SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

CoC Advisory Board Agenda
May 13, 2019 ║ 10 AM – 12 PM
SETA, 925 Del Paso Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95815- Sequoia Room

I. Welcome & Introductions: Sarah Bontrager, Chair			
II. FY2019 HUD CoC Program NOFA Competition			
A. Item: Presentation of Competition Policies, Renewal Projects Scoring Tool & New Projects Scoring Tool	- Presenter(s): Bridget Kurt DeJong and Meadow Robinson, HomeBase & Arturo Baiocchi and Emily Halcon, PRC Co-Chairs	10:05 AM (30 minutes)	Information
B. Item: Public Comment on Competition Policies, Renewal Projects Scoring Tool & New Projects Scoring Tool	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager	10:35 AM (35 minutes)	Public Comment
C. Item: Member Discussion & Action - **Policies- ACTION** - **Renewal Projects Scoring Tool- ACTION** - **New Projects Scoring Tool- ACTION**	- Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager	11:10 AM (50 minutes)	Action
VII. Meeting Adjourned			

DRAFT 2019 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.

A. **Annual Performance Report** (APR) data is generated from project inputs to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This data can <u>only</u> 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, 2018 and terminating March 31, 2019.

D. All projects that began operations on or before April 1, 2018 will be required to cooperate in preparing an Annual Performance Report to be used in the local competition, as follows:

   i.   On **May 10**, the HMIS Lead ran APRs for all CoC-funded projects and shared those reports with those projects and with HomeBase. <u>Each provider is responsible for reviewing the accuracy and completeness of its own APRs.</u> 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 17**, 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 two 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 **May 31**, 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.

II.   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).

III.   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 one year, 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 before 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 **automatically 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 and Evaluation committee. Selection of those members is subject to the rules governing the Performance and Evaluation Committee and subject to the Conflict of Interest policy adopted by the Performance and Evaluation Committee.

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

For Consideration by the CoC Advisory Board, May 13, 2019

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 one year of operating data 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 consolidates, the Panel has discretion to score the entire consolidation based on the renewal projects that have more than one year of operating data.

J. The Panel has discretion to adjust the 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.

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.

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, projects serving chronically homeless individuals and families, and, in particular, single-site, permanent supportive housing projects.

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.

DRAFT 2019 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**
   b. **Prioritization for DV Bonus**
	25 points

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	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 program type based on their housing and disability status.	Met/Not Met
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 approach.	Met/Not Met

2. <u>HOUSING (25 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
2.A. Fully Described and Appropriate Housing	Award points for a housing design that: • is clearly and fully described • has a layout or features that are thoughtfully matched to the target population • is strategically located to meet the needs of the target population • is physically accessible to persons with disabilities • 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 Additionally, for Victim Service Providers: • is designed to protect the safety of the population they serve	RFI	Up to **10** points
2.B. Ready to Start	Award points if the project will be ready to begin housing clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider: • 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;	RFI	Up to **5** points

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	• Whether the project site faces regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement, environmental issues, or zoning issues; • Whether the agency's current staff has the capacity to begin preparing for this project; • Whether the agency already has policies and procedures that can be used as-is or easily adapted for use in a CoC-funded project		

2.C. Program Outcomes	Award points if:
	 • The project's goals are realistic and sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project
	 • Outcomes are measureable and appropriate to the population being served, and must meet minimum CoC-adopted targets, including:
	    o At least 85% of clients experience positive housing outcomes
	    o At least 55% of adult clients maintain or increase their income from all sources
	 • Prospective outcomes reflect actual performance outcomes from other projects administered by the applicant (as appropriate).
		RFI	Up to **10** points

3. SERVICES (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
3.A. Appropriate Supportive Services	Award points for services that: • use a Housing First approach, • offer ongoing support to stay housed, • are comprehensive and well-coordinated, • include culture-specific elements, and • are thoughtfully matched to the target population 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: • Who will be referred; • The agencies that will accept referrals; • The types of services to be provided; and • The logic behind the agency's referral scheme	RFI	Up to **10** 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. 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).	RFI	Up to **10** points

4. AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4.A. Budget	Award points based on the bullet points below: • Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read. • The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population. • The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds. • The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs.	Budget RFI	Up to **5** 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 **10** points

	o a strategy for ensuring adequate grant drawdowns • Is large enough to handle the expected client case load; • Is familiar with innovative or evidence-based practices; • Includes at least one person with formal training and/or education in a relevant social services field		
4.C. Audit and Monitoring Findings	Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring. Award up to 3 points if the agency adequately explains how the irregularities found by auditors or monitors will be addressed or have been addressed. Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to **5** points

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 **15** 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).	RFI APR	Up to **10** points

	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	Award points for each of the following items: • Project provides data describing the CoC's population of domestic violence survivors • Project explains how it proposes to meet the unmet needs of domestic violence survivors, especially with survivors who come from unsheltered situations. • The project will have housing that is specifically designed to accommodate the needs of survivors. • The project's staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing.	RFI	Up to **5** 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 **10** points
5.B.3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes	Award points for each of the following items: • The project articulates a specific plan for ensuring that its residents will be safe from further domestic violence. • The project sets quantitative safety targets that are appropriate and realistic. • The project explains why it is likely to be able to achieve the targeted safety outcomes.	RFI	Up to **10** 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 **5** points
6.B. Local Competition Deadlines	Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments. • Award 3 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late. • Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late. • 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.	HomeBase analysis	Up to **5** points

FY2018 FACTORS THAT WERE REMOVED IN FY2019 TOOL
- *Community Need (Threshold Factor, considered in Scored Factor "Community Priority")*
- *Site Control (merged with Scored Factor "Ready to Start")*
- *Projected Outcomes (re-envisioned as Scored Factor "Program Outcomes")*
- *Project Staffing (merged with Scored Factor "Agency Capacity")*
- *Community Coordination (merged with Scored Factor "Appropriate Supportive Services")*
- *Participant Evaluation (considered in Scored Factor "Fully Described and Appropriate Housing")*
- *Fiscal Capacity (merged with Scored Factor "Agency Capacity")*
- *Housing First (moved to Threshold, and also considered in "Appropriate Supportive Services")*
- *Chronic Homeless (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Special Populations (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Severity of Needs (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Serve Highly Vulnerable Clients with high VI-SPDAT (removed due to Coordinated Entry reasons)*
- *Single-Site Housing (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Fair Housing (moved to Threshold, as "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing")*
- *Ability to Quantify Need – DV (considered in "How Project Will Address Need")*
- *Ability to House Survivors – DV (considered in "How Project Will Address Need")*
- *Ability to Serve All Types of Survivors – DV (considered in "How Project Will Address Need" and "Previous Performance")*
- *Experience with Federal Grants (considered in Scored Factor "Agency Capacity")*
- *HMIS (considered in Threshold Factor "HMIS" and Scored Factor "Program Outcomes")*
- *Coordinated Entry (considered in Threshold Factor "Coordinated Entry")*
- *Including Consumers (considered in Threshold Factor "Formerly Homeless Input")*

