcon	City of Sacramento	Yes
Erin Johansen	Mental Health	Yes
Jameson Parker	Business Community & Street	
	Outreach	Yes
Jenna Abbott	Business Community	Yes
John Foley	Homeless Services Provider	No
John Kraintz	Lived Experience	Yes
Julie Davis-Jaffe	Employment Development	Yes
Lt. Julie Pederson	Law Enforcement – County	Yes
MaryLiz Paulson	Housing Authority	Yes
Mike Jaske	Faith Community Advocate	Yes
Noel Kammermann	Local Homeless Coalition/Network	Yes
Peter Beilenson	Mental Health – County	Yes
Pixie Pearl	TAY Homeless Services Provider	No
Sarah Bontrager	City of Elk Grove	Yes
Stefan Heisler	City of Rancho Cordova	Yes
Stephanie Cotter	City of Citrus Heights	Yes
Tiffany Gold	Youth Action Board	Yes

Guests	
Angel Doney	

Ana Marie TrujilloAne wattsCheyenne CarawayDeisy MadrigalDelphine BrodyMonica Rocha-WyattMoe CopelandMeadow robinsonKristin HannahKathy JakeKristin TaylorPeter MusePat MachtJanna HaynesShelly HubertusSherri GreenSarah OdanielRagan KnotesJoe SmithTanya CruzTim KoehlerTara Turrentine	
Cheyenne Caraway Deisy Madrigal Delphine Brody Monica Rocha-Wyatt Moe Copeland Meadow robinson Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Ana Marie Trujillo
Deisy Madrigal Delphine Brody Monica Rocha-Wyatt Moe Copeland Meadow robinson Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Ane watts
Delphine Brody Monica Rocha-Wyatt Moe Copeland Meadow robinson Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Cheyenne Caraway
Monica Rocha-Wyatt Moe Copeland Meadow robinson Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Deisy Madrigal
Moe Copeland Meadow robinson Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Delphine Brody
Meadow robinson Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Monica Rocha-Wyatt
Kristin Hannah Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Moe Copeland
Kathy Jake Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Meadow robinson
Kristin Taylor Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Kristin Hannah
Peter Muse Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Kathy Jake
Pat Macht Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Kristin Taylor
Janna Haynes Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Peter Muse
Shelly Hubertus Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Pat Macht
Sherri Green Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Janna Haynes
Sarah Odaniel Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Shelly Hubertus
Ragan Knotes Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Sherri Green
Joe Smith Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Sarah Odaniel
Tanya Cruz Tim Koehler	Ragan Knotes
Tim Koehler	Joe Smith
	Tanya Cruz
Tara Turrentine	Tim Koehler
	Tara Turrentine

SSF Staff	Title
Lisa Bates	Chief Executive Officer
Alexa Jenkins	CoC Coordinator
Joe Concannon	CES Manager
Michele Watts	Chief Planning Officer
Ya-Yin Isle	Chief Strategic Initiatives Officer
Sarah Schwartz	Field Administrator & Sutter
	Navigator
Tamu Green	System Performance Advisor

I. Call to Order & Welcome: Sarah Bontrager, Chair		
Sarah Bontrager, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:15 AM		
II. Minutes & COVID-19 Homelessness Response Plan Revote	Presenter: Emily Halcon, Secretary	Information

M/S to approve the April 8, 2020 minutes & the COVID-19 Response Plan Revote
1 <sup>st</sup> Maryliz Paulson
2 <sup>nd</sup> Alexis Bernard
Motion approved.

III. Chairs Report	Presenter: Sarah Bontrager	Information
Thanked everyone for their hard wo	rk on COVID-19 response eff	ort.
IV. SSF CEO's Report	Presenter: Lisa Bates	Information
Lisa echoed Sarah's appreciation.		
V. New Business		
V.A. COVID-19 Homelessness Response Updates - Shelters - Encampments - Rehousing	Presenter: Lisa Bates; Cindy Cavanaugh, Sacramento County; Emily Halcon, City of Sacramento	Discussion
SSF Staff reviewed the weekly COV serve. Lisa discussed the motel stra and CDC guidance on prioritization. people who have tested positive in t currently 420 rooms in the system. T partners referring into motels. Miche strategy and its goal to help people includes meal delivery, placement a targeted outreach. A nurse advice lin medical assistance. Cindy gave an o welcomed rehousing suggestions via	tegy and that they are followi There has not been a signific he shelters or encampments. There are designated referral le provided overview of the e remain safely in encampmen nd maintenance of sanitation he is available 7 days a week overview of the rehousing stra	ng public health cant amount of There are entities and ncampment ts. This effort stations, and if people need
V.B. HUD "Mega-Waiver"	Presenter: Michele Watts, SSF	Information
Michele explained the provisions of waiver is to reduce some of the adm	-	

waiver is to reduce some of the administrative requirements of compliance with CoC Program regulations during COVID-19. She invited CoC providers interested in using the waiver to reach out to her if they have any questions.

V.C. 2019 HUD CoC FY2019 Award Announcement:	Presenter Michele Watts, SSF	Information

Michele reviewed the award announcement for the 2019 NOFA competition. The total award was \$23,349,292, with an increase of 12% over the 2018 award amount. There are two new PSH projects and two new domestic violence TH-RRH projects.

V.D. FY2020 NOFA Competition	- Presenter: Emily	Information
PRC Update	Halcon, PRC Co-Chair	

Emily shared that the 2020 NOFA hasn't been delay or changed due to COVID-19, so the PRC is moving forward. She hopes that the changes that had positive feedback last year will translate well in our response this year. The PRC is trying to work in additional time for providers to review and submit their data, as the process can be burdensome and time-consuming.

## VI. Announcements

- Kathy Jake is interested in participation with encampment strategy, and was advised to join the Outreach Volunteer Network
- Tamu Nolfo Green, SSF, invited interested members and guests to join the Outreach Volunteer Network created by the partnership with Donate4Sacramento Fund.

## VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 AM.

# Sacramento Homelessness COVID-19 RESPONSE TEAM

Weekly Progress Report

Brought to you in partnership by Sacramento County, City of Sacramento, Sacramento Steps Forward and the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency

May 29, 2020

Welcome to the seventh weekly report highlighting progress and highlights of the COVID-19 Homeless Response Team's work to implement the **Sacramento COVID-19 Homelessness Response Plan**. This report includes <u>actions to date through Thursday, May 28th</u>.

**Isolation/Quarantine Units for Persons Experiencing Homelessness** 

As an emergency response to COVID-19, medically supported isolation care centers, and preventative quarantine care centers have been temporarily funded to provide safe places for people experiencing homelessness who are COVID+, symptomatic or otherwise highly vulnerable.

Total Care Centers Open	Total Since 4/8
# Preventative Quarantine Care Center (PQCC) Motels	3 motels
# motel rooms	420 rooms
# Medically Supported Isolation Care Center (MICC) Trailers	18 trailers
# Preventative Quarantine Care Center (PQCC) Trailers	41 trailers

Served in Trailers and Motels	Week between 5/22 – 5/28	Total since 4/8
# Served in MICC Trailers	1 HH/1 individual	11 HH/11 individuals
# Served in PQCC Trailers	14 HH/14 individuals	17 HH/17 individuals
# Served in PQCC Motels	46 HH	497 HH
	52 individuals	607 individuals
TOTAL Served*	61 HH	525 HH
	67 individuals	635 individuals

\*Total unduplicated served since 4/8/20 are: 507 HH/617 individuals

- A small number of Registered Nurses from the COVID-19 Medical Assistance and Supply Team (CMAST) will remain onsite to support the MICC-trailers and another number have been diverted to PQCC-motels and will provide onsite support to guests 7-days per week.
- Designated referral partners who are referring into the program include hospitals, Federally Qualified Health Clinics (FQHCs), outreach teams, correctional health, emergency shelters, law enforcement and other homeless service providers.

## **Ensuring Safety and Health for Persons Living Outdoors**

This strategy is focused around providing coordinated support to people who are unsheltered to remain safely in place per CDC guidance to slow the spread of COVID-19.

