Sacramento Continuum of Care (CoC) Board Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 8th, 2021 | 8:00 AM to 10:00 AM

[Recording of Zoom Meeting](). The chat is below the minutes.

Attendance:

Member	Area of Representation	Present
Alexis Bernard	Mental Health Service Organization	Yes
Amani Sawires Rapaski	Substance Abuse	No
Angela Upshaw - Vice Chair	Veterans	Yes
April Marie Dawson	People with Disabilities	No
Chevon Kothari	County Health Services	No
Christie M. Gonzales	Substance Abuse Service Organizations	Yes
Christie Lynn	Law Enforcement	No
Erin Johansen - Chair	Mental Health	Yes
Fatemah Martinez	Shelter Provider	Yes
Jameson Parker	Business Community & Street Outreach	Yes
Jenna Abbott	Business Community	No
John Kraintz	Lived Experience	Yes
Joseph Smith	Coalition/Network	Yes
Julie Davis-Jaffe	Employment Development	Yes
Juile Hirota	Shelter and/or Housing Provider	Yes
MaryLiz Paulson	Housing Authority	Yes
Mike Jaske	Faith Community Advocate	Yes
Nicholas Golling	City of Sacramento	Yes
Pixie Pearl - Secretary	Homeless Youth	Yes
Sarah Bontrager	City of Elk Grove	Yes
Stefan Heisler	City of Rancho Cordova	Yes
Stephanie Cotter	City of Citrus Heights	Yes
Tara Turrentine	Education	Yes

Tiffany Gold	Youth with Lived Experience	No

SSF Staff	SSF Title
Andrew Geurkink	Continuum of Care Specialist
Hamid Bashiri	Data and Analytics Manager
Kathreen Daria	Volunteer & Training Coordinator
Lisa Bates	Chief Executive Officer
Michele Watts	Chief Planning Officer
Michelle Charlton	Continuum of Care Coordinator
Peter Bell	Coordinated Entry Manager
Sarah Schwartz	Field Administrator
Theresa Bible	Outreach Navigator – Meadowview
Ya-yin Isle	Chief Strategic Initiatives Officer

Guests
Ane Watts, Benjamin Uhlehenhop, Bo Cassell, Brandon A. Wirth, Bruce Kuban, Charles Ware, Cheyenne Caraway, Cynthia P, Danielle Foster, Darrin Greer, David Husid, Debbie Hughes Martinez, Emily Halcon, Gina Roberson, Harjit Signh Gill, Jeffery Tardaguila, Jonathan Russell, Kate Hutchinson, Koby Rodriguez, Lee Sorrell, Mike Nguy, Monica Rocha-Wyatt, Puplinger, QJ, Richelle Cullen, Robynne Rose-Haymer, Sanford (Sandy) Robinson, SH, Shannon Hus, Sharna Braucks, Stepphanie Nevin, Tamyra Dow, and Troy Lynch.

I. **Welcome & Introductions:** Erin Johansen, Chair
Erin called the meeting to order around 8:04 AM. Attendance of 38 participants.
II. Review & Approval of June 9th & August 11th Minutes: Pixie Pearl, Secretary
Motioned for approval of 6/9/21 CoC Board minutes: 1st - Alexis Bernard / 2nd - MaryLiz Paulson Motion approved. Motioned for approval of 8/11/21 CoC Board minutes: 1st - MaryLiz Paulson / 2nd - Joseph Smith Motion approved.

III. Chair's Report: Erin Johansen

Erin mentioned:

● Moving into the busy season with Notice of Funding Opportunities (NOFO) released, there will be some new categories/approaches to the NOFO that will be discussed in this meeting. The NOFO is due to HUD by November 16th.
● The opportunity to sit in on the first SHPC meeting on August 27 was positive and productive.

Please see the recording for more details.

IV. CEO's Report: Lisa Bates

Lisa shared details about the [Sacramento Homeless Policy Council](SHPC):
● On August 27, we held our first meeting of the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council, with Sacramento County, City of Sacramento, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, and Citrus Heights represented by elected officials. Erin represented the CoC and Ashely Brand, SSF's Chair, moderated.
● We had 4 great speakers: Curtis Freeman, a Project Roomkey participant, Helene Schneider from the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, Ali Sutton from the California Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency, and Beth Sandor from Community Solutions.
● About 50 people joined the webinar to listen in.
● As an initial meeting, a focus was on building foundational knowledge about the homeless system response in Sacramento, including a review of our system performance measures.
Please see the recording for more details.

V. Announcements:

CoC Board Chair & CoC Board Members: None

Community:

● Jeffery Tardaguila asked when is the next PIT Count meeting?
  ○ Response: the PIT Count meeting will be September 16th at 9:00am

VI. Consent Agenda - Action Items:
A. CoC Board Member Appointment: Emily Halcon
B. 2021 Governance Charter Revisions
C. Defunded Projects' Closure Policy and Procedures

Consent Agenda - Action Items:
Motioned for approval: 1st - Alexis Bernard / 2nd - Sarah Bontrager
Motion approved.

VI. New Business:

A. FY2021 CoC NOFO - **Time-Sensitive Revisions to Project Review Tools Approved by Executive Committee 8/26/21** - **Other Updates**	Angel Uhercik & Sarah Bontrager, PRC Co-Chairs, Maddie Nation, Homebase, & Michele Watts, SSF Chief Planning Officer	9:25 AM (25 minutes)	Information

Maddie shared a 2021 NOFO Competition Update presentation discussing the goals for the presentation, CoC NOFO high-level overview, Funding for Sacramento CoC, Eligible new project types, Bonus & DV funding projects, Noteworthy changes, Timeline with key deadlines, Executive committee action, TA Workshop, the Review & Rank and more. Please see the recording for more details.