DRAFT 2019 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. **BONUS**	3 points
TOTAL	100 points

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. <u>HOUSING PERFORMANCE (24 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	2018 Scale	Proposed Scale
	Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)			
2A. Housing Retention	Successes in Housing Retention for PSH projects are measured by the percentage of individual project participants that remain in permanent housing **or** exit as "living-leavers" to permanent housing at the end of the evaluation period. For projects that serve families, that experience an outsized impact on program performance, projects are invited to discuss under the *exceptional circumstances* supplemental question for consideration by the panel.[1] Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 95% = **24** 90% - 94% = **18** 85% - 89% = **12** 80% - 84% = **6** < 80% = **0**	≥ 99% = **24** 97% - 98.9% = **18** 96% - 97.9% = **12** 90% - 95.9% = **6** 85% - 89.5%= **4** 80% - 84.9%= **2** < 79.9% = **0**
	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 to a Permanent Housing destination from the total number of all participants in the project. For projects that serve families, that experience an outsized impact on program performance, projects are invited to discuss under the *exceptional circumstances* supplemental question for consideration by the panel. Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 85% = **22** 80% - 85% = **18** 75% - 79% = **12** 70% - 74% = **6**	≥ 90% = **24** 85-89.9% = **22** 80% - 84.9% = **18** 75% - 79.9% = **12** 70% - 74.9% = **6**

---

[1] 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.

			< 70% = **0**	< 69.9% = **0**

3. INCOME PERFORMANCE (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	PSH Scale	RRH Scale	Score
3A. Increase or Maintain Income	Successes in increasing or maintaining 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 impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q19	≥ 85%	≥ 75%	**4**
			70% - 84.9%	60% - 74.9%	**3**
			55% - 69.9%	45% - 59.9%	**2**
			40% - 54.9%	30% - 44.9%	**1**
			< 39.9%	< 29.9%	**0**

Name	Description	Sources	Score
3B. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits	Successes in connecting participants with non-cash mainstream benefits are measured by the percentage of adult stayers/leavers with non-cash benefit sources, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment. Adult participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q20	≥ 95% = **4**
			90% - 94.9% = **3**
			80% - 89.9% = **2**
			75% - 79.9% = **1**
			< 75% = **0**
3C. Health Insurance	Successes in connecting participants with health insurance are measured by the percentage of stayers/leavers with health insurance, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment. Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance	APR Q5 APR Q21	≥ 95% = **2**
			90% - 94.9% = **1**
			< 89.9% = **0**

4. <u>UTILIZATION PERFORMANCE (20 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	2018 Scale	Proposed Scale
4A. Bed and/or Unit Utilization	<u>For Projects Serving **Single Adults in Shared Housing**</u>: Successes in achieving full utilization for PSH and RRH projects that serve single adult households in units that have more than one bed are best measured by looking at the **number of beds** in use on the last Wednesday of each quarter, divided by the total number of beds promised in e-snaps. <u>For Projects Serving **Adults in Non-Shared Housing and/or Families**</u>: Successes in achieving full utilization for PSH and RRH projects that serve adults in non-shared units or families are best measured by looking at the **number of units** in use on the last Wednesday of each quarter, divided by the total number of units promised in e-snaps.	APR Q7b APR Q8b E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **12** 85% - 94% = **9** 75% - 84% = **6** 65% - 74% = **3** < 65% = **0**	≥ 95% = **12** 90% - 94.9% = **9** 85% - 89.9% = **6** 80% - 84.9% = **3** < 80% = **0**

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4B. Grant Spenddown	Successes in Grant Spenddown are measured by dividing the amount of money drawn down from e-LOCCs during the project's most recently completed contract by the amount on the corresponding GIW.	e-LOCCs E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **6** 85% - 94% = **4** 75% - 84% = **2** < 75% = **0**
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).	RFI	Up to **2** points

5. <u>SEVERITY OF NEED AND SERVICE QUALITY (20 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
5A. Chronic Homeless	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: • Project has attached eligibility forms to document chronic homelessness that reflect the current definition of chronic homelessness. • Project has checked the box for DedicatedPLUS or 100% Dedicated in e-snaps. • Project has listed the evidence-based practices staff use on a daily basis to serve clients who are chronically homeless.	APR Q26a E-snaps RFI	Up to **3** 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., serving a unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site-based housing). 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): • Chronic homelessness • Current or past substance abuse • History of domestic violence • Physical & Mental Health Conditions • Transgender/gender non-conforming • Youth • Seniors Successes will be measured with reference to both APR data where available and narrative responses.	RFI APR Q5a Q10 Q13a1, Q14a, Q15, Q16, Q27a	Up to **12** Points

5C. Quality of Services	Successes in Quality of Services are measured based on the project's narrative explaining to extent to which the project provides services that: • offer ongoing support to stay housed, • are comprehensive and well-coordinated, • are delivered by an adequate number of appropriately trained staff and • are thoughtfully matched to the needs of the target population. 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.	RFI	Up to **5** points

6. <u>COMPLIANCE (12 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
6A. Audit or Monitoring Findings	Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring. Award up to 4 points if the agency adequately explains how the irregularities found by auditors or monitors will be addressed or have been addressed. Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to **8** points
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	APR Q6	< 5% error = **2** 5% - 10% error = **1**

	unable to calculate, where the lower percentage the better. Projects with less than 5% data inaccuracy should receive full points.		> 10% error = **0**
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. Projects that entered client entries/exits into HMIS in under 5 days received full points	APR Q6e	≤ 5 days = **2**
			5 days – 8 days = **1**
			> 8 days = **0**

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 **4** 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 **2** points
7C. Local Competition Deadlines	Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments. Deduct up to 5 points if project was late in finalizing APRs without valid reason. Deduct 2 points if any portion of the local application was turned in up to 24 hours late. Deduct 5 points if any mandatory portion of the local application was more than 24 hours late. 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.	HomeBase analysis	Up to **5** points

8. BONUS (3 pts.)

8A. BONUS 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 **3** points

FY2018 FACTORS THAT WERE REMOVED IN FY2019 TOOL

o *Unscored Cost Factor (Cost review happening outside CoC competition)*
o *Unscored Project Serves Highly Vulnerable Individuals as Identified by the VI-SPDAT (Data not ready for 2019 competition)*
o *Entries from Homelessness (Referrals coming through CE)*
o *Length of Stay (Need more information to set benchmarks)*
o *Coordinated Entry (Data not ready for 2019 competition)*
o *Housing First (Captured in Existing Threshold Factor)*
o *Special Populations, Single-Site Housing, and Severity of Needs (Merged into Severity of Needs & Special Considerations)*
o *Voluntary Reallocation (Moved to Review and Rank Policies)*

CoC Advisory Board Meeting: May 13, 2019, 10:00 – 12:00pm

Feedback Survey Summary & Responses:
Providers and CoC Advisory Board Members were given one week to provide feedback on both the new and renewal scoring tools as well as the CoC Review and Rank Policies. Provider/Board Member feedback is reproduced here exactly as written, with no editing. Where feedback read "no comment" "no change" or the like, it is not reproduced. HomeBase, SSF, and Performance Review Committee Co-Chairs discussed feedback and provide responses within this document.