Sanitation Stations	Total since 4/8
Handwashing Stations	56
Toilets	49
Locations	36

\*Placement of stations is dynamic, and equipment may be moved

Encampment Activities	Week between 5/22 - 5/28	Total since 4/8
# Meals served through Loaves and Fishes	1,000	7,600
# Meals served by Sacramento Covered	2,000	14,800
# Meals served by volunteer groups*	5,969	17,907

\*This is the third week of tracking for meals served by volunteer groups, which includes organizations funded by Donate4Sacramento. We will continue to report on this number.

Encampments and Outreach	Total
# Designated Outreach Navigators	37
# Encampments Identified with 20+ individuals	43
# Encampments Identified with < 20 individuals	39
TOTAL Encampments Identified	82

- The Response Team pilot expansion of water bottle delivery to six sites with satellite delivery services for one month will begin on Monday. Additional methods for providing water continue to be assessed as well.
- A network of 28 volunteer groups, 20 groups funded by Donate4Sacramento, have been delivering food and water to encampments.

- Medical assistance has been provided to 47 encampment areas to date by volunteer medical students from UC Davis Medical School and California Northstate University, local health care providers and a Medical Integrated Health Unit, and by the WellSpace Health Street Nursing program.
- A private provider of trash removal services has been contracted for clean-up near sanitation station locations and in areas where food is distributed. This COVID related service augments clean-up occurring by the City and County.
- Servicing of sanitation stations is included with the deployment of the stations and will continue.





## **Keeping Existing Emergency Shelters Safe and Operational**

This strategy ensures that existing shelters can safely remain open following CDC guidelines, moving vulnerable guests into COVID prevention care centers, and continuing to serve the general homeless populations.

- Elica Health's Health on Wheels mobile clinic continues to visit eight congregate shelters per week to provide primary care, emergency dental services and testing for COVID-19.
- The Nurse Advice Line for shelter staff to access real-time, health services support is as follows: Monday-Friday 9-5PM and Saturday-Sunday 10AM-4PM.
- Held weekly calls with private and publicly funded shelters.





## **COVID Testing**

County Public Health with medical partners are completing robust COVID testing at shelters, encampments and isolation/quarantine care centers with the goal of being able to do widespread testing to ensure the health and safety of people experiencing homelessness.

Testing Locations	<b>Testing Partner</b>	# Tests	Positive	Negative	Pending
		Administered	Results	Results	Tests
Shelters	Elica Health	183	0	183	0
Encampments	Joan Viteri Memorial Clinic	70	0	70	0
Isolation/Quarantine Care Centers	DHS Medical Staff	179	1	178	0

- Our COVID testing effort in shelters has concluded. Testing kits will continue to be available to shelters.
- The Department of Health Services provides 200 tests per week to the Joan Viteri Memorial Clinic (JVMC) medical team to test unsheltered people experiencing homelessness. Testing will continue in encampments.
- Testing is a condition of referral into the isolation/quarantine care centers. DHS medical staff will continue to administer tests at those locations to guests.



Photos by: Hector Amezcua

## **Access to Housing**

Strategies to improve access into permanent housing include:

- The Response Team is accelerating work on strategies to maximize housing placements as persons exit Isolation/Quarantine units, that can include increasing access to existing market units, new acquisition/rehabilitation projects. A Re-Housing Strategy is anticipated to be brought before the City and County governing bodies in June.
- Sacramento is one of eight communities in the State to receive technical assistance from HUD on Re-Housing.
- The Response Team is working with veteran homeless service providers on connecting isolation/quarantine guests to VA programs including Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) and HUD-VASH.

In addition, housing efforts continue more broadly:

• Since April 8, 31 families have moved into permanent housing from the City's Pathways and the County's Flexible Supportive Housing Program with a Housing Choice Voucher.

## **Acknowledging Our Partners**

We wish to acknowledge all the public, private, and community partners whose efforts are helping keep people experiencing homelessness safe and slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus. This week's featured partners are providers of existing emergency shelters.

Thanks and appreciation to all of our community's shelter providers who continue to serve the most needy in our community. When the COVID-19 pandemic began, there was uncertainty as to the full impact it would have on our entire community, both our homed and unhomed residents. Each day, shelter workers put our community first and have been a consistent presence in so many lives, offering safety, stability, and hope during such challenging and uncertain times. By not giving up and being responsive and flexible to changes in program operations, our shelters were willing to risk their own health to serve those who would otherwise not have a safe space to shelter in place. They are the often overlooked and unsung heroes of our community. This week, and as always, we give thanks and gratitude for their continued passion, hard work, and dedication!

# Summary of Significant Proposed Changes to the CoC NOFA Materials in 2020

#### Overview

Each year, the Project Review Committee (PRC) is responsible for drafting the materials that guide the local CoC NOFA competition. In 2020, these materials included the Review and Rank Policies, Renewal Project Scoring Tool, New Project Scoring Tool, and Coordinated Entry New Project Scoring Tool. All materials are included in this meeting packet for your review, with proposed changes from the 2019 materials marked with red text. This document provides a high-level summary of the PRC's significant proposed changes to the NOFA materials for the 2020 competition.

#### **Feedback and Drafting Process**

Throughout the past year, Homebase collected feedback on the NOFA materials from providers and PRC members. During the April and May meetings of the PRC, the PRC reviewed the aggregated feedback and drafted changes to the materials for the 2020 competition. Then, providers had the opportunity to give feedback to drafted changes, which was aggregated and considered by the PRC Chairs for integration into the materials. The materials presented to the CoC Board were reviewed and approved by the PRC on May 26th.

#### **Review and Rank Policies**

There were three areas of change for the Review and Rank Policies:

- Expanded Discretion for the Ranked List (pg. 7, paragraph f.) Panelists will have the option to prioritize specific renewal projects over new projects, if the renewal project fits the following criteria: (1) meets a unique or prioritized need in the community, (2) has a strong track record of performance, and (3) developed a plan for improving project performance. Any use of this discretion will be reflected on the Ranked List.
- 2. Extended Protection Period for New Projects from 12 months to 18 months (pg. 7, paragraph e.) Renewal projects with less than 18 months of operating data will be prioritized at the bottom of Tier 1.
- 3. Changed Method by which Expansion Projects are Scored (pg. 7, paragraph d.) When a project expands and consolidates, the Panel will treat the fully consolidated project as a renewal project. The data for all components of the project will be combined for scoring. The Panel retains discretion to consider any exceptional circumstances that result from the consolidation when scoring the project.



#### **Renewal Project Scoring Tool**

In response to feedback on the 2019 Renewal Project Scoring Tool, two factors from 2019 were heavily modified and one new factor was added:

- 1. Scoring Factor 2A: Housing Retention (pg. 3) In an effort to make this factor more equitable for permanent supportive housing projects of different sizes, projects will be scored based on whichever measurement yields a higher score: the scale in the righthand column OR the two bullets in red.
- 2. Scoring Factor 6A: Audit or Monitoring Findings (pg. 7-8) The 2020 changes to this policy include: (1) clarification of the term "irregularities" used in 2019, (2) addition of SSF as an eligible source of findings for sub-recipients, (3) a request for applicants to provide documentation to support audit or monitoring findings, and (4) an opportunity for applicants to score full points if an irregularity is found but an appropriate explanation is provided.
- 3. Scoring Factor 9A: BONUS Coordinated Entry Participation (pg. 10) In an effort to incentivize full Coordinated Entry participation among providers, this factor awards points to projects that fill 100% of their project vacancies through Coordinated Entry. For projects that have not been integrated into Coordinated Entry at this point, some points are available for (1) an explanation of the current barriers to CE participation, and (2) a description of the concrete steps the project has taken over the past year to move towards CE integration.

#### **New Project Scoring Tool**

Only one change was made to the New Project Scoring Tool for PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH projects:

1. Factor 4C. Audit and Monitoring Findings (pg. 5-6) Please see #2 under "Renewal Project Scoring Tool" above for a summary of major changes to this scored factor.