B. County 22/23 Budget Community Engagement- CoC Board Input on High-Level Priorities	Erin Johansen, Lisa Bates, & Emily Halcon, County of Sacramento, Director of Homeless Initiatives	9:10 AM (15 minutes)	Action

Emily shared details about the County's approval of the 2021/22 budget, preparation of the 2022/23 budget, and efforts to reach out to community advising committees to provide their input to be addressed within the budget. Erin mentioned the CoC Executive Committee's intention is to be consistent with all efforts/input from the CoC Board, SHPC, Gaps Analysis, etc. Lisa discussed the priorities to be considered which are listed within the memo (provided within this minutes packet).

Approval of County 22/23 Budget Community: 1st - Mike Jaske / 2nd - Tara Turrentine

Motion approved.

C. Coordinated Entry Implementation Recommendations (CESH 2)	Michele Watts & Peter Bell, SSF CE Manager	8:40 AM (30 minutes)	Information

Michele and Peter shared a presentation discussing the CESC vision, Funding to support CESC improvements, CESH-19 background, CESH-19 Core areas of work & rationale, CESH-19 funding goals & activities, CESH-19 estimated budget, CES & HRS Support (staff positions), and CESH-2019 Funding next steps. Please see the recording for more details.

D. YHDP Application Update	Michele Watts & Kathreen Daria, SSF Volunteer & Training Coordinator	9:50 AM (5 minutes)	Information
Michele and Kathreen shared details about the application, when HUD will announce the results, and more. Please see the recording for more details.			
E. HHAP-3 Update	Lisa Bates & Ya-yin Isle, SSF Chief Strategic Initiatives Officer	9:55 AM (5 minutes)	Information
Ya-yin shared a presentation discussing the HHAP-3 Part A, Part B, and Part C. Please see the recording for more details.			
VIII. Meeting Adjourned at 9:19 AM. Attendance of 57 participants. Next CoC Board Meeting: Wednesday, October 13th, 2021			

CoC Board Meeting Chat

07:54:15 From Tamyra Dow Hope Coop to Everyone:
        Good Morning!!!

07:58:41 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator to Everyone:
        Good Morning and Welcome! Here are today's meeting materials:
https://sacramentostepsforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/9.8.21-CoC-Board-Materials.pdf

08:01:57 From SH to Everyone:
        Good morning, Shalinee Hunter in attendance

08:03:17 From Stefan Heisler to Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator(Direct Message):

Hi Michelle, I'm here 😊

08:04:40 From Emily Halcon to Everyone:
    Emily Halcon (she/her), Director of Homeless Initiatives, Sacramento County; local government

08:04:48 From Maddie Nation, Homebase (she/her) to Everyone:
    Maddie Nation (she/her) - Policy Analyst, Homebase. For today I'm here to share about the Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Opportunity (CoC NOFO).

08:04:54 From Monica Rocha-Wyatt (she/her) to Everyone:
    Monica Rocha-Wyatt (she/her), Sacramento County Behavioral Health, Program Planner

08:05:05 From William White to Everyone:
    William White, LTC Specialist - California Health & Wellness

08:05:06 From Tamyra Dow Hope Coop to Everyone:
    Tamyra Dow She/Her Housing Resource Specialist Hope Cooperative

08:05:10 From Julie Hirota to Everyone:
    Julie Hirota (she/her) - Saint John's Program for Real Change, CEO, Women and Children's Housing Program

08:05:24 From SH to Everyone:
    Shalinee Hunter, Assistant Director of EEOP with Dept of Transportation, REQ Committee Member

08:05:29 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
    Alexis Bernard (she/her), Turning Point Community Programs, Director of Housing, Mental Health Service Provider

08:05:34 From Robynne Rose-Haymer to Everyone:
    Robynne Rose-Haymer, she/her/hers, Deputy Chief Programs Officer, Sacramento LGBT Community Center, TAY programs and Health services

08:05:42 From Benjamin Uhlenhop - Next Move to Everyone:
    Benjamin Uhlenhop - He Him His - Next Move - Homeless Services(PSH, Shelter, Francis House, Mather) Program Manager

08:05:46 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator to Stefan Heisler(Direct Message):

Thank you

08:06:03 From Stephanie Cotter to Everyone:
    Stephanie Cotter (she/her), City of Citrus Heights, Housing Division

08:06:28 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator to Everyone:
    Here are today's meeting materials:
https://sacramentostepsforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/9.8.21-CoC-Board-Materials.pdf

08:06:28 From Tara Turrentine to Everyone:
    Tara Turrentine, She/Her/Hers, Sacramento County Office Of Education,
Coordinator, Education for Homeless Children and Youth, CoC Board Member

08:06:39 From Jeffery Tardaguila to Everyone:
    Jeffery Tardaguila Mr,Him, Public Advocate

08:06:56 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    Pixie Pearl, They/Them, California Homeless Youth Project, Secretary

08:06:57 From David Husid to Everyone:
    David Husid Cottage Housing (He Him His) We run two PSH programs. Quinn
Cottages and SERNA Village

08:07:43 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
    Motion to Approve