DRAFT 2019 RENEWAL TOOL FEEDBACK

- 6 responses: 2 CoC Advisory Board; 4 CoC-Funded Provider Agency

2A. Housing Retention (PSH)
- In the 2018 tool, we counted persons that stayed/exited to perm housing against the total # of those that participated in the project during measurement period(not include persons who died). For 2019- this is measured by the % of persons that remain in per housing or exit as living leavers. What does "living leavers" mean? Is the Rank and Review proposing to calculate the factor differently or is it being described differently? Also, the point category changed from 2018 to 2019- for 2018 greater than 95% allowed for full points and in 2019- its 99% for full point. This change impacts project that are smaller so one negative exit means we can not score full point vs. project with more units. Example- property with 60 units and 2 negative score is 96% which is 18 points and project with 2 negative exits and 15 units score is 86% so its 4 points. How will you address this big gap when both project had two negative exit?
  - **Response:** The calculation has not changed. The calculation will be found in the PRESTO report. For small projects, the revised policy that allows for up to 25% shift in points gives the panel leniency in changing points where the impact is unfair.
- we recommend returning to 2018 scale. 2019 standard is unreasonable for highly vulnerable populations which all of us should be serving
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is in light of high performance in the 2018 competition, where 14 of 18 projects were awarded full points. The average performance on this metric in the 2018 competition was 96.78%. The proposed 2019 scale reflects an effort to create more distinction among high performing projects.
- Please describe what this phrase means: "outsized impact on program performance". How do families create an outsized impact on program performance?
  - **Response:** This measure is counted based on individuals not households, if a large household leaves the project unsuccessfully that could appear as a very negative outcome, when it is one unit.

2B. Housing Placement (RRH)
- Fix final 2019 row from <70% to <60% = 0
  - **Response:** This was a HomeBase error and has been revised.

- What constitutes an RRH exit? It was my understanding that individuals participating in RRH are placed in permanent housing with a time limited rental subsidy and at the end of the subsidy they would be 100% responsible for rent in that permanent housing unit. Plus same comment as for 2.A.
  - **Response:** A RRH exit is when the subsidy or program participation ends. For small projects, the revised policy that allows for up to 25% shift in points gives the panel leniency in changing points where the impact is unfair.

3A. Increase or Maintain Income
- The wording in 2019 changed and did not state "including all sources of income". The description in the 2018 tool was more descriptive as to how to calculate. In 2018 stated- count each adult who increased or maintain income and then count the total # of adults who participated in the project during the measurement period. Then divide the # of success by the # of adults living. For 2019- are we changing how we calculate the factor or is the Rank and Review panel just describing it differently. What is the intent?
  - **Response:** The calculation has not changed. The calculation will be found in the PRESTO report.
- Recommend that both PSH and RRH scales are the same. Income is more critical to maintain housing for RRH vs PSH, not less.
  - **Response**: PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and agree that income is indeed important for RRH. The RRH scale is designed intentionally to be slightly more lenient (than the PSH scale) given the short-term nature of RRH assistance, and thus the shorter time period to get folks connected to income.
- If someone enters the project without income and does not obtain an income between entry and exit or entry and annual assessment - this does not count against the project? I was under the impression that increasing income was a goal of PSH and RRH
  - **Response:** If someone maintains non-zero income or increases income, that is positive. If someone decreases income or has no income, that is negative.

3B. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits
- Connecting participants with non-cash benefits-The wording in 2019 changed and did not include the word "with at least -one non cash benefit". So as long as one mainstream benefit is obtained, is it considered a success? Also, persons that passed away are not counted in 2019. Health insurance is now excluded and is separated in its own scoring factor. This creates a challenge because people that have SSI will not get food stamps. This is changing in June but for this competition client will not qualify. We recommend that health insurance be combined with this non cash mainstream benefits
  - **Response:** Yes, one mainstream benefit is considered a success. HomeBase recently circulated guidance in a document entitled *Non-Cash Benefits Memorandum for Sacramento* that reflects that non-cash benefits may include a variety of resources*.* Please see that guidance for other sources of non-cash mainstream benefits.
- For highly vulnerable populations, SSI is a lengthy process with automatic denial as the rule. We believe that full points should be allocated at 90%
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is in light of high performance in the 2018 competition.
- Not combining non cash with health insurance which are non cash benefits which should be considered as such will put us in a low percentile and will cause us to lose a possible 4 points Last year this was a problem and they combined non cash benefits and health insurance. It seems this year they are not going to do that.

- o **Response:** One mainstream benefit is considered a success. The APR presents these categories separately and in the spirit of accuracy, the scoring tool will follow this format.

3C. Health Insurance
- if health benefits are not included with maintstream benefits we will lose points for non cash mainstream benefits
  - o **Response:** One mainstream benefit is considered a success. The APR presents these categories separately and in the spirit of accuracy, the scoring tool will follow this format.
- Is this only looking at individuals who entered without insurance and have insurance at exit and/or at annual reassessment? It appears as though projects are being given points even if someone entered with insurance. (BTW, most people entering PSH or RRH now should have insurance because of the Medi-Cal expansion, unless they are undocumented or have not been being served by the medical system.)
  - o **Response:** Everyone with insurance is considered a success.

4A. Bed and/or Unit Utilization
- the scoring scale changes in 2019 disproportionately impacts projects that are smaller. See example on question 2A.
  - o **Response:** For small projects, the revised policy that allows for up to 25% shift in points gives the panel leniency in changing points where the impact is unfair.
- Due to continual pressure on housing capacity we support returning to 2018 standard score
  - o **Response**: PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is. The proposed scale reflects an effort to create more distinction in the middle ranges and only reward performance that reflects greater than 80% utilization. High utilization rates are essential to ensuring that housing resources are being used effectively in the community. Additionally, high utilization rates contribute to a reduction in total number of persons experiencing homelessness.

4B. Grant Spenddown
- As above, due to housing capacity pressure and the fact that HUD does NOT penalize for grant under spending we advocate for full points at 90%.
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is. While HUD may not set the same standard, funding should be optimized to ensure that resources are used effectively to serve as many participants as possible.

4C. Quarterly Drawdowns
[No feedback received]

5A. Chronic Homeless
- Part of the scoring factor includes "Project has listed the evidence based practices staff use on a daily basis to serve clients who are chronically homeless." This is worded awkwardly. Whose evident based practices is being referenced? Additional clarification required. This seems like an open ended question without any indication of specific practices that the PRC is looking for.
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as is. The PRC has not limited the Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) that applicants may discuss. Applicants may speak to any EBPs implemented by their program. Note that SSF has hosted

trainings on both Motivational Interviewing and Trauma Informed Care, both EBPs would be relevant for response to this question.