#### **Coordinated Entry New Project Scoring Tool**

New in 2020, the PRC has approved a Coordinated Entry New Project Scoring Tool for new SSO-CE project applicants. **The CE New Project Scoring Tool includes eight factors that have been heavily modified or are entirely new**. The remaining 20 factors are the same as the New Project Scoring Tool for PSH, RRH, and TH-RRH.



## SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE 2020 COC REVIEW AND RANK POLICIES

#### THE CONTINUUM OF CARE NOFA REVIEW AND RANK PROCESS

The Continuum of Care Program Annual Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) requires all Continuums of Care throughout the country to review projects receiving Continuum of Care funding and prioritize projects based on performance outcomes. The Sacramento Continuum of Care Continuum of Care (CoC) adopts the following procedure to review both renewal projects and proposed new projects as part of the Continuum of Care Program competition. The provisions of this policy are subject to change annually depending on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's specific requirements in that year's NOFA.

#### 1. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTS

- A. **Annual Performance Report** (APR) data is generated from project inputs to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This data can only be modified through corrected HMIS inputs. The data in the Annual Performance Report will be processed and formatted using the PRESTO web tool, and then presented to the Review and Rank Panel as part of the local NOFA competition.
- B. Projects that primarily serve survivors of domestic violence will generate their APRs using data from an alternative, non-HMIS database. If no such data is available, the project's program director or executive director may hand-tabulate the relevant data and sign a statement under penalty of perjury confirming that the director has personally reviewed the data and that the data is accurate.
- C. APR data will cover the full calendar year beginning April 1, 2019 and terminating March 31, 2020.
- D. All projects that began operations on or before April 1, 2019 will be required to cooperate in preparing an Annual Performance Report to be used in the local competition, as follows:
  - i. On **May 11**, the HMIS Lead ran APRs for all CoC-funded projects and shared those reports with those projects and with Homebase. Each provider is responsible for reviewing the accuracy and completeness of its own APRs. Agencies are encouraged to begin correcting their APR data as soon as they receive their draft APRs. This may require, e.g., completing annual follow-up evaluations on old clients, doing research to determine the final destination of clients who have left a program, and transferring data from paper case notes to HMIS.
  - ii. By **May 15**, Homebase will use the APRs to generate one basic PRESTO report per project that shows each project's primary objective criteria (e.g. housing placement, income, and utilization). Agencies will be given access to these basic reports as an educational <u>tool</u> to help them fulfill their responsibility to correct their APRs.
  - iii. For the next four weeks [unless constricted by NOFA timeline], Homebase will help agencies answer questions regarding their APRs and/or PRESTO reports and to help providers troubleshoot any errors in those reports. Although most errors will need to be fixed via additional data entry or by discussing issues with the HMIS lead, Homebase will provide technical assistance to agencies who proactively request it. In order to confirm that all corrections have been successful, agencies are encouraged to request new APRs from the HMIS Lead and review the new APRs.
- E. By **June 15**, all projects are required to have finished cleaning and correcting their APR data. Providers who are tardy in finalizing their APRs without a valid reason will lose up to 5 out of 100 points in the local competition.

#### 1I. NOFA RELEASE AND KICKOFF CONFERENCE

- A. Upon publication of the CoC Program NOFA, the Collaborative Applicant will review the currently adopted scoring tools for all project types and ensure they comply with the NOFA. In the event the scoring tools do not comport with the NOFA, changes will be made and adopted prior to the use of the tools in the competition. All changes will be presented to and approved by the CoC Advisory Board with input from the Performance Review Committee members and project applicants encouraged. Formal input may be given if time allows.
- B. Upon publication of the CoC NOFA, the Collaborative Applicant will schedule and announce a time and date for a Kickoff Conference where details about the funding opportunity and the process are provided. These details will be distributed to the entire CoC via listserv, email, posting, and any other method appropriate to ensure full distribution to the CoC.

## C. All applicants/potential applicants are required to participate in the NOFA Overview Kickoff Conference.

- i. At the Kickoff Conference, the Collaborative Applicant will present an overview of the HUD CoC Program NOFA, including details about available funding and any major changes in the application from previous years.
- ii. Applicants will also be oriented to the process for reviewing and ranking applications, which will cover any supplemental local application materials, the scoring tools and applicable dates.
- iii. Applicants will also have the opportunity to ask any questions they have about both the local and HUD application processes.
- iv. A portion of the Conference will be dedicated to orienting potential new applicants to the funding opportunity to prepare them for the application process and provide all necessary information about the Continuum of Care program.
- D. At the Kickoff Conference, Homebase will distribute a local competition schedule that includes a deadline for submitting the Local Application (see Section III of these policies).

#### 1II. LOCAL APPLICATIONS

- A. At the Kickoff Conference, shortly after publication of the CoC Program NOFA, HomeBase will distribute the Local Application, which will include Supplemental Questions to be answered by each project, as well as a list of Attachments to be submitted by each project. For Renewal Projects that have been operating for at least eighteen months (from the eLOCCS operating start date), the Local Application is also considered to include the APR.
  - i. The **Supplemental Questions** provide Project Applicants with the opportunity to report on project success and provide explanations for the objective project performance data contained in the APR.
  - ii. Attachments: The attachments to be collected include e-snaps materials such as the applicant profile and the project application that needs to be submitted to HUD as part of the national competition. Attachments may also be used to collect or verify objective information not captured in HMIS, particularly as it relates to project budgets, grant performance, and financial audits application. All of this information can be reviewed by the Review and Rank Panel to determine eligibility and ensure project design is appropriate for HUD funding.
- B. Answers to all Supplemental Questions must be completed online, using the PRESTO web tool. Agencies will receive PRESTO login information immediately following the Kickoff Conference. Agencies who decide to submit new projects after the Kickoff Conference but before the local application deadline should request PRESTO logins from Homebase via e-mail.
- C. As the Supplemental Questions are answered, the PRESTO report will be updated in real-time. It is each agency's responsibility to review its PRESTO reports and confirm that the reports are correct prior to the local application deadline. Projects may make use of the essay questions and short-answer questions to clarify the context of their objective performance data, but Homebase cannot and will not edit a project's scores based on a project's assertions about its own performance. The only way to correct objective performance data is by entering new data into HMIS, which should be done <u>before</u> the Kickoff Conference (see Section I of these policies).
- D. Late penalties: A project that turns in Local Application materials after the deadline (or insists on modifying Local Application materials after the deadline) will be subject to late penalties. Late penalties are imposed at the discretion of the Review & Rank Panel, based on the following guidance:
  - i. Materials received up to 10 minutes late may be accepted without penalty.
  - ii. Materials received between 10 minutes and 24 hours after the deadline will cause the applicant to receive a two-point score deduction in the local competition.
  - iii. Materials received between 24 hours and 72 hours after the deadline will receive a five-point score deduction.

- iv. Materials received more than 72 hours after the deadline **may be excluded** at the discretion of the Panel. If a Local Application is still substantially incomplete or non-compliant 72 hours after the deadline, then, at the discretion of the Panel, the project may be **rejected** and **denied entry into the local competition**.
- E. **Changes to PRESTO Reports:** Starting 72 hours after the Local Application deadline, changes to the PRESTO reports will be made <u>only</u> to correct transcription errors on the part of Homebase. The underlying information, such as APRs and Supplemental Answers, will not be changed.