08:07:48 From Gina Roberson to Everyone:
    Gina Roberson, she/hers, WEAVE, Domestic Violence

08:07:53 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    6/9/21 Meeting Minutes

08:08:06 From Sarah Bontrager to Everyone:
    Yes

08:08:08 From Stefan Heisler to Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC
Coordinator(Direct Message):
    Yes

08:08:09 From Stephanie Cotter to Everyone:
    yes

08:08:09 From Joseph Smith to Everyone:
    approve

08:08:09 From Julie Hirota to Everyone:
    yes

08:08:11 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
    yes

08:08:14 From MaryLiz Paulson to Everyone:
    Yes

08:08:14 From Tara Turrentine to Everyone:
    Yes

08:08:14 From Stefan Heisler to Everyone:
    Yes

08:08:14 From Christie Gonzales to Everyone:
    yes

08:08:15 From angela upshaw to Everyone:
    yes

08:08:16 From Erin Johansen, Hope Cooperative to Everyone:
    Yes

08:08:17 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    yes

08:08:21 From Mike Jaske to Everyone:
    yes

08:09:07 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator to Everyone:
    Here is the Sacramento Homeless Policy Council Webpage:
https://sacramentostepsforward.org/sacramento-homeless-policy-council/

08:09:15 From Julie Davis-Jaffe - SETA Sacramento Works to Everyone:
    Yes

08:09:53 From charles ware to Everyone:

charles ware he/him oak park homeless project boots on the ground/basic needs for homeless charlesware7777@gmail.com hello everyone

08:14:06 From Joseph Smith to Everyone:
    second

08:14:19 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    aug 11 meeting minutes

08:14:21 From Julie Hirota to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:21 From MaryLiz Paulson to Everyone:
    Yes

08:14:22 From Erin Johansen, Hope Cooperative to Everyone:
    Yes

08:14:23 From Stefan Heisler to Everyone:
    Yes

08:14:23 From Julie Davis-Jaffe - SETA Sacramento Works to Everyone:
    Yes

08:14:25 From Christie Gonzales to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:25 From Joseph Smith to Everyone:
    approve

08:14:26 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:27 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:27 From Stephanie Cotter to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:28 From Mike Jaske to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:30 From Nick Golling City of Sacramento to Everyone:
    aye

08:14:35 From Sarah Bontrager to Everyone:
    Yes

08:14:37 From angela upshaw to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:37 From Tara Turrentine to Everyone:
    yes

08:14:47 From John Kraintz to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:32 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
    Motion to approve

08:17:39 From Sarah Bontrager to Everyone:
    Second

08:17:42 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    Consent Agenda

08:17:45 From Julie Davis-Jaffe - SETA Sacramento Works to Everyone:
    Yes

08:17:45 From Julie Hirota to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:46 From angela upshaw to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:47 From MaryLiz Paulson to Everyone:
    Yes

08:17:47 From Sarah Bontrager to Everyone:
    Yes

08:17:47 From Christie Gonzales to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:48 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:48 From Erin Johansen, Hope Cooperative to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:48 From Stefan Heisler to Everyone:
    Yes

08:17:50 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:52 From Joseph Smith to Everyone:
    approve

08:17:55 From Tara Turrentine to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:56 From Stephanie Cotter to Everyone:
    yes

08:17:59 From Nick Golling City of Sacramento to Everyone:
    aye!

08:18:00 From QJ to Everyone:
    yes

08:18:02 From Kate Hutchinson to Everyone:
    Kate Hutchinson, she, her, Deputy Director Lutheran Social Services, Homelessness services provider

08:19:52 From Lisa Bates (She/Her) - SSF to Everyone:
    PIT meeting will be Sept 16th at 9:00

08:26:48 From Erin Johansen, Hope Cooperative to Everyone:
    Will that change in performance focus be transferred to project performance in the R&R as well?

08:37:09 From Cheyenne Caraway to Everyone:
    Can projects get a list of the non conflicted panel members please?

08:39:14 From Cheyenne Caraway to Everyone:

Thank you!

08:39:31 From Maddie Nation, Homebase (she/her) to Everyone:
sacramento@homebaseccc.org

08:42:27 From Monica Rocha-Wyatt (she/her) to Everyone:
BRB

08:49:00 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator to Everyone:
Approval of County 22/23 Budget:

08:49:01 From Julie Hirota to Everyone:
yes

08:49:03 From Jameson Parker to Everyone:
yes

08:49:03 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
Yes

08:49:03 From Nick Golling City of Sacramento to Everyone:
Yes

08:49:03 From angela upshaw to Everyone:
yes

08:49:04 From Mike Jaske to Everyone:
yes

08:49:04 From Sarah Bontrager to Everyone:
Yes

08:49:04 From Pixie Pearl (they/them) CHYP to Everyone:
yes

08:49:05 From Tara Turrentine to Everyone:
Yes

08:49:05 From MaryLiz Paulson to Everyone:
Yes

08:49:06 From Julie Davis-Jaffe - SETA Sacramento Works to Everyone:

Yes

08:49:06 From Stefan Heisler to Everyone:
        Yes

08:49:07 From Joseph Smith to Everyone:
        approve

08:49:08 From Emily Halcon to Everyone:
        abstain

08:49:08 From Christie Gonzales to Everyone:
        yes

08:49:08 From Erin Johansen, Hope Cooperative to Everyone:
        Motion to accept the memo to the county

08:49:11 From Stephanie Cotter to Everyone:
        yes

08:49:13 From Fatemah Martinez to Everyone:
        Yes

08:49:14 From Erin Johansen, Hope Cooperative to Everyone:
        Yes

08:49:25 From Julie Hirota to Everyone:
        yes

09:03:56 From Michelle Charlton (She/Her/Hers) SSF, CoC Coordinator to Everyone:
        Details about the CESC: https://sacramentostepsforward.org/committees/#cesc

09:11:08 From Emily Halcon to Everyone:
        Thanks all - glad to be back on the CoC Board. I apologize I have to leave early for the Board of Supervisors meeting, but look forward to continuing to work with you all!