5B. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations

- This is worded awkwardly. There is a gap of housing and services for the homeless in our community. So is the question "how the project contributes to filling the gap". Define unique population? Question needs to be reworded and additional clarification is needed. How will this category be scaled/scored? How many points for single site, for leveraging cash, or unique population?
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as in response to requests for increased subjectivity in the scoring tool to account for varying special considerations and special populations being served by projects.

5C. Quality of Services

- How will "comprehensive and well coordinated" services be defined? How is an "adequate number of staff" determined/defined? How is "thoughtfully matched" to the needs of participants defined? These criteria are subjective as stated and could lead to ambiguities between scorers.
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as in response to requests for increased subjectivity in the scoring tool to account for varying service models and delivery methods.

6A. Audit or Monitoring Findings
[No feedback received]

6B. Accurate Data
- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
  - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31 at latest.
- Why are projects dinged for questions that clients refuse to answer?
  - o **Response:** HUD data standards mandate, that "Client Doesn't Know" or "Client Refused" is treated as missing data since that field is left blank (pg 4, Data Standards Manual). Please note that the scoring tool awards full points to projects with less than 5% error/missing data, and further that this factor was reduced from 3 points in 2018 to 2 points in 2019. In the 2018 competition, all projects demonstrated less than 5% error/missing data and were awarded full points.

6C. Timely Data
- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
  - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31 at latest.
- Shouldn't annual re-certifications also be part of the timely data score?
  - o **Response:** This data will not be ready for the 2019 competition but may be implemented as part of the *Timely Data* factor in the future.

7A. Participation in CoC Activities
- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31.
- Are CoC meetings voluntary events?
    - o **Response**: Yes, voluntary events include monthly provider trainings, committee meetings, and CoC Advisory Board meetings. Applicants are asked to provide information on voluntary events they attended.

7B. Mandatory Training
- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input in advance of May 28 when Supplemental Questions open for response by Applicants.
- Please send out to the providers a confirmation of SSF records in advance so if providers dispute can be rectified prior to R&R
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input in advance of May 28 when Supplemental Questions open for response by Applicants.

7C. Local Competition Deadlines
[No feedback received]

8A. Enhancing Capacity
- the bonus factor contradicts question 5b. If the intent is to focus on severity of needs and special populations, it will be challenging for folks to move out of a PSH. Also, the market is tight with limited choices for rental. Also, how is this scored? Success is evidenced by the % of individuals served that exit. A project that serves 15 units and has 2 exist will have a different % outcome from a project that serves 60 units and has 2 exists. How is permanent housing defined? Is moving permanently with a relative defined as a success?
    - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as in response to requests for a method to incentivize flow through PSH as a way to enhance capacity, where appropriate. This is a subjective factor and will not have a scaled score. Permanent housing destinations are defined by HUD, and includes *staying or living with family or friends, permanent tenure.*
- Please specify the % that will result in full point
    - o **Response:** This is a subjective factor and will not have a scaled score.

DRAFT 2019 NEW TOOL FEEDBACK

- 3 responses: 2 CoC Advisory Board; 1 CoC-Funded Provider Agency

2A. Fully Described & Appropriate Housing
[No feedback received]

2B. Ready to Start

[No feedback received]

2C. Program Outcomes
- Should the standard for maintain/increase income be higher, or is this already aligned with HUD standards?
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the standard as is. HUD does not declare a standard for new projects.

3A. Appropriate Supportive Services
- Point value should be higher for all of the requirements in this. Perhaps add 5 points from 3B
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the current point allocation as is. Relevant experience has been highlighted as particularly important by PRC members.

3B. Relevant Experience
- Disproportionate with 3A. Remove 5 points and add to above.
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the current point allocation as is. Relevant experience has been highlighted as particularly important by PRC members.

4A. Budget
[No feedback received]

4B. Agency Capacity
[No feedback received]

4C. Audit and Monitoring Findings
[No feedback received]

5A1. Community Priority
[No feedback received]

5A2. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations
[No feedback received]

5B1. How Project will Address Need
[No feedback received]

5B2. Previous Performance
- "will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region" this seems redundant of 5.B.1. since community priority was identified there and they will be scored on filling a gap in that question. Is there a reason for the redundancy?
  - **Response:** Projects will be scored under the factors under 5A or 5B, not both. 5B will be only used if the project is applying for *DV Bonus* funding.

5B3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes
[No feedback received]

6A. Participation in CoC Activities
[No feedback received]

6B. Local Competition Deadlines
[No feedback received]

DRAFT 2019 COC REVIEW AND RANK POLICES

- 4 responses: 3 CoC Advisory Board; 1 CoC-Funded Provider Agency

New Policies
[No feedback received]

Existing Policies
- Page 4 Local Application. Use of Presto. Any data whether coming from SSF or HMIS should be uploaded to Presto(including score information) so the applicant has access early on and not days before the PRESTO report is due. Applicant would like to see the score and data in Presto before or by the date the NOFA drops.
  - **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31 at latest.
- Page 4- Local Application items C. "Per the policy the only way to correct objective performance data is by entering new data into HMIS which should be done before the kick off conference." If this is required we need to know how the data is pulled from HMIS and presented in the PRESTO report as indicated on page 2 of the policy. It was only when the data was represented on the PRESTO report when we discovered errors. We may not realize there is an issue to correct with HMIS until the data is translated into the PRESTO report. Also, how will the policy propose to address the issues(the PRESTO report) that need to be manually corrected. In other words, it can not be corrected on HMIS. Example: APR is correct but PRESTO is not translating/categorizing the information correctly. For Mather, we have persons coming from a Per Diem program-and per HUD folks still are considered chronically homeless so the Presto scoring needs to be changed manually since the PRESTO report will be wrong.
  - **Response**: With the removal of the *Entries from Homelessness* factor we don't anticipate this will be a problem. However, should other PRESTO issues arise, the HomeBase team is available for support at sacramento@homebaseccc.org.
- The Review and Rank Panel determines if any renewal project should receive a decrease in funding. - How will the Panel make this determination? Based on what criteria?
  - **Response**: Please see details in the section labelled *Reallocation of Funds* in the *Review and Rank Policies*

SACRAMENTO STEPS FORWARD
Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

CoC Advisory Board Agenda
May 13, 2019 ║ 10 AM – 12 PM
SETA, 925 Del Paso Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95815- Sequoia Room

I. **Welcome & Introductions:** Sarah Bontrager, Chair			
II. **FY2019 HUD CoC Program NOFA Competition**			
A. Item: Presentation of Competition Policies, Renewal Projects Scoring Tool & New Projects Scoring Tool	- Presenter(s): Bridget Kurt DeJong and Meadow Robinson, HomeBase & Arturo Baiocchi and Emily Halcon, PRC Co-Chairs	10:05 AM (30 minutes)	Information
B. Item: Public Comment on Competition Policies, Renewal Projects Scoring Tool & New Projects Scoring Tool	Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager	10:35 AM (35 minutes)	Public Comment
C. Item: Member Discussion & Action - **Policies- ACTION** - **Renewal Projects Scoring Tool- ACTION** - **New Projects Scoring Tool- ACTION**	- Presenter(s): Sarah Bontrager	11:10 AM (50 minutes)	Action
VII. Meeting Adjourned			

SACRAMENTO CONTINUUM OF CARE
DRAFT 2019 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.