#### IV. REVIEW AND RANK PROCESS

- A. The Review and Rank Panel (Panel) shall consist of the non-conflicted members of the Performance Review Committee. Selection of those members is subject to the rules governing the Performance Review Committee and subject to the Conflict of Interest policy adopted by the Performance Review Committee or the Governance Committee, as applicable.
- B. If a person or an organization believes there is a conflict of interest that would exclude a Review and Rank Panel Member, it needs to be brought to the attention of Homebase staff within three calendar days of the announcement of the Review and Rank Panel membership. The concerned person/organization would need to provide specific and substantial information regarding the alleged conflict to allow the Collaborative Applicant to conduct a fair evaluation
- C. The Panel shall be announced to the Continuum of Care Competition applicants no later than two weeks before the Review and Rank meeting.
- D. The Panel shall receive a training from Homebase on the use of the PRESTO system, the CoC Program and local competition, and their responsibilities as Review and Rank panelists. This training may be conducted via videoconference at the convenience of the Panel.
- E. The Panel shall review the PRESTO reports and supplemental project information prior to the scheduled Review and Rank meeting.
- F. The Panel shall meet in person to discuss the applications submitted as part of the Continuum of Care Competition.
- G. All projects submitted as Renewal Projects will need to be on call during the Review and Rank meeting to answer questions from the Review and Rank panel.
- H. All projects submitted as New Projects may be invited to attend the Review and Rank Meeting to be interviewed by the Panel, at the discretion of the Panel. These interviews would be scheduled prior to the Review and Rank Meeting. Failure to cooperate with an invitation by the Review and Rank Panel may result in a project not being funded.
- I. The ranked list is created by the following procedures:
  - a. One ranked list is prepared based on a compilation of Review and Rank Panel raw scores for each application.
  - b. Those applications that do not meet certain threshold requirements (as detailed on the scoring tool) will not be included in the ranked list.
  - c. The Review and Rank Panel determines if any renewal project should receive a decrease in funding. Any funding captured from an existing project will be made available for reallocation to a new project that meets the

requirements in the NOFA. See the section below labeled "Reallocation of Funds" for more details.

- d. Certain project types will automatically be ranked in the bottom of Tier 1. *Within this region at the bottom of Tier 1,* renewal housing projects with less than eighteen months of operating data (as defined by the eLOCCS project start date) will be placed at the top of the region. HMIS renewal projects will be placed in the middle of the region, and Coordinated Entry renewal projects will be ranked at the bottom of the region, immediately above the 'straddling' project.
- e. In the event that a project expands and consolidates, the Review and Rank Panel will treat the fully consolidated project as a renewal project. The data for all components of the project will be combined for scoring. Note that the panel does retain discretion to consider any exceptional circumstances that result from the consolidation and if applicants wish for the panel to consider such circumstances they should include specific details including the operating dates of legacy project and expansion project, the number of beds/units in legacy project and expansion project, and the specific scored factor(s) for which the project is seeking relief.
- In order to promote system performance by preventing returns to f. homelessness and promoting housing stability and retention, the PRC has determined that new housing project that have not demonstrated their ability to better enhance system performance may be prioritized directly below any renewal projects that have met the following performance requirements. Performance requirements for this purpose are 1) the renewal project meets a unique or prioritized need within the community; 2) the agency has a strong track record of past performance for this project or a similar project (if the project under review has not been scored before); and 3) the agency has developed a plan for achieving better outcomes for this project within the next year. If a plan will be required from a project, the panel will notify the project applicant during the competition period. The panel should also consider if this discretion has been exercised before to prioritize this renewal project over a new project application. If the panel exercises their discretion to prioritize a renewal project over a new project, it must be noted on the ranked list and briefly explained using the performance requirements listed above. The use of this discretion factor cannot be the grounds for an appeal.
- J. The Panel has discretion to adjust a scaled score up or down within the boundaries set by the scoring tool based on their understanding of the context of the project's performance through the program's written explanation and any statements made by the program during the review and rank interview (if

applicable). However, absent a truly extraordinary circumstance, outside the control of the operator, panelists should not adjust a score by more than 25% of the maximum possible value for that scoring factor (up to the nearest 0.5 increment). If a program's score in a scaled scoring factor is altered, the Performance and Review Committee must document the reason for the alteration and the evidence relied upon in making the alteration

- K. After creating the ranked list, the Panel may recommend programs for reallocation based on the policy outlined in the sectioned titled "Reallocation of Funds."
- L. After the Review and Rank Meeting, a priority listing with scores will be compiled.
- M. Project applicants will be notified of the scoring results within three business days of the Review and Rank Meeting. Project applicants will receive a full list of project scores and may request a scoring breakdown for their own project.

#### V. ELIGIBILITY FOR APPEALS

Projects shall be allowed to appeal the decisions of the Review and Rank Panel subject to the requirements of this section.

- A. **Timing.** All appeals shall be concluded within 10 days of the Review and Rank Panel Meeting.
- B. **Composition of Appeals Panel.** Appeals will be sent to the CoC Advisory Board but will be heard by a non-conflicted subcommittee of Advisory Board members, together with two non-voting members: the SSF Deputy Director, and one member of the original Review Panel.
- C. Eligible Projects. A project may appeal if:
  - 1. The Review and Rank panel recommends the project for full or partial reallocation
  - 2. The project is placed in Tier  $2^*$
  - 3. The project may fall into Tier 2 if another appeal is successful\*
  - 4. The project is a new project not recommended for funding (if new project funding was available)\*
  - 5. If the project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be made.
- D. Eligible Grounds. Appeals may be made on the following bases:

Projects Recommended for Full or Partial Reallocation

- 1. May appeal its score on any grounds
- 2. May submit any information the agency feels is relevant

Projects Recommended or At Risk for Placement in Tier 2

- 1. May appeal only errors in scoring or in information provided to the Review Panel by parties other than the recipient/subrecipient
- 2. May not supplement application materials to support appeal

New Projects Not Recommended for Funding

- 1. May appeal errors in scoring or in information provided to the Review Panel by parties other than the recipient/subrecipient, if correcting the error could cause the project to be recommended for funding
- 2. May not supplement application materials to support appeal

NOTE: Appeals based on policy considerations, funding priorities, or other subjective criteria will not be considered and are not eligible.

#### VI. PROCESS FOR APPEALS

- A. **Timeline for Appeals.** Any Project Applicant seeking to appeal must adhere to the included timeline. Failure to meet a deadline in the timeline voids the Project Applicant's appeal.
- B. **Notice of Appeal.** Project Applicants will have 24 hours after the issuance of the Priority Listing to provide notice to the CoC of an intent to appeal. This notice must include:
  - i. A statement as to why the project is eligible to appeal.
  - ii. The basis for the appeal
  - iii. A brief statement of the facts upon which the Project Applicant bases its appeal. These facts need not be complete, but must give the CoC a sufficient understanding for the basis of the appeal.
- C. The CoC will contact the appealing Project Applicant in an attempt to clarify the scoring decision and determine if the appeal can be resolved without requiring a formal hearing.
- D. If a resolution is not possible, the Project Applicant will submit a formal appeal pursuant to the official CoC Competition timeline.
  - iv. The Formal Appeal must consist of a short, clear, written statement no longer than two pages of the basis for the Project Applicant's appeal of the Review and Rank Panel's decision.
  - v. The Formal Appeal must be sent as an attachment to the Collaborative Applicant.
- E. Upon timely receipt of the Formal Appeal, the Collaborative Applicant will convene the Appeal Panel and set a time and date for the Appeal Hearing.
- F. The Appeal Hearing shall be conducted according to the following procedure:
  - vi. The Appeal Hearing will be conducted telephonically.
  - vii. The Appeal Panel (including non-voting members) will join the call with the neutral facilitator.
  - viii. The neutral facilitator will explain the facts of the appeal and answer any procedural questions.
  - ix. The Appeal Panel may ask the Review and Rank Panel member questions about the Review and Rank Process to clarify what occurred during Review and Rank and what information the Panel considered in evaluating the Project Applicant.
  - x. The appealing Project Applicant will then join the phone call. The appealing Project Applicant will be allotted a few minutes to explain their appeal. The Appeal Panel may then ask any questions of the appealing Project Applicant. The appealing Project Applicant then leaves the phone call.

- xi. The Appeal Panel conducts a discussion of the appeal and takes a formal vote.
- G. The Appeal Panel may consider the effect of its decision on other Project Applicants and may include those project applicants in the appeals discussion.
- H. The decision of the Appeal Panel is final.
- I. Once the appeals are complete, the Priority Listing will be submitted to the CoC for Review and Approval.
- J. Once the Priority Listing is approved all project determinations are concluded and the Review and Rank Process is complete.
- K. The approved Priority Listing shall be publicly posted on the CoC website in accordance with the timeline stated in the Continuum of Care Program NOFA.