09:18:51 From Alexis Bernard, Turning Point Community Programs to Everyone:
        thank you!

09:18:51 From Nick Golling City of Sacramento to Everyone:
        thank you!

FY 2021 CoC NOFO Competition Update

Sacramento CoC Board

September 2021

Homebase

Goals for Today's Presentation

1. Provide a **high-level overview** of the 2021 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Opportunity (CoC NOFO) competition

2. Review **time-sensitive action taken by the Executive Committee** on the CoC NOFO scoring materials

CoC NOFO High-Level Overview

- Background
- Funding for Sacramento CoC
- Eligible New Project Types
- Bonus & DV Funding-Eligible Projects
- Noteworthy Changes & HUD Policy Priorities
- Timeline with Key Deadlines
- Spotlights: Technical Assistance (TA) Workshop, Review & Rank

Homebase

Background

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has released a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

- Funding competition among approximately 450 Continuums of Care (CoC)
- Released on August 18, 2021
- Approximately $2.7 billion available nationally

https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/e-snaps/fy-2021-coc-program-nofa-coc-program-competition/

Homebase

Funding for Sacramento CoC

Tier 1 (Annual Renewal Demand)	$26,381,539
Tier 2 (CoC Bonus and reallocated funds)	$1,319,077
Domestic Violence Bonus	$1,498,148
CoC Planning	$791,446

Eligible New Project Types

Permanent Supportive Housing	Rapid Re-Housing	Joint Transitional Housing Rapid Re-Housing
Coordinated Entry - Supportive Services Only	Homeless Management Information System	Planning

Bonus & DV Funding Projects

Eligible types of new projects created through bonus or reallocated funding:

- Permanent Housing-Permanent Supportive Housing
- Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing
- Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing
- Dedicated HMIS
- Supportive services Only projects for Coordinated Entry

Eligible types of new projects created through DV bonus:

- Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing
- Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing
- Supportive services Only projects for Coordinated Entry

Homebase

Noteworthy Changes

Tribes and Tribally Designated Housing Entities eligible to apply.

Application deemphasizes system performance. New priorities:

- Determining, addressing impact of COVID-19
- Promoting racial equity in homelessness and in the local CoC process
- Inclusion in the local planning process of current and former homeless persons with lived experience
- Partnerships with housing, health, and service agencies.
- *System performance will be a higher priority again in 2022.*

Up to 10 bonus points if CoC Priority Listing includes <u>new project applications</u> (created through reallocation or CoC Bonus) that utilizes:

- housing subsidies or subsidized housing units funded through sources other than the CoC or ESG programs, and
- healthcare provided through an array of healthcare services providers.

Homebase

2021 HUD CoC Policy Priorities

REVISED in 2021

- Ending homelessness for all persons
- Improving system performance

BACK AGAIN in 2021

- Use a housing first approach

NEW in 2021

- Reducing unsheltered homelessness
- Partnering with housing, health, and service agencies
- Racial equity
- Persons with lived experience

Homebase

Timeline with Key Deadlines

August 18	2021 CoC Program NOFO was released.
September 2	Mandatory Technical Assistance (TA) Workshop for all project applicants.
September 8	New project Letter of Intent (LOI) due
September 24	Renewal and new project e-SNAPS applications due; New project PRESTO applications due
October 20-22	Review & Rank Panel meets to review renewal and new project PRESTO applications; generate the preliminary Priority Listing
October 29	CoC Board meets to approve the Priority Listing

Submission Deadline:
Tuesday, November 16, 2021, at 8:00 PM EDT/7:00 PM CDT/5:00 PM PDT

Homebase

Two Parallel Processes for Providers

Complete PRESTO Application

↓

Participate in Review & Rank Panel Interviews

↓

Review Priority Listing

↓

Priority Listing is Submitted to HUD

Complete e-SNAPS Application

↓

Participate in Project Compliance Review with Homebase and SSF (if sub-recipient)

↓

e-SNAPS Application is Submitted to HUD

homebase

Executive Committee Action: Approve Small Modifications to the Scoring Materials

- Homebase identified three areas for improvement to the scoring tools to improve the CoC application score:
  - Objective measure of safety for domestic violence projects (renewal projects)
  - Leveraging non-CoC funded Housing Resources (new projects)
  - Cross-Sector Relationships with Healthcare Providers (new projects)
- Increase the CoC application score by up to 11 pts (pending new project applicants)
- The Executive Committee reviewed and approved these changes on August 26th

Homebase

Spotlight: TA Workshop

- Attendance is mandatory for all project applicants

- Provide attendees with:
  - An overview of the local application process
  - Instructions for completing the local (PRESTO) and national (e-SNAPS) project applications.

- 72 unique participants, representing ~27 agencies
  - Publicized through the CoC's mailing list, on the SSF website, and targeted outreach to domestic violence providers, tribal entities, healthcare partners, and SHRA.