A. **Annual Performance Report** (APR) data is generated from project inputs to the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This data can <u>only</u> 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, 2018 and terminating March 31, 2019.

D. All projects that began operations on or before April 1, 2018 will be required to cooperate in preparing an Annual Performance Report to be used in the local competition, as follows:

    i.   On **May 10**, the HMIS Lead ran APRs for all CoC-funded projects and shared those reports with those projects and with HomeBase. <u>Each provider is responsible for reviewing the accuracy and completeness of its own APRs.</u> 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 17**, 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 two 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 **May 31**, 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.

II. 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).

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 one year, 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 **automatically 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 and Evaluation committee. Selection of those members is subject to the rules governing the Performance and Evaluation Committee and subject to the Conflict of Interest policy adopted by the Performance and Evaluation Committee.

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 one year of operating data 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 consolidates, the Panel has discretion to score the entire consolidation based on the renewal projects that have more than one year of operating data.

J. The Panel has discretion to adjust the 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.

<div style="margin-left: 2em;">

xi.   The Appeal Panel conducts a discussion of the appeal and takes a formal vote.

</div>

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.

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, projects serving chronically homeless individuals and families, and, in particular, single-site, permanent supportive housing projects.

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.

DRAFT 2019 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**
   b. **Prioritization for DV Bonus**
	25 points

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	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 program type based on their housing and disability status.	Met/Not Met
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 approach.	Met/Not Met

2. HOUSING (25 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
2.A. Fully Described and Appropriate Housing	Award points for a housing design that: • is clearly and fully described • has a layout or features that are thoughtfully matched to the target population • is strategically located to meet the needs of the target population • is physically accessible to persons with disabilities • 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 Additionally, for Victim Service Providers: • is designed to protect the safety of the population they serve	RFI	Up to **10** points
2.B. Ready to Start	Award points if the project will be ready to begin housing clients within 3 months of receiving HUD funding. Consider: • 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;	RFI	Up to **5** points

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	• Whether the project site faces regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement, environmental issues, or zoning issues; • Whether the agency's current staff has the capacity to begin preparing for this project; • Whether the agency already has policies and procedures that can be used as-is or easily adapted for use in a CoC-funded project		

2.C. Program Outcomes	Award points if:
	• The project's goals are realistic and sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project
	• Outcomes are measureable and appropriate to the population being served, and must meet minimum CoC-adopted targets, including:
	   o At least 85% of clients experience positive housing outcomes
	   o At least 55% of adult clients maintain or increase their income from all sources
	• Prospective outcomes reflect actual performance outcomes from other projects administered by the applicant (as appropriate).
		RFI	Up to **10** points

3. <u>SERVICES (20 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
3.A. Appropriate Supportive Services	Award points for services that: • use a Housing First approach, • offer ongoing support to stay housed, • are comprehensive and well-coordinated, • include culture-specific elements, and • are thoughtfully matched to the target population 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: • Who will be referred; • The agencies that will accept referrals; • The types of services to be provided; and • The logic behind the agency's referral scheme	RFI	Up to **10** points

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	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. 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).	RFI	Up to **10** points

4. AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4.A. Budget	Award points based on the bullet points below: • Project has submitted a budget that is clear, complete, and easy to read. • The budget shows that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population. • The budget shows that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds. • The budget shows that the project is taking appropriate measures to contain costs.	Budget RFI	Up to **5** 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 **10** points

	o a strategy for ensuring adequate grant drawdowns • Is large enough to handle the expected client case load; • Is familiar with innovative or evidence-based practices; • Includes at least one person with formal training and/or education in a relevant social services field		
4.C. Audit and Monitoring Findings	Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring. Award up to 3 points if the agency adequately explains how the irregularities found by auditors or monitors will be addressed or have been addressed. Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to **5** points

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 **15** 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).	RFI APR	Up to **10** points

	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	Award points for each of the following items: • Project provides data describing the CoC's population of domestic violence survivors • Project explains how it proposes to meet the unmet needs of domestic violence survivors, especially with survivors who come from unsheltered situations. • The project will have housing that is specifically designed to accommodate the needs of survivors. • The project's staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing.	RFI	Up to **5** 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 **10** points
5.B.3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes	Award points for each of the following items: • The project articulates a specific plan for ensuring that its residents will be safe from further domestic violence. • The project sets quantitative safety targets that are appropriate and realistic. • The project explains why it is likely to be able to achieve the targeted safety outcomes.	RFI	Up to **10** 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 **5** points
6.B. Local Competition Deadlines	Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments. • Award 3 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late. • Award no points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late. • 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.	HomeBase analysis	Up to **5** points

FY2018 FACTORS THAT WERE REMOVED IN FY2019 TOOL
- *Community Need (Threshold Factor, considered in Scored Factor "Community Priority")*
- *Site Control (merged with Scored Factor "Ready to Start")*
- *Projected Outcomes (re-envisioned as Scored Factor "Program Outcomes")*
- *Project Staffing (merged with Scored Factor "Agency Capacity")*
- *Community Coordination (merged with Scored Factor "Appropriate Supportive Services")*
- *Participant Evaluation (considered in Scored Factor "Fully Described and Appropriate Housing")*
- *Fiscal Capacity (merged with Scored Factor "Agency Capacity")*
- *Housing First (moved to Threshold, and also considered in "Appropriate Supportive Services")*
- *Chronic Homeless (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Special Populations (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Severity of Needs (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Serve Highly Vulnerable Clients with high VI-SPDAT (removed due to Coordinated Entry reasons)*
- *Single-Site Housing (considered in Scored Factor "Severity of Needs & Special Considerations")*
- *Fair Housing (moved to Threshold, as "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing")*
- *Ability to Quantify Need – DV (considered in "How Project Will Address Need")*
- *Ability to House Survivors – DV (considered in "How Project Will Address Need")*
- *Ability to Serve All Types of Survivors – DV (considered in "How Project Will Address Need" and "Previous Performance")*
- *Experience with Federal Grants (considered in Scored Factor "Agency Capacity")*
- *HMIS (considered in Threshold Factor "HMIS" and Scored Factor "Program Outcomes")*
- *Coordinated Entry (considered in Threshold Factor "Coordinated Entry")*
- *Including Consumers (considered in Threshold Factor "Formerly Homeless Input")*