#### APPENDIX A: REALLOCATION OF FUNDS

HUD expects CoCs to reallocate funds from non- and/or under-performing projects to higher priority community needs that align with HUD priorities and goals. Reallocation involves using funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects. In the recent competitions, HUD allowed CoCs to use the reallocation process to create:

- New permanent supportive housing projects that serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth.
- New rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, coming directly from the streets or emergency shelter or fleeing domestic violence.
- New projects for dedicated HMIS.
- New Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects for centralized or coordinated entry systems.

HUD expects that CoCs will use performance data to decide how to best use the resources available to end homelessness within the community. CoCs should reallocate funds to new projects whenever reallocation would reduce homelessness. Communities should use CoC approved scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and address the policy priorities listed in the NOFA. Recent NOFAs have stated that HUD would prioritize those CoCs that have demonstrated a capacity to reallocate funding from lower performing projects to higher performing projects through the local selection process. HUD assigned four points in the Collaborative Applicant Application to reallocation.

The Sacramento Continuum of Care has identified a need for additional permanent housing, with targeted services for either youth or seniors

Reallocated funding shall be prioritized for projects which clearly and concretely address these needs.

#### Voluntary Reallocation

In order to encourage projects to voluntarily align themselves with HEARTH Act goals and local priorities regarding housing and service provision, existing projects that voluntarily wish to convert their project to permanent housing or another eligible new project type as defined by HUD in the Continuum of Care Competition Notice of Funding Available will be given the first option in accessing the funds reallocated from their existing project to create a new project (note that the new project funding request cannot exceed the funding available via the existing project). If the agency does not wish to use voluntarily reallocated funds for a new project, the funds will be released back into the common pool for the entire CoC.

Any such project may request reallocation and exercise the option to access funding through written notice to the panel, which should be sent to Sacramento@homebaseccc.org. The project must submit a new project application and if the panel determines the new project application to be of reasonable quality, then the project may be given full points in the new project scoring tool factor 2B, *Ready to Start*, scoring factor.

#### APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECT FUNDING

In some circumstances there may be an opportunity after the application deadline for programs to submit application materials for additional funding. The Sacramento Continuum of Care will issue a Supplemental Project Application when:

- 1. After receiving all project applications it appears there is additional funding available; or,
- 2. After conducting the threshold review of the submitted project applications it appears there is additional funding available; or,
- 3. After conducting the review and rank, the Panel has recommended a program for reallocation and there are not adequate new project applications for those funds.

In the event that Supplemental Applications are required, the Collaborative Applicant will:

- Email the CoC and other interested parties (all homeless service and housing providers in the CoC area) with specifics regarding how much money is available and which type of programs qualify.
- The Collaborative Applicant will provide technical assistance and guidance, as needed, to ensure applicants understand the funding requirements.
- Any additional applications for these funds will be due as soon as possible after this email is distributed, as determined by the NOFA submission deadline.
- The Review and Rank Panel will reconvene either via telephone, video conference, or in person depending on availability and convenience to evaluate the applications.

For this type of process, the timeline will be extremely short and may make an application burdensome; however, expanding an already submitted application, applying in collaboration, and a community consensus on how to spend the funds are also viable options.

#### 2020 Renewal Project Scoring Tool

	Summary of Factors & Point Allocations			
1.	Threshold Factors	N/A		
2.	Housing Performance	24 points		
3.	Income Performance	10 points		
4.	Utilization Performance	20 points		
5.	Severity of Need and Service Quality	20 points		
6.	Compliance	12 points		
7.	Community	11 points		
8.	Enhancing Capacity	3 points		
9.	<b>BONUS: Coordinated Entry Participation</b>	3 points		
	TOTAL 100 points (+ 3 bonus)			

## 1. THRESHOLD FACTORS

Name	Description	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing, in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
Coordinated Entry	The project will participate in coordinated entry to the extent possible for this project type, as demonstrated by its policies and procedures.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Successful Drawdown	If the project is under contract with HUD, then the project has made at least one successful drawdown of federal funds as of the time of this application was submitted.	Met/Not Met
Formerly Homeless Input	The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes.	Met/Not Met
Basic Compliance with HUD Policies	The agency has adequate internal financial controls, adequate record maintenance and management, and adequate policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA and fair housing requirements, and confidentiality.	Met/Not Met
Eligible Applicants	The project will only accept new participants if they can be documented as eligible for this project's program type based on their housing and disability status.	Met/Not Met
Equal Access	The project provides equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, local residency status, or any other protected category.	Met/Not Met

Match	Agency demonstrates 25% match per grant.	Met/Not Met
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	Agency actively prevents discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: race, color, ancestry, or national origin; religion; mental or physical disability; sex, gender, or sexual orientation; marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, and custody arrangements; genetic information; source of income; other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing	Met/Not Met
Required but not scored		

#### [Scored Factors Continue on Next Page]

## 2. HOUSING PERFORMANCE (24 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score		
	Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)				
	Successes in Housing Retention for PSH projects are measured by the percentage of individual project participants that remain in permanent housing <u>or</u> exit as "living-leavers" to permanent housing at the		≥ 99% = <b>24</b>		
	end of the evaluation period. For projects that serve families or small projects, that		98% - 98.9% = <b>18</b>		
	experience an outsized impact on program performance for this factor, projects are invited to discuss the number of households that left the project and how long each household had been in the program prior to leaving the program		96% - 97.9% = <b>12</b>		
2A. Housing Retention	Policy, at section IV. Review and Rank Process,	APR Q5 APR Q23	90% - 95.9% = <b>6</b>		
	<ul> <li>paragraph J:</li> <li>If one household left the program unsuccessfully, the panel may elect to increase a project's scaled score and award</li> </ul>		85% - 89.5%= <b>4</b>		
	<ul> <li>up to 18 points to the project, and</li> <li>If two households left the program unsuccessfully, the panel may elect to increase a project's scaled score and to award up to 6 points.</li> </ul>		80% - 84.9%= <b>2</b>		
	Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.		< 79.9% = <b>0</b>		
	Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) for Transitional Age	Youth (TAY)			
2B. Housing Placement	Successes in Housing Placement for RRH projects are measured by the number of participants who exited	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 90% = <b>24</b>		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Feedback was received about using households instead of individuals to show performance so that larger families don't have an outsized-impact on program performance, but APRs do not provide information by household, only by program participant.

to a Permanent Housing destination from the total number of all participants in the project.	85-89.9% = <b>22</b>
For projects that serve families, that experience an outsized impact on program performance, projects are invited to discuss under the <i>exceptional</i> <i>circumstances</i> supplemental question for	80% - 84.9% = <b>18</b>
consideration by the panel. Participants that passed away during the	75% - 79.9% = <b>12</b>
measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	70% - 74.9% = <b>6</b>
	< 69.9% = <b>0</b>

## 3. INCOME PERFORMANCE (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	PSH Scale	RRH Scale	Score
	Successes in increasing or maintaining		≥ 85%	≥ 75%	4
	participant income are measured by the percent of adult participants in the project who maintained a non-zero income, or increased income, from project entry to exit or Annual Assessment. Adult participants that passed away during the measurement period do not		70% - 84.9%	60% - 74.9%	3
3A. Increase or Maintain Income		APR Q5 APR Q19	55% - 69.9%	45% - 59.9%	2
			40% - 54.9%	30% - 44.9%	1
impact the project's performance.		< 39.9%	< 29.9%	0	

	Successes in connecting participants with		≥ 95% <b>= 4</b>
3B. Non- Cash	non-cash mainstream benefits are measured by the percentage of adult	APR Q5	90% - 94.9% = <b>3</b>
Mainstream Benefits	stayers/leavers with non-cash benefit sources, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.	APR Q20	80% - 89.9% = <b>2</b>
			75% - 79.9% <b>= 1</b>

	Adult participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.		< 75% = <b>0</b>
	Successes in connecting participants with health insurance are measured by the percentage of stayers/leavers with		≥ 95% = <b>2</b>
3C. Health Insurance	health insurance, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.	APR Q5 APR Q21	90% - 94.9% = <b>1</b>
	Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance		< 89.9% = <b>0</b>