Homebase

Spotlight: Review & Rank

Tier 1:

- Conditionally selected from the highest-scoring CoC to the lowest-scoring CoC, provided the project applications pass both eligibility and threshold review.

- If a DV Bonus project ranked in Tier 1 is selected with DV Bonus funds, the project will be removed from this tier and the projects below it will move up one rank position.

Tier 2:

- Less likely to be funded. Scored using a 100-point scale based on three factors:
  - CoC Score, CoC Project Ranking, Commitment to Housing First

- Dedicated HMIS projects and Coordinated Entry SSO projects will automatically receive 10 points.

Goal of Review & Rank Panel: Develop the Priority Listing

Homebase

Questions?

Homebase

2021 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 model and utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches.	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

Name	Description	Sources	Score
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; • 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	RFI	Up to **5** points

2.C. Program Outcomes	Award points if:
	• The project's goals are realistic and sufficiently challenging given the scale of the project
	• Outcomes are measurable and appropriate to the population being served, and must meet minimum CoC-adopted targets, including:
	    ○ At least 85% of clients experience positive housing outcomes
	    ○ 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 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	RFI	Up to **10** points
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. <u>AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)</u>

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
	    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
		e-LOCCs
		
		E-Snaps
			Up to **10** points

4.C. Audit and Monitoring Findings	The agency must report **all irregularities** resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub-recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex. City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for **similar projects.** Agencies that have irregularities for similar projects must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, agencies should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction); Award **full points (5 points)** for the project if: • If the agency can show no irregularities from similar projects; or • If no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring for similar projects. Award **up to 5 points** for the project if: • If the agency adequately submits relevant documentation identifying any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the agency will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the agency will avoid similar findings in the future. • If the agency is currently disputing findings from an audit or monitoring for a similar project and submits (1) a brief explanation of the irregularities, and (2)	All HUD, SSF, financial audits, or audits/ monitoring from other funding entities from the last 2 years. RFI	Up to **5** points

6

	the most updated timeline available for disputing the irregularities. Award **up to 3 points** if irregularities were found for similar projects and the agency provided documentation, but the agency does not provide an adequate explanation. Award **no points** if the agency does not submit any documentation (e.g., confirmation letters) from oversight entities to support this criteria.		

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

If this application is for a __DV Bonus-funded__ new project, please skip this section and move to the next.

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. OR Award points if the project addresses the priority need identified by the CoC Board in 2021: Permanent Supportive Housing, with targeted services for those experiencing health conditions identified by the CDC as making someone vulnerable to COVID-19. For a full list of conditions, see here. Please note that HUD may require that Permanent Supportive Housing be dedicated to persons experiencing Chronic Homelessness. Please note, projects can receive points for both the Community Priority (5.A.1) and HUD Priority (5.A.2) factors if they meet the criteria.	E-snaps RFI	Up to **10** points

Name	Description	Source	Score
5.A.2. HUD Priority	Award points if the project addresses the priority needs identified by HUD in 2021: • Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing that leverages healthcare resources to support program participants (as documented with a written commitment from a health care organization); OR • Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing, with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or other non-CoC funding for rental assistance of leasing. Please note, projects can receive points for both the Community Priority (5.A.1) and HUD Priority (5.A.2) factors if they meet the criteria.	E-snaps RFI	Up to **5** points
5.A.3. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations	Award points to projects that will serve population(s) with severe needs and vulnerabilities (e.g. chronically homeless, history of domestic violence), and will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region (e.g., serving a unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site based housing). Applicants should specifically consider the needs and vulnerabilities of youth or seniors or for those experiencing health conditions identified by the CDC as making someone vulnerable to COVID-19. For a full list of conditions, see here.	RFI APR	Up to **10** points

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.
	• The project's staff utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches.
	• The project meets a priority need identified by HUD in 2021:
	  ○ Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing that leverages healthcare resources to support program participants (as documented with a written commitment from a health care organization); <u>OR</u>
	  ○ Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing, with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or other non-CoC funding for rental assistance of leasing.
		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.	RFI	Up to **10** points

	• The project explains why it is likely to be able to achieve the targeted safety outcomes.		

6. COMMUNITY (10 pts.)

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

2021 Renewal Project Scoring Tool

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

1. THRESHOLD FACTORS

Name	Description	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing, in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
Coordinated Entry	The project will participate in coordinated entry to the extent possible for this project type, as demonstrated by its policies and procedures.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Successful Drawdown	If the project is under contract with HUD, then the project has made at least one successful drawdown of federal funds as of the time of this application was submitted.	Met/Not Met
Client Participation in Project Design and Policymaking	Absent the impact of COVID-19, the agency typically 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 Begin on Next Page]

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

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	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 or small projects, that experience an outsized impact on program performance for this factor, projects are invited to discuss the number of households that left the project and how long each household had been in the program prior to leaving the program unsuccessfully under the *exceptional circumstances* supplemental question for consideration by the panel.[1] In an exception to the Review and Rank Policy, at section IV. Review and Rank Process, paragraph J: • If one household left the program unsuccessfully, the panel may elect to increase a project's scaled score and award up to 18 points to the project, and • If two households left the program unsuccessfully, the panel may elect to increase a project's scaled score and to award up to 6 points. Participants that passed away during the measurement period.	APR Q5 APR Q23	≥ 99% = **24**
			98% - 98.9% = **18**
			96% - 97.9% = **12**
			90% - 95.9% = **6**
			85% - 89.5%= **4**
			80% - 84.9%= **2**
			< 80% = **0**

---

[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.