DRAFT 2019 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. BONUS	3 points
TOTAL	100 points

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	2018 Scale	Proposed Scale
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)				
2A. Housing Retention	Successes in Housing Retention for PSH projects are measured by the percentage of individual project participants that remain in permanent housing **or** exit as "living-leavers" to permanent housing at the end of the evaluation period. For projects that serve families, that experience an outsized impact on program performance, projects are invited to discuss under the *exceptional circumstances* supplemental question for consideration by the panel.[1] Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 95% = **24** 90% - 94% = **18** 85% - 89% = **12** 80% - 84% = **6** < 80% = **0**	≥ 99% = **24** 97% - 98.9% = **18** 96% - 97.9% = **12** 90% - 95.9% = **6** 85% - 89.5% = **4** 80% - 84.9% = **2** < 79.9% = **0**
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 to a Permanent Housing destination from the total number of all participants in the project. For projects that serve families, that experience an outsized impact on program performance, projects are invited to discuss under the *exceptional circumstances* supplemental question for consideration by the panel. Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 85% = **22** 80% - 85% = **18** 75% - 79% = **12** 70% - 74% = **6**	≥ 90% = **24** 85-89.9% = **22** 80% - 84.9% = **18** 75% - 79.9% = **12** 70% - 74.9% = **6**

---

[1] 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.

			< 70% = **0**	< 69.9% = **0**

3. INCOME PERFORMANCE (10 pts.)

Name	Description	Sources	PSH Scale	RRH Scale	Score
3A. Increase or Maintain Income	Successes in increasing or maintaining 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 impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q19	≥ 85%	≥ 75%	**4**
			70% - 84.9%	60% - 74.9%	**3**
			55% - 69.9%	45% - 59.9%	**2**
			40% - 54.9%	30% - 44.9%	**1**
			< 39.9%	< 29.9%	**0**

Name	Description	Sources	Score
3B. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits	Successes in connecting participants with non-cash mainstream benefits are measured by the percentage of adult stayers/leavers with non-cash benefit sources, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment. Adult participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance.	APR Q5 APR Q20	≥ 95% = **4** 90% - 94.9% = **3** 80% - 89.9% = **2** 75% - 79.9% = **1** < 75% = **0**
3C. Health Insurance	Successes in connecting participants with health insurance are measured by the percentage of stayers/leavers with health insurance, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment. Participants that passed away during the measurement period do not impact the project's performance	APR Q5 APR Q21	≥ 95% = **2** 90% - 94.9% = **1** < 89.9% = **0**

4. <u>UTILIZATION PERFORMANCE (20 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	2018 Scale	Proposed Scale
4A. Bed and/or Unit Utilization	<u>For Projects Serving **Single Adults in Shared Housing**</u>: Successes in achieving full utilization for PSH and RRH projects that serve single adult households in units that have more than one bed are best measured by looking at the **number of beds** in use on the last Wednesday of each quarter, divided by the total number of beds promised in e-snaps. <u>For Projects Serving **Adults in Non-Shared Housing and/or Families**</u>: Successes in achieving full utilization for PSH and RRH projects that serve adults in non-shared units or families are best measured by looking at the **number of units** in use on the last Wednesday of each quarter, divided by the total number of units promised in e-snaps.	APR Q7b APR Q8b E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **12** 85% - 94% = **9** 75% - 84% = **6** 65% - 74% = **3** < 65% = **0**	≥ 95% = **12** 90% - 94.9% = **9** 85% - 89.9% = **6** 80% - 84.9% = **3** < 80% = **0**

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4B. Grant Spenddown	Successes in Grant Spenddown are measured by dividing the amount of money drawn down from e-LOCCs during the project's most recently completed contract by the amount on the corresponding GIW.	e-LOCCs E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **6** 85% - 94% = **4** 75% - 84% = **2** < 75% = **0**
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).	RFI	Up to **2** points

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

Name	Description	Sources	Score
5A. Chronic Homeless	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: • Project has attached eligibility forms to document chronic homelessness that reflect the current definition of chronic homelessness. • Project has checked the box for DedicatedPLUS or 100% Dedicated in e-snaps. • Project has listed the evidence-based practices staff use on a daily basis to serve clients who are chronically homeless.	APR Q26a E-snaps RFI	Up to **3** 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., serving a unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site-based housing). 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): • Chronic homelessness • Current or past substance abuse • History of domestic violence • Physical & Mental Health Conditions • Transgender/gender non-conforming • Youth • Seniors Successes will be measured with reference to both APR data where available and narrative responses.	RFI APR Q5a Q10 Q13a1, Q14a, Q15, Q16, Q27a	Up to **12** Points

| 5C. Quality of Services | Successes in Quality of Services are measured based on the project's narrative explaining to extent to which the project provides services that:
• offer ongoing support to stay housed,
• are comprehensive and well-coordinated,
• are delivered by an adequate number of appropriately trained staff and
• are thoughtfully matched to the needs of the target population.

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. | RFI | Up to **5** points |

6. __COMPLIANCE (12 pts.)__

Name	Description	Sources	Score
6A. Audit or Monitoring Findings	Award full points if the agency was not audited or monitored or if no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring. Award up to 4 points if the agency adequately explains how the irregularities found by auditors or monitors will be addressed or have been addressed. Award no points if the agency's audits or monitoring revealed misconduct that has not been corrected.	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to **8** points
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	APR Q6	< 5% error = **2** 5% - 10% error = **1**

	unable to calculate, where the lower percentage the better. Projects with less than 5% data inaccuracy should receive full points.		> 10% error = **0**
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. Projects that entered client entries/exits into HMIS in under 5 days received full points	APR Q6e	≤ 5 days = **2**
			5 days – 8 days = **1**
			> 8 days = **0**

7. <u>COMMUNITY</u> (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 **4** 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 **2** points
7C. Local Competition Deadlines	Award full points if the project met all local competition deadlines, including deadlines for turning in supporting documents and attachments. Deduct <u>up to 5 points</u> if project was late in finalizing APRs without valid reason. Deduct 2 points if any portion of the local application was turned in <u>up to</u> 24 hours late. Deduct 5 points if any mandatory portion of the local application was <u>more than</u> 24 hours late. 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.	HomeBase analysis	Up to **5** points

8. **BONUS (3 pts.)**

8A. BONUS 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 **3** points

FY2018 FACTORS THAT WERE REMOVED IN FY2019 TOOL
- *Unscored Cost Factor (Cost review happening outside CoC competition)*
- *Unscored Project Serves Highly Vulnerable Individuals as Identified by the VI-SPDAT (Data not ready for 2019 competition)*
- *Entries from Homelessness (Referrals coming through CE)*
- *Length of Stay (Need more information to set benchmarks)*
- *Coordinated Entry (Data not ready for 2019 competition)*
- *Housing First (Captured in Existing Threshold Factor)*
- *Special Populations, Single-Site Housing, and Severity of Needs (Merged into Severity of Needs & Special Considerations)*
- *Voluntary Reallocation (Moved to Review and Rank Policies)*

CoC Advisory Board Meeting: May 13, 2019, 10:00 – 12:00pm

Feedback Survey Summary & Responses:

Providers and CoC Advisory Board Members were given one week to provide feedback on both the new and renewal scoring tools as well as the CoC Review and Rank Policies. Provider/Board Member feedback is reproduced here exactly as written, with no editing. Where feedback read "no comment" "no change" or the like, it is not reproduced. HomeBase, SSF, and Performance Review Committee Co-Chairs discussed feedback and provide responses within this document.