## 4. UTILIZATION PERFORMANCE (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	For Projects Serving <b>Single Adults in Shared</b> <u>Housing</u> : Successes in achieving full utilization for		≥ 95% = <b>12</b>
	snaps. APR		90% - 94.9% = <b>9</b>
4A. Bed and/or Unit Utilization		APR Q7b APR Q8b E-Snaps	85% - 89.9% = <b>6</b>
4B. Grant Spenddown			80% - 84.9% = <b>3</b>
	on the last Wednesday of each quarter, divided by the total number of units promised in e-snaps.		< 80% = <b>0</b>
	Successes in Grant Spenddown are measured by dividing the amount of money drawn down from e-LOCCs during the project's most recently	e-LOCCs	≥ 95% = <b>6</b>
	completed contract by the amount on the corresponding GIW.	E-Snaps	85% - 94% = <b>4</b>

			75% - 84% = <b>2</b>
			< 75% = <b>0</b>
4C. Quarterly Drawdowns	Successes in Grant Spenddown are also measured by the number of drawdowns made by projects, and depend on projects drawing down quarterly (i.e., occurring at least once in each three-month period during the year). Award 0.5 points for each successful quarterly drawdown over the competition period.	RFI	Up to <b>2</b> points

## 5. SEVERITY OF NEED AND SERVICE QUALITY (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
5A. Chronic Homeless	<ul> <li>Successes in Chronic Homelessness are measured as follows: Award 1 point for each of the following items, for a total of up to 3 points: <ul> <li>Project has attached eligibility forms to document chronic homelessness that reflect the current definition of chronic homelessness.</li> <li>Project has checked the box for DedicatedPLUS or 100% Dedicated in essnaps.</li> <li>Project has listed the evidence-based practices staff use on a daily basis to serve clients who are chronically homeless.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	APR Q26a E-snaps RFI	Up to <b>3</b> points
5B. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations	Successes are dependent on projects serving population(s) with severe needs and vulnerabilities and the projects' explanation of the role the project plays in filling an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region (e.g., leveraging unique funding; maintaining site-based housing; or serving a unique population such as LGBTQ individuals, individuals with felonies, or individuals transferred from a PSH program to	RFI APR Q5a Q10 Q13a1, Q14a, Q15, Q16, Q27a	Up to <b>12</b> Points

	<ul> <li>prevent eviction). Applicants should consider the following needs, vulnerabilities, and populations that when answering this question (while these examples are not exhaustive, they do represent categories for which APR information is available):</li> <li>Chronic homelessness</li> <li>Current or past substance abuse</li> <li>History of domestic violence</li> <li>Physical &amp; Mental Health Conditions</li> <li>Transgender/gender non-conforming</li> <li>Youth</li> <li>Seniors</li> </ul> Successes will be measured with reference to both APR data where available and narrative responses.		
5C. Quality of Services	<ul> <li>Successes in Quality of Services are measured based on the project's narrative explaining to extent to which the project provides services that: <ul> <li>offer ongoing support to stay housed,</li> <li>are comprehensive and well-coordinated,</li> <li>are delivered by an adequate number of appropriately trained staff and</li> <li>are thoughtfully matched to the needs of the target population.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Successes for projects provided by Victim Service Providers are also measured based on the project's narrative explaining the extent to which the project provides services that improve the safety for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking.</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points

## 6. COMPLIANCE (12 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
6A. Audit or Monitoring Findings	The project must report <b>all</b> <b>irregularities</b> resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub- recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex.	All HUD, SSF, financial audits, or audits/ monitoring from other	Up to <b>8</b> points

	City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for this project. Projects that have irregularities must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, projects should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction); Award full points (8 points) for the project if: • The project was not audited or monitored; or • If no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring for this project. Award up to 8 points for the project if: • If a project adequately submits relevant documentation identifying any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the project will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the project will avoid similar findings in the future. Award up to 4 points if irregularities were found for this project and the project does not provide an adequate explanation. Award no points if the project does not submit any documentation (e.g., confirmation letters)	funding entities from the last 2 years. RFI	
	any documentation (e.g., confirmation letters) from oversight entities to support this criteria.		
6B. Accurate Data	Successes in Accurate Data are measured using the percent of data recorded as either missing, don't know, client refused to answer, and/or unable to calculate, where the lower percentage the better. Projects with less than 5% data inaccuracy should receive full points.	APR Q6	< 5% error = <b>2</b> 5% - 10% error = <b>1</b> > 10% error = <b>0</b>

	6C. Timely Data	Successes in Timely Data are measured using the average length of time (in days) between when a client enters or exits the project, and when the project records the entry or exit in HMIS.	APR Q6e	≤ 5 days = <b>2</b> 5 days – 8 days = <b>1</b>	
	Projects that entered client entries/exits into HMIS in under 5 days received full points		> 8 days = <b>0</b>		

## 7. COMMUNITY (11 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
7A. Participation in CoC Activities	Successes in Participation in CoC Activities are measured based on the agency's attendance, participation, and leadership at CoC events, meetings, committees, forums, and projects, with a focus on activities that took place since the last NOFA. Typically, full points should be awarded if the agency meaningfully participated in at least 4 voluntary events over the course of the year, or if the agency led at least 1 successful event, training, or initiative over the course of the year.	RFI	Up to <b>4</b> points
7B. Mandatory Training	Successes in Mandatory Training are based on whether the agency demonstrated regular attendance at mandatory training events by attending at least one such event per quarter.	RFI SSF Staff Report	Up to <b>2</b> points
7C. Local Competition Deadlines	<ul> <li>Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments.</li> <li>Deduct <u>up to 5 points</u> if project was late in finalizing APRs without valid reason.</li> <li>Deduct 2 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late.</li> <li>Deduct 5 points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late.</li> <li>If any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 72 hours late, the project may be disqualified at the discretion of the Panel.</li> </ul>	HomeBase analysis	Up to <b>5</b> points

## 8. ENHANCING CAPACITY (3 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
8A. Enhancing Capacity	Success is measured by PSH programs that effectively facilitate successful flow from PSH to other permanent housing (including housing with rental subsidy), evidenced by percent of individuals served that exit to other permanent housing.	RFI APR Q23	Up to <b>3</b> points

## 9. BONUS COORDINATED ENTRY PARTICIPATION (3 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
9A. BONUS Coordinated Entry Participation	<ul> <li>If this project participates in Coordinated Entry:</li> <li>Award full points to projects who filled 100% of project vacancies through CE as shown by program enrollment</li> <li>Award no points to projects who filled less than 100% of project vacancies through CE as shown by program enrollment</li> <li>If this project does not currently participate in Coordinated Entry:</li> <li>Award up to two points if this project provides an explanation of (1) the barriers (e.g., restrictions from other funders) that prevent the project from being fully integrated into Coordinated Entry, and (2) the steps the project has taken over the competition year towards Coordinated Entry integration.</li> </ul>	RFI SSF Staff Report	Up to <b>3</b> points

#### 2020 New Project Scoring Tool

Summary of Factors & Point Allocations		
1. Threshold Factors	N/A	
2. Housing	25 points	
3. Services	20 points	
4. Agency Capacity	20 points	
5. Prioritization, option of:		
a. Prioritization for New Projects Except for DV Bonus	25 points	
b. Prioritization for DV Bonus		
6. Community	10 points	
TOTAL	100 points	

## 1. THRESHOLD FACTORS

Name	Description	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies will include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing and provide housing and services in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
Coordinated Entry	The project will participate in coordinated entry to the full extent possible for this project type.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Formerly Homeless Input	The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes.	Met/Not Met
Basic Compliance with HUD Policies	<b>Compliance with</b> record maintenance and management, and adequate policies Met,	
Eligible Clients		
Eligible Applicant		
Equal Access	The project will provide equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, or local residency status.	Met/Not Met
Match	Agency will be able to provide 25% match per grant.	Met/Not Met

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	Agency will actively prevent discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: race, color, ancestry, or national origin; religion; mental or physical disability; sex, gender, or sexual orientation; marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, and custody arrangements; genetic information; source of income; other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing	Met/Not Met
Budget	Project has made a good faith effort to complete the budget template provided, showing both CoC and non-CoC funding sources for the project.	Met/Not Met
For DV Bonus Projects Only: Serving DV	Project is 100% dedicated to serving victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, including dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking who came from sheltered or unsheltered situations. The project must follow a Housing First model and utilize trauma-informed and client- centered approaches.	Met/Not Met