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) and Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid Re-Housing (TH-RRH)		
2B. Housing Placement	Successes in Housing Placement for RRH and TH-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	≥ 90% = **24** 85-89.9% = **22** 80% - 84.9% = **18** 75% - 79.9% = **12** 70% - 74.9% = **6** < 70% = **0**

3. <u>INCOME PERFORMANCE (10 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	PSH Scale	RRH and TH-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**
			< 40%	< 30%	**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** < 90% = **0**

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

Name	Description	Sources	Score
4A. Bed and/or Unit Utilization	<u>For Projects Serving **Single Adults in Shared Housing**</u>: Successes in achieving full utilization for PSH, RRH, and TH-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.	APR Q7b APR Q8b E-Snaps	≥ 95% = **12** 90% - 94.9% = **9** 85% - 89.9% = **6**

	For Projects Serving **Adults in Non-Shared Housing and/or Families**: Successes in achieving full utilization for PSH, RRH, and TH-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.		80% - 84.9% = **3**
			< 80% = **0**
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% - 94.9% = **4**
			75% - 84.9% = **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). Award 0.5 points for each successful quarterly drawdown over the competition period.	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., leveraging unique funding; maintaining site-based housing; or serving a unique population such as LGBTQ individuals, individuals with felonies, or individuals transferred from a PSH program to prevent eviction). Applicants should consider the following needs, vulnerabilities, and populations that when answering this question (while these examples are not exhaustive, they do represent categories for which APR information is available): • Chronic homelessness • Current or past substance abuse • History of domestic violence • Physical & Mental Health Conditions	RFI APR Q5a Q10 Q13a1, Q14a, Q15, Q16, Q27a	Up to **12** Points

	• Transgender/gender non-conforming • Youth • Seniors Successes will be measured with reference to both APR data where available and narrative responses.		
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 thoughtfully matched to the needs of the target population, and • Are delivered by an adequate number of appropriately trained staff (i.e., in your response, please include the project's (1) current case manager to client ratio, (2) number of additional staff and/or volunteers supporting the work of case managers, (3) a brief description of your rationale for this approach to case management). 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. Full points will be available to domestic violence projects that provide objective data on how they improved participant safety.	RFI	Up to **5** points

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

Name	Description	Sources	Score

6A. Audit or Monitoring Findings	The project must report **all irregularities** resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub-recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex. City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for **this project** (including shared common spaces for projects co-located with non-CoC-funded units). Projects that have irregularities must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, projects should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction); Award **full points (8 points)** for the project if: • The project was not audited or monitored; or • If no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring for this project. Award **up to 8 points** for the project if: • If a project adequately submits relevant documentation identifying any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the project will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on,	All HUD, SSF, financial audits, or audits/ monitoring from other funding entities from the last 2 years. RFI	Up to **8** points

	and (3) how the project will avoid similar findings in the future. • If a project is currently disputing findings from an audit or monitoring and submits (1) a brief explanation of the irregularities, and (2) the most updated timeline available for disputing the irregularities. Award **up to 4 points** if irregularities were found for this project and the project provided documentation, but the project does not provide an adequate explanation. Award **no points** if the project does not submit any documentation (e.g., confirmation letters) from oversight entities to support this criteria.		
6B. Accurate Data	Successes in Accurate Data are measured using the percent of data recorded as either missing, don't know, client refused to answer, and/or unable to calculate, where the lower percentage the better. Projects with less than 5% data inaccuracy should receive full points.	APR Q6	< 5% error = **2**
			5% - 10% error = **1**
			> 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 (11 pts.)</u>

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. <u>ENHANCING CAPACITY (3 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
8A. Transitions to Permanent Housing	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

9. <u>BONUS COORDINATED ENTRY PARTICIPATION (3 pts.)</u>

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

2021 Coordinated Entry New Project Scoring Tool

Summary of Factors & Point Allocations	
1. Threshold Factors	N/A
2. Coordinated Entry Project Design	32 points
3. Services	13 points
4. Agency Capacity	20 points

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
Coordinated Entry Understanding	The applicant has communicated and coordinated with the current Coordinated Entry (CE) Lead to learn about how the current CE system operates and submits a proposed project that demonstrates integration with the current CE system [to be confirmed by CE Lead]. The applicant also understands the HUD requirements for Coordinated Entry, as demonstrated in this application.	Met/Not Met
Housing First	The project's policies will include a commitment to identifying and lowering its barriers to housing and provide housing and services in line with a Housing First approach.	Met/Not Met
HMIS	The project will enter data for all CoC-funded beds into HMIS (or parallel database for domestic violence services).	Met/Not Met
Formerly Homeless Input	The agency includes homeless or formerly homeless individual in feedback and decision-making processes.	Met/Not Met
Basic Compliance with HUD Policies	The agency has adequate internal financial controls, adequate record maintenance and management, and adequate policies regarding termination of assistance, client appeals, ADA requirements, and confidentiality.	Met/Not Met
Eligible Applicant	Neither the applicant nor the sub-recipients (if any) are for-profit entities.	Met/Not Met