DRAFT 2019 RENEWAL TOOL FEEDBACK

- 6 responses: 2 CoC Advisory Board; 4 CoC-Funded Provider Agency

2A. Housing Retention (PSH)
- In the 2018 tool, we counted persons that stayed/exited to perm housing against the total # of those that participated in the project during measurement period(not include persons who died). For 2019- this is measured by the % of persons that remain in per housing or exit as living leavers. What does "living leavers" mean? Is the Rank and Review proposing to calculate the factor differently or is it being described differently? Also, the point category changed from 2018 to 2019- for 2018 greater than 95% allowed for full points and in 2019- its 99% for full point. This change impacts project that are smaller so one negative exit means we can not score full point vs. project with more units. Example- property with 60 units and 2 negative score is 96% which is 18 points and project with 2 negative exits and 15 units score is 86% so its 4 points. How will you address this big gap when both project had two negative exit?
  - **Response:** The calculation has not changed. The calculation will be found in the PRESTO report. For small projects, the revised policy that allows for up to 25% shift in points gives the panel leniency in changing points where the impact is unfair.
- we recommend returning to 2018 scale. 2019 standard is unreasonable for highly vulnerable populations which all of us should be serving
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is in light of high performance in the 2018 competition, where 14 of 18 projects were awarded full points. The average performance on this metric in the 2018 competition was 96.78%. The proposed 2019 scale reflects an effort to create more distinction among high performing projects.
- Please describe what this phrase means: "outsized impact on program performance". How do families create an outsized impact on program performance?
  - **Response:** This measure is counted based on individuals not households, if a large household leaves the project unsuccessfully that could appear as a very negative outcome, when it is one unit.

2B. Housing Placement (RRH)
- Fix final 2019 row from <70% to <60% = 0
  - **Response:** This was a HomeBase error and has been revised.

- What constitutes an RRH exit? It was my understanding that individuals participating in RRH are placed in permanent housing with a time limited rental subsidy and at the end of the subsidy they would be 100% responsible for rent in that permanent housing unit. Plus same comment as for 2.A.
  - o **Response:** A RRH exit is when the subsidy or program participation ends. For small projects, the revised policy that allows for up to 25% shift in points gives the panel leniency in changing points where the impact is unfair.

3A. Increase or Maintain Income
- The wording in 2019 changed and did not state "including all sources of income". The description in the 2018 tool was more descriptive as to how to calculate. In 2018 stated- count each adult who increased or maintain income and then count the total # of adults who participated in the project during the measurement period. Then divide the # of success by the # of adults living. For 2019- are we changing how we calculate the factor or is the Rank and Review panel just describing it differently. What is the intent?
  - o **Response:** The calculation has not changed. The calculation will be found in the PRESTO report.
- Recommend that both PSH and RRH scales are the same. Income is more critical to maintain housing for RRH vs PSH, not less.
  - o **Response**: PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and agree that income is indeed important for RRH. The RRH scale is designed intentionally to be slightly more lenient (than the PSH scale) given the short-term nature of RRH assistance, and thus the shorter time period to get folks connected to income.
- If someone enters the project without income and does not obtain an income between entry and exit or entry and annual assessment - this does not count against the project? I was under the impression that increasing income was a goal of PSH and RRH
  - o **Response:** If someone maintains non-zero income or increases income, that is positive. If someone decreases income or has no income, that is negative.

3B. Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits
- Connecting participants with non-cash benefits-The wording in 2019 changed and did not include the word "with at least -one non cash benefit". So as long as one mainstream benefit is obtained, is it considered a success? Also, persons that passed away are not counted in 2019. Health insurance is now excluded and is separated in its own scoring factor. This creates a challenge because people that have SSI will not get food stamps. This is changing in June but for this competition client will not qualify. We recommend that health insurance be combined with this non cash mainstream benefits
  - o **Response:** Yes, one mainstream benefit is considered a success. HomeBase recently circulated guidance in a document entitled *Non-Cash Benefits Memorandum for Sacramento* that reflects that non-cash benefits may include a variety of resources. Please see that guidance for other sources of non-cash mainstream benefits.
- For highly vulnerable populations, SSI is a lengthy process with automatic denial as the rule. We believe that full points should be allocated at 90%
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is in light of high performance in the 2018 competition.
- Not combining non cash with health insurance which are non cash benefits which should be considered as such will put us in a low percentile and will cause us to lose a possible 4 points Last year this was a problem and they combined non cash benefits and health insurance. It seems this year they are not going to do that.

- o **Response:** One mainstream benefit is considered a success. The APR presents these categories separately and in the spirit of accuracy, the scoring tool will follow this format.

3C. Health Insurance
- if health benefits are not included with maintstream benefits we will lose points for non cash mainstream benefits
  - o **Response:** One mainstream benefit is considered a success. The APR presents these categories separately and in the spirit of accuracy, the scoring tool will follow this format.
- Is this only looking at individuals who entered without insurance and have insurance at exit and/or at annual reassessment? It appears as though projects are being given points even if someone entered with insurance. (BTW, most people entering PSH or RRH now should have insurance because of the Medi-Cal expansion, unless they are undocumented or have not been being served by the medical system.)
  - o **Response:** Everyone with insurance is considered a success.

4A. Bed and/or Unit Utilization

- the scoring scale changes in 2019 disproportionately impacts projects that are smaller. See example on question 2A.
  - o **Response:** For small projects, the revised policy that allows for up to 25% shift in points gives the panel leniency in changing points where the impact is unfair.
- Due to continual pressure on housing capacity we support returning to 2018 standard score
  - o **Response**: PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is. The proposed scale reflects an effort to create more distinction in the middle ranges and only reward performance that reflects greater than 80% utilization. High utilization rates are essential to ensuring that housing resources are being used effectively in the community. Additionally, high utilization rates contribute to a reduction in total number of persons experiencing homelessness.

4B. Grant Spenddown
- As above, due to housing capacity pressure and the fact that HUD does NOT penalize for grant under spending we advocate for full points at 90%.
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the proposed 2019 scale as is. While HUD may not set the same standard, funding should be optimized to ensure that resources are used effectively to serve as many participants as possible.