## 2. HOUSING (25 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
2.A. Fully Described and Appropriate Housing	<ul> <li>Award points for a housing design that: <ul> <li>is clearly and fully described</li> <li>has a layout or features that are thoughtfully matched to the target population</li> <li>is strategically located to meet the needs of the target population</li> <li>is physically accessible to persons with disabilities</li> <li>will help maximize client choice in the CoC (e.g. by including a plan to evaluate each client's needs, strengths, and preferences in order to determine which mainstream benefits and/or jobs the client could qualify for</li> </ul> </li> <li>Additionally, for Victim Service Providers: <ul> <li>is designed to protect the safety of the population they serve</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points
2.B. Ready to Start	<ul> <li>Award points if the project will be ready to begin housing clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider:</li> <li>Whether the agency has adequately described how the project will acquire the necessary housing for the project type. For RRH, this may include landlord engagement strategies;</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points

	<ul> <li>Whether the project site faces regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement, environmental issues, or zoning issues;</li> <li>Whether the agency's current staff has the capacity to begin preparing for this project;</li> <li>Whether the agency already has policies and procedures that can be used as-is or easily adapted for use in a CoC-funded project</li> </ul>		
2.C. Program Outcomes	<ul> <li>Award points if:</li> <li>The project's goals are realistic and sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project</li> <li>Outcomes are measureable and appropriate to the population being served, and must meet minimum CoC-adopted targets, including:         <ul> <li>At least 85% of clients experience positive housing outcomes</li> <li>At least 55% of adult clients maintain or increase their income from all sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>Prospective outcomes reflect actual performance outcomes from other projects administered by the applicant (as appropriate).</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points

# 3. SERVICES (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
3.A. Appropriate Supportive Services	<ul> <li>Award points for services that: <ul> <li>use a Housing First approach,</li> <li>offer ongoing support to stay housed,</li> <li>are comprehensive and well-coordinated,</li> <li>include culture-specific elements, and</li> <li>are thoughtfully matched to the target population</li> </ul> </li> <li>For projects that will be referring specific types of clients to specific outside services, award points if the project explains a concrete plan for referrals, giving examples of: <ul> <li>Who will be referred;</li> <li>The agencies that will accept referrals;</li> <li>The types of services to be provided; and</li> <li>The logic behind the agency's referral scheme</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points

	For Victim Service Providers award points for services that improve the safety for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking		
3.B. Relevant Experience	Award points if the agency submitting this application has demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to successfully carry out the work proposed and has successfully served homeless people as a particular group.	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points
	Consider the experience of the agency in handling a similar project (e.g. if the project will involve relocation of tenants, what experience does the agency have with relocation).		

# 4. AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4.A. Budget	<ul> <li>Award points based on the bullet points below:</li> <li>Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read.</li> <li>The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population.</li> <li>The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds.</li> <li>The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs.</li> </ul>	Budget RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points
4.B. Agency Capacity	Award points if agency: Has successfully handled at least one other federal grant or other major grant of this size and complexity, either in or out of the CoC (or can otherwise demonstrate that it can successfully manage complex reporting requirements). • Has sufficient fiscal capacity to manage the grant, including: o internal financial controls o grant match tracking o well-maintained records o oversight by a board of directors o a strategy for documenting eligible costs	e-LOCCs E-Snaps	Up to <b>10</b> points

	<ul> <li>a strategy for ensuring adequate grant drawdowns</li> <li>Is large enough to handle the expected client case load;</li> <li>Is familiar with innovative or evidence-based practices;</li> <li>Includes at least one person with formal training and/or education in a relevant social services field</li> </ul>		
4.C. Audit and Monitoring Findings	The project must report <b>all irregularities</b> resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub- recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex. City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for <b>similar projects</b> . Projects that have irregularities must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, projects should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction); Award <b>full points (5 points)</b> for the project if: • Award full points if the agency can show no irregularities from similar projects; or • If no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring for similar projects. Award <b>up to 5 points</b> for the project if: • If a project adequately submits relevant documentation identifying any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the project will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the project will avoid similar findings in the future. Award <b>up to 3 points</b> if irregularities were found for similar projects and the project provided documentation, but the project provided documentation, but the project does not provide an adequate explanation. Award <b>no points</b> if the project does not submit any	All HUD, SSF, financial audits, or audits/ monitoring from other funding entities from the last 2 years. RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points

documentation (e.g., confirmation letters) from oversight entities to support this criteria.

## 5A. PRIORITIZATION FOR NEW PROJECTS EXCEPT DV BONUS (25 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
5.A.1. Community Priority	Award points if the project addresses the priority need identified by the Advisory Committee in 2019: Permanent Supportive Housing, with targeted services for either youth or seniors. Please note that HUD may require that Permanent Supportive Housing be dedicated to persons experiencing Chronic Homelessness.	E-snaps RFI	Up to <b>15</b> points
5.A.2. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations	Award points to projects that will serve population(s) with severe needs and vulnerabilities (e.g. chronically homeless, history of domestic violence), and will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region (e.g., serving a unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site based housing). Applicants should specifically consider the needs and vulnerabilities of youth and seniors.	RFI APR	Up to <b>10</b> points

## 5B. PRIORITIZATION FOR DV BONUS HOUSING (25 pts.)

**Use this section** <u>instead of</u> the previous page if the project is applying for DV Bonus funding. For all scoring purposes, "domestic violence" also includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or trafficking.

Name	Description	Source	Score
5.B.1. How Project will Address Need	<ul> <li>Award points for each of the following items:</li> <li>Project provides data describing the CoC's population of domestic violence survivors</li> <li>Project explains how it proposes to meet the unmet needs of domestic violence survivors, especially with survivors who come from unsheltered situations.</li> <li>The project will have housing that is specifically designed to accommodate the needs of survivors.</li> <li>The project's staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing.</li> <li>The project's staff utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches.</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points
5.B.2. Previous Performance	Award points if the agency has experience serving, or demonstrates a plan to serve, victims who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, which includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, and that experience, or plan, specifically shows that they can serve victims who come from unsheltered situations.	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points
5.B.3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes	<ul> <li>Award points for each of the following items:</li> <li>The project articulates a specific plan for ensuring that its residents will be safe from further domestic violence.</li> <li>The project sets quantitative safety targets that are appropriate and realistic.</li> <li>The project explains why it is likely to be able to achieve the targeted safety outcomes.</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points

# 6. COMMUNITY (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
6.A. Participation in CoC Activities	Award points for the agency's attendance, participation, and leadership at CoC events, meetings, committees, forums, and projects, with a focus on activities that took place since the last NOFA. Typically, full points should be awarded if the agency meaningfully participated in at least 4 voluntary events over the course of the year, or if the agency led at least 1 successful event, training, or initiative over the course of the year.	RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points
6.B. Local Competition Deadlines	<ul> <li>Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments.</li> <li>Award 3 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late.</li> <li>Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late.</li> <li>If any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 72 hours late, the project may be disqualified at the discretion of the Panel.</li> </ul>	HomeBase analysis	Up to <b>5</b> points

### 2020 Coordinated Entry New Project Scoring Tool

Summary of Factors & Point Allocations		
1. Threshold Factors	N/A	
2. Coordinated Entry Project Design	32 points	
3. Services	13 points	
4. Agency Capacity	20 points	
<ul> <li>5. Prioritization, option of:</li> <li>a. Prioritization for New Projects Except for DV Bonus</li> <li>b. Prioritization for DV Bonus</li> </ul>	25 points	
6. Community	10 points	
TOTAL	100 points	