Equal Access	The project will provide equal access and fair housing without regard to sexual orientation, gender identity, or local residency status.	Met/Not Met
Match	Agency will be able to provide 25% match per grant.	Met/Not Met
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	Agency will actively prevent discrimination by affirmatively accommodating people based on differences in: race, color, ancestry, or national origin; religion; mental or physical disability; sex, gender, or sexual orientation; marital or familial status, including pregnancy, children, and custody arrangements; genetic information; source of income; other arbitrary characteristics not relevant to a person's need or suitability for housing	Met/Not Met
Budget	Project has made a good faith effort to complete the budget template provided, showing both CoC and non-CoC funding sources for the project.	Met/Not Met
For DV Bonus Projects Only: Serving DV	Project is 100% dedicated to serving victims who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, including dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking who came from sheltered or unsheltered situations. The project must follow a Housing First model and utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches.	Met/Not Met

2. <u>COORDINATED ENTRY PROJECT DESIGN (32 pts.)</u>

Name	Description	Sources	Score
2.A. Connections to Current CE System	Award points if the proposed project will align with HUD requirements and local coordinated entry design: • Does the project demonstrate knowledge and understanding of current Coordinated Entry System including processes and policies around eligibility, assessment, prioritization and match, placement, and the circumstances under which a Coordinated Entry referral can be denied?	RFI	Up to **8** points

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

	• Whether the agency's current staff has the capacity to begin preparing for this project; • Whether the agency has a plan to train staff in local Coordinated Entry processes and tools (e.g., does the project indicate how many staff will be/are already trained in HMIS or the VI-SPDAT); and • Whether the agency already has policies and procedures that can be used as-is or easily adapted for use in this project.		

3. <u>SERVICES (13 pts.)</u>

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

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	• Does the project have existing relationships with service providers that are not currently available through the existing Coordinated Entry System? • Does the project participate in any unique committees or partnerships that will be beneficial for connecting clients to services?		
3.C. Agency Resource Training	Award points if the proposed project will conduct or provide access to training for staff on available mainstream resources for which clients may qualify. Consider: • Agency plans for staff training on benefits eligibility; • Agency capacity to provide connections to mainstream benefits, such as SOAR training.	RFI	Up to **3** points

4. <u>AGENCY CAPACITY (20 pts.)</u>

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	e-LOCCs E-Snaps	Up to **10** points

	successfully manage complex reporting requirements).
	• Has sufficient fiscal capacity to manage the grant, including:
	    ◦ internal financial controls
	    ◦ grant match tracking
	    ◦ well-maintained records
	    ◦ oversight by a board of directors
	    ◦ a strategy for documenting eligible costs
	    ◦ 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	The agency must report **all irregularities** resolved or unresolved (e.g., a concern or finding from HUD, a recommendation or finding from SSF (sub-recipients only), a significant deficiency or material weakness from a financial audit, or any type of finding from another funding entity ex. City or County) revealed by any audits or monitoring for **similar projects.** Agencies that have irregularities for similar projects must provide (1) relevant documentation identifying those irregularities (e.g., highlighted sections of a financial report), and (2) the project's plan to rectify program irregularities. If irregularities have been rectified, agencies should include any available confirmation letters from relevant oversight entities (e.g. SSF, HUD, Financial entity, Local Jurisdiction); Award **full points (5 points)** for the project if: • If the agency can show no irregularities from similar projects; or	All HUD, SSF, or financial audits from last 2 years. RFI	Up to **5** points

	• If no irregularities have been revealed by any audits or monitoring for similar projects. Award **up to 5 points** for the project if: • If the agency adequately submits relevant documentation identifying any irregularities and provides an adequate explanation to show how any irregularities have been or will be addressed. An adequate explanation includes (1) a brief explanation of the steps the agency will take to address the irregularities, (2) the timeline these steps will be completed on, and (3) how the agency will avoid similar findings in the future. • If the agency is currently disputing findings from an audit or monitoring for a similar project and submits (1) a brief explanation of the irregularities, and (2) the most updated timeline available for disputing the irregularities. Award **up to 3 points** if irregularities were found for similar projects and the agency provided documentation, but the agency does not provide an adequate explanation. Award **no points** if the agency does not submit any documentation (e.g., confirmation letters) from oversight entities to support this criteria.		

<u>5A. PRIORITIZATION FOR NEW PROJECTS EXCEPT DV BONUS (25 pts.)</u>

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. <u>OR</u> Award points if the project addresses the priority need identified by the CoC Board in 2021: Permanent Supportive Housing, with targeted services for those experiencing health conditions identified by the CDC as making someone vulnerable to COVID-19. For a full list of conditions, see <u>here</u>. Please note that HUD may require that Permanent Supportive Housing be dedicated to persons experiencing Chronic Homelessness. Please note, projects can receive points for both the Community Priority (5.A.1) and HUD Priority (5.A.2) factors if they meet the criteria.	E-snaps RFI	Up to **10** points
5.A.2. HUD Priority	Award points if the project addresses the priority needs identified by HUD in 2021: Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing that leverages healthcare resources to support program participants (as documented with a written commitment from a health care organization); <u>OR</u> Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing, with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or other non-CoC funding for rental assistance of leasing. Please note, projects can receive points for both the Community Priority (5.A.1) and HUD Priority (5.A.2) factors if they meet the criteria.	E-snaps RFI	Up to **5** points
5.A.3. Severity of Needs & Special Considerations	Award points to projects that will serve population(s) with severe needs and vulnerabilities (e.g. chronically homeless,	RFI APR	Up to **10** points

	history of domestic violence), and will also fill an important gap in housing and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the Sacramento region (e.g., serving a unique population, leveraging certain funding, maintaining site based housing). Applicants should specifically consider the needs and vulnerabilities of youth or seniors or for those experiencing health conditions identified by the CDC as making someone vulnerable to COVID-19. For a full list of conditions, see here.		

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's staff has skills that are specifically needed to identify and locate survivors, or to persuade survivors to accept and enter housing. • The project's staff utilize trauma-informed and client-centered approaches. • The project meets a priority need identified by HUD in 2021: ○ Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing that leverages healthcare resources to support program participants (as documented with a written commitment from a health care organization); OR	RFI	Up to **5** points

Name	Description	Sources	Score
	• Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid Re-Housing, with Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) or other non-CoC funding for rental assistance of leasing.		
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

To: Sacramento Continuum of Care Board

From: Erin Johansen, CoC Executive Committee Chair
Lisa Bates, SSC CEO

Date: September 8, 2021

Subject: Sacramento County 2022/23 Budget Input Request- ACTION

This memo outlines several high-level recommendations for consideration in response to the County of Sacramento's request for input on budget priorities to be included in a broad community input process to be launch for the upcoming FY2022/23 budget cycle.

There are 71 County advisory boards and commissions, including the Sacramento CoC Board. The County seeks to tap into the expertise of these groups to help frame priorities for the next budget cycle, with the intent of launching a broader community input process based on input from the CoC and these other boards. The recommendations are to be high level recommendations. Additional public participation opportunities will occur throughout the year.

The CoC Board Executive Committee has considered these budget priorities based on the CoC gaps analysis, CES evaluation and key requests made at the August Sacramento Homeless Policy Council meeting. Specifically, the priorities to be considered include:
- Increased on-going funding for homeless programs to sustain and increase shelter and rehousing services for chronically homeless

---

individuals and take full advantage of federal, state and private funding opportunities.

- Increase in staffing resources to address homeless response system-level coordination
- Participation in and financial support of an expanded homeless Coordinated Entry System that incorporates shelter and housing resources
- Participation and contribution to HMIS data expansion, quality and integration
- Full participation in integrated solutions that provide CalAim enhanced care services and in lieu of services for homeless population, including supporting services onsite in PSH projects

Action Requested

Discuss proposed recommendations and approve or delegate final approval to CoC Executive Committee for transmittal to the County in response to their request for input on the 2022/23 budget.

Coordinated Entry System Improvements Funding- CESH-19 & Other Sources

Sacramento CoC Board Presentation
September 8, 2021

Michele Watts, SSF Chief Planning Officer
Peter Bell, SSF Coordinated Entry System Manager

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CES Vision

- Sacramento CoC is responsible for the local Coordinated Entry System (CES), operated by Sacramento Steps Forward
- CES is intended to ensure homeless response system resources are prioritized for those with the greatest need
- CES **core elements** are access, assessment, prioritization, referral, and problem-solving
- Like many CoCs, Sacramento's CES is a work in progress supported by multiple funding sources, contracted, awarded, allocated, proposed, upcoming, and under development

Funding to Support CES Improvements

Contracted, Awarded, Allocated or Proposed
- **CESH** 18 & 19
- **HHAP** 1 & 2

Upcoming Opportunities
- **HHAP** 3 & 4
- **HUD CoC NOFO** CE Project

Under Development
- Support from Cities and County

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CESH-19 Background

- CESH-19 funding is one CES funding source, allocated by the CoC to support Coordinated Entry System improvements
- CESH-19 funding application was approved by the CoC in April 2019 and accepted by the state in October 2019
- CESH-19 CoC application priorities are:
  - CES Improvements
  - System Supports
- Funding must be awarded by October 7, 2021

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CESH-19 Core Areas of Work

Plan for use of CESH-19 funds for CES Improvements & System Supports built out based on local system analyses and recommendations from the CES Evaluation, Gaps Analysis & Racial Equity Action Plan.

Three core areas of work will be prioritized:

1. Coordinated entry system improvements;
2. Advancing racial equity goals; and
3. Uplifting the voices of people with lived experience to inform broader homeless response system decision-making

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CESH-19 Core Areas of Work Rationale

- Improves upon the core elements of CES (access, assessment, prioritization, referral and problem-solving)
- Invests in action to address systemic racial disparities as recommended by the Racial Equity Committee
- Supports people with lived experience to influence system change

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CESH-19 Funding Goals & Activities

- Support authentic collaboration between the Racial Equity and Coordinated Entry System Committees
- Advance the recommendations of the Racial Equity Action Plan and the Coordinated Entry System Evaluation
- Support people with lived experience on our boards, committees and special projects with stipends and ongoing dedicated staffing support
- Provide community-wide training on problem-solving and other best practices
- Roll-up data and communicate broadly

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CESH-19 Estimated Budget

Activity	Funding Category	Year 1 Cost	Year 2 Cost	Year 3 Cost	Total Cost
CES and HRS Staffing Support	CES / System Support	$272,147	$217,147	$217,147	$706,441
Community Training(s)	System Support	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$45,000
Stipends, flexible supports, and consultation costs for People with Lived Experience	System Support	$36,500	$36,500	$37,000	$110,000
Total					$861,441

SACRAMENTO STEPS FORWARD

CES and HRS Support: Staff Positions

- Lived Experience Coordinator

- CE Referral Specialist (first year only)

- REQ & CE Implementation Specialist

- CE Data Liaison