4C. Quarterly Drawdowns
[No feedback received]

5A. Chronic Homeless
- Part of the scoring factor includes "Project has listed the evidence based practices staff use on a daily basis to serve clients who are chronically homeless." This is worded awkwardly. Whose evident based practices is being referenced? Additional clarification required. This seems like an open ended question without any indication of specific practices that the PRC is looking for.
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as is. The PRC has not limited the Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) that applicants may discuss. Applicants may speak to any EBPs implemented by their program. Note that SSF has hosted

trainings on both Motivational Interviewing and Trauma Informed Care, both EBPs would be relevant for response to this question.

5B. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations

- This is worded awkwardly. There is a gap of housing and services for the homeless in our community. So is the question "how the project contributes to filling the gap". Define unique population? Question needs to be reworded and additional clarification is needed. How will this category be scaled/scored? How many points for single site, for leveraging cash, or unique population?
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as in response to requests for increased subjectivity in the scoring tool to account for varying special considerations and special populations being served by projects.

5C. Quality of Services

- How will "comprehensive and well coordinated" services be defined? How is an "adequate number of staff" determined/defined? How is "thoughtfully matched" to the needs of participants defined? These criteria are subjective as stated and could lead to ambiguities between scorers.
  - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as in response to requests for increased subjectivity in the scoring tool to account for varying service models and delivery methods.

6A. Audit or Monitoring Findings
[No feedback received]

6B. Accurate Data
- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
  - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31 at latest.
- Why are projects dinged for questions that clients refuse to answer?
  - o **Response:** HUD data standards mandate, that "Client Doesn't Know" or "Client Refused" is treated as missing data since that field is left blank (pg 4, Data Standards Manual). Please note that the scoring tool awards full points to projects with less than 5% error/missing data, and further that this factor was reduced from 3 points in 2018 to 2 points in 2019. In the 2018 competition, all projects demonstrated less than 5% error/missing data and were awarded full points.

6C. Timely Data
- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
  - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31 at latest.
- Shouldn't annual re-certifications also be part of the timely data score?
  - o **Response:** This data will not be ready for the 2019 competition but may be implemented as part of the *Timely Data* factor in the future.

7A. Participation in CoC Activities

- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31.
- Are CoC meetings voluntary events?
    - o **Response**: Yes, voluntary events include monthly provider trainings, committee meetings, and CoC Advisory Board meetings. Applicants are asked to provide information on voluntary events they attended.

7B. Mandatory Training

- Since we are being scored on this factor, the data should be inputted into the Presto report by the time the NOFA competition starts. We would like to have access to the information so we have a sense of how we are scoring early on. Last year the information was not provided timely.
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input in advance of May 28 when Supplemental Questions open for response by Applicants.
- Please send out to the providers a confirmation of SSF records in advance so if providers dispute can be rectified prior to R&R
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input in advance of May 28 when Supplemental Questions open for response by Applicants.

7C. Local Competition Deadlines
[No feedback received]

8A. Enhancing Capacity

- the bonus factor contradicts question 5b. If the intent is to focus on severity of needs and special populations, it will be challenging for folks to move out of a PSH. Also, the market is tight with limited choices for rental. Also, how is this scored? Success is evidenced by the % of individuals served that exit. A project that serves 15 units and has 2 exist will have a different % outcome from a project that serves 60 units and has 2 exists. How is permanent housing defined? Is moving permanently with a relative defined as a success?
    - o **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the language as in response to requests for a method to incentivize flow through PSH as a way to enhance capacity, where appropriate. This is a subjective factor and will not have a scaled score. Permanent housing destinations are defined by HUD, and includes *staying or living with family or friends, permanent tenure.*
- Please specify the % that will result in full point
    - o **Response:** This is a subjective factor and will not have a scaled score.

DRAFT 2019 NEW TOOL FEEDBACK

- 3 responses: 2 CoC Advisory Board; 1 CoC-Funded Provider Agency

2A. Fully Described & Appropriate Housing
[No feedback received]

2B. Ready to Start

[No feedback received]

2C. Program Outcomes
- Should the standard for maintain/increase income be higher, or is this already aligned with HUD standards?
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the standard as is. HUD does not declare a standard for new projects.

3A. Appropriate Supportive Services
- Point value should be higher for all of the requirements in this. Perhaps add 5 points from 3B
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the current point allocation as is. Relevant experience has been highlighted as particularly important by PRC members.

3B. Relevant Experience
- Disproportionate with 3A. Remove 5 points and add to above.
  - **Response:** PRC Chairs considered this feedback on May 6 and opted to leave the current point allocation as is. Relevant experience has been highlighted as particularly important by PRC members.

4A. Budget
[No feedback received]

4B. Agency Capacity
[No feedback received]

4C. Audit and Monitoring Findings
[No feedback received]

5A1. Community Priority
[No feedback received]

5A2. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations
[No feedback received]

5B1. How Project will Address Need
[No feedback received]

5B2. Previous Performance
- "will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region" this seems redundant of 5.B.1. since community priority was identified there and they will be scored on filling a gap in that question. Is there a reason for the redundancy?
  - **Response:** Projects will be scored under the factors under 5A or 5B, not both. 5B will be only used if the project is applying for *DV Bonus* funding.

5B3. Ability to Meet Safety Outcomes
[No feedback received]

6A. Participation in CoC Activities
[No feedback received]

6B. Local Competition Deadlines
[No feedback received]

DRAFT 2019 COC REVIEW AND RANK POLICES

- 4 responses: 3 CoC Advisory Board; 1 CoC-Funded Provider Agency

New Policies
[No feedback received]

Existing Policies
- Page 4 Local Application. Use of Presto. Any data whether coming from SSF or HMIS should be uploaded to Presto(including score information) so the applicant has access early on and not days before the PRESTO report is due. Applicant would like to see the score and data in Presto before or by the date the NOFA drops.
    - o **Response:** HomeBase is working with SSF to get the data and input it by May 31 at latest.
- Page 4- Local Application items C. "Per the policy the only way to correct objective performance data is by entering new data into HMIS which should be done before the kick off conference." If this is required we need to know how the data is pulled from HMIS and presented in the PRESTO report as indicated on page 2 of the policy. It was only when the data was represented on the PRESTO report when we discovered errors. We may not realize there is an issue to correct with HMIS until the data is translated into the PRESTO report. Also, how will the policy propose to address the issues(the PRESTO report) that need to be manually corrected. In other words, it can not be corrected on HMIS. Example: APR is correct but PRESTO is not translating/categorizing the information correctly. For Mather, we have persons coming from a Per Diem program-and per HUD folks still are considered chronically homeless so the Presto scoring needs to be changed manually since the PRESTO report will be wrong.
    - o **Response**: With the removal of the *Entries from Homelessness* factor we don't anticipate this will be a problem. However, should other PRESTO issues arise, the HomeBase team is available for support at sacramento@homebaseccc.org.
- The Review and Rank Panel determines if any renewal project should receive a decrease in funding. - How will the Panel make this determination? Based on what criteria?
    - o **Response**: Please see details in the section labelled *Reallocation of Funds* in the *Review and Rank Policies*