# **1. THRESHOLD FACTORS**

Name	Description	Met/Not Met
Coordinated Entry Understanding	The applicant has communicated and coordinated with the current Coordinated Entry (CE) Lead to learn about how the current CE system operates and submits a proposed project that demonstrates integration with the current CE system [to be confirmed by CE Lead]. The applicant also understands the HUD requirements for Coordinated Entry, as demonstrated in this application.	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies will include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing and provide housing and services in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Formerly Homeless Input	The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes.	Met/Not Met
Basic Compliance with HUD Policies	The agency has adequate internal financial controls, adequate record maintenance and management, and adequate policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA requirements, and confidentiality.	Met/Not Met
Eligible Clients	The project will only accept new participants if they can be documented as eligible for this project's	Met/Not Met

	program type based on their housing and disability status.	
Eligible Applicant	Neither the applicant nor the sub-recipients (if any) are for-profit entities.	Met/Not Met
Equal Access	The project will provide equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, or local residency status.	Met/Not Met
Match	Agency will be able to provide 25% match per grant.	Met/Not Met
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	Agency will actively prevent discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: race, color, ancestry, or national origin; religion; mental or physical disability; sex, gender, or sexual orientation; marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, and custody arrangements; genetic information; source of income; other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing	Met/Not Met
Budget	Project has made a good faith effort to complete the budget template provided, showing both CoC and non-CoC funding sources for the project.	Met/Not Met
For DV Bonus Projects Only: Serving DV	Project is 100% dedicated to serving victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, including dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking who came from sheltered or unsheltered situations. The project must follow a Housing First model and utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches.	Met/Not Met

# 2. COORDINATED ENTRY PROJECT DESIGN (32 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
2.A. Connections to Current CE System	<ul> <li>Award points if the proposed project will align with HUD requirements and local coordinated entry design:</li> <li>Does the project demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current Coordinated Entry System including processes and policies around eligibility, assessment,</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>8</b> points

	prioritization and match, placement, and the circumstances under which a CE referral can be denied?		
2.B. Capacity Building	<ul> <li>Award points if the proposed project will align with HUD requirements and local coordinated entry design: <ul> <li>Does the project demonstrate why and how it meets an existing need within the current Coordinated Entry system?</li> <li>Will the households served by this project be new to Coordinated Entry or receive additional (targeted) services through the proposed project beyond what is currently available?</li> <li>Does the project provide a connection to housing and/or services not currently available through the existing Coordinated Entry System?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>8</b> points
2.C. Alignment with Local Process	<ul> <li>Award points if the proposed project demonstrates how it will connect into the current Coordinated Entry System:</li> <li>Does the project demonstrate it will use community-approved assessment tools such as the VI-SPDAT?</li> <li>Does the project demonstrate how it will ensure that Coordinated Entry eligible households are document ready?</li> <li>Does the project demonstrate how it will work with the Coordinated Entry Lead to ensure clients are identified and connected to appropriate housing vacancies quickly including, using processes such as by-name list and case conferencing?</li> <li>Does the project demonstrate how it will adequately protect the safety of DV survivors during assessment and referral?</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>8</b> points
2.D. Ready to Start	Award points if the proposed project will be ready to begin serving clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider:	RFI	Up to <b>8</b> points

# 3. SERVICES (13 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
3.A. Referrals to Services	<ul> <li>Award points if the proposed project's services assessment process will align with HUD requirements and local Coordinated Entry design.</li> <li>Does the project have a plan for diverting clients who might be able to self-resolve? Evaluate how the project will connect clients to self-help resources when appropriate.</li> <li>Will the project actively evaluate which services a client would benefit from while waiting to be matched with housing (e.g., on-going case management), taking into account client preference?</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>4</b> points
3.B. Services in the Community	<ul> <li>Award points if the proposed project will have adequate connections to the broader homelessness system of care. Consider:</li> <li>Does the project adequately describe their plan for connecting clients to services in the</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>6</b> points

	<ul> <li>community? Award fewer points for general statements, more points for concrete descriptions of service linkages and delivery.</li> <li>Does the project have existing relationships with service providers that are not currently available through the existing Coordinated Entry System?</li> <li>Does the project participate in any unique committees or partnerships that will be beneficial for connecting clients to services?</li> </ul>		
3.C. Agency Resource Training	<ul> <li>Award points if the proposed project will conduct or provide access to training for staff on available mainstream resources for which clients may qualify. Consider: <ul> <li>Agency plans for staff training on benefits eligibility;</li> <li>Agency capacity to provide mainstream benefits, such as SOAR training.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>3</b> points

# 4. AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4.A. Budget	<ul> <li>Award points based on the bullet points below:</li> <li>Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read.</li> <li>The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population.</li> <li>The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds.</li> <li>The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs.</li> </ul>	Budget RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points

4.B. Agency Capacity	Award points if agency: Has successfully handled at least one other federal grant or other major grant of this size and complexity, either in or out of the CoC (or can otherwise demonstrate that it can successfully manage complex reporting requirements). • Has sufficient fiscal capacity to manage the grant, including:	e- LOCCs E- Snaps	Up to <b>10</b> points
4.C. Audit and Monitoring Findings	<ul> <li>The project must report all irregularities resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub-recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex. City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for similar projects. Projects that have irregularities must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, projects should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction);</li> <li>Award full points (5 points) for the project if: <ul> <li>Award full points if the agency can show no irregularities from similar projects; or</li> <li>If no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring for similar projects.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points

<ul> <li>If a project adequately submits relevant documentation identifying any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the project will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the project will avoid similar findings in the future.</li> </ul>	
Award <b>up to 3 points</b> if irregularities were found for similar projects and the project provided documentation, but the project does not provide an adequate explanation.	
Award <b>no points</b> if the project does not submit any documentation (e.g., confirmation letters) from oversight entities to support this criteria.	

# 5A. PRIORITIZATION FOR NEW PROJECTS EXCEPT DV BONUS (25 pts.)

Name	Description	Sourc es	Score
5.A.1. Community Priority	Award points if the project addresses the priority need identified by the Advisory Committee in 2019: Permanent Supportive Housing, with targeted services for either youth or seniors. Please note that HUD may require that Permanent Supportive Housing be dedicated to persons experiencing Chronic Homelessness.	E- snaps RFI	Up to <b>15</b> points
5.A.2. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations	Award points to projects that will serve population(s) with severe needs and vulnerabilities (e.g. chronically homeless, history of domestic violence), and will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region (e.g., serving a	RFI APR	Up to <b>10</b> points

unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site based housing).	
Applicants should specifically consider the needs and vulnerabilities of youth and seniors.	

# 5B. PRIORITIZATION FOR DV BONUS HOUSING (25 pts.)

**Use this section instead of the previous page** if the project is applying for DV Bonus funding. For all scoring purposes, "domestic violence" also includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or trafficking.

Name	Description	Source	Score
5.B.1. How Project will Address Need	<ul> <li>Award points for each of the following items:</li> <li>Project provides data describing the CoC's population of domestic violence survivors</li> <li>Project explains how it proposes to meet the unmet needs of domestic violence survivors, especially with survivors who come from unsheltered situations.</li> <li>The project's staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing.</li> <li>The project's staff utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches.</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points
5.B.2. Previous Performa nce	Award points if the agency has experience serving, or demonstrates a plan to serve, victims who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, which includes dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, and that experience, or plan, specifically shows that they can serve victims who come from unsheltered situations.	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points
5.B.3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes	<ul> <li>Award points for each of the following items:</li> <li>The project articulates a specific plan for ensuring that its residents will be safe from further domestic violence.</li> <li>The project sets quantitative safety targets that are appropriate and realistic.</li> </ul>	RFI	Up to <b>10</b> points

The project explains why it is likel able to achieve the targeted safet	
outcomes.	

# 6. COMMUNITY (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
6.A. Participation in CoC Activities	Award points for the agency's attendance, participation, and leadership at CoC events, meetings, committees, forums, and projects, with a focus on activities that took place since the last NOFA. Typically, full points should be awarded if the agency meaningfully participated in at least 4 voluntary events over the course of the year, or if the agency led at least 1 successful event, training, or initiative over the course of the year.	RFI	Up to <b>5</b> points
6.B. Local Competition Deadlines	mpetition hours late.		Up to <b>5</b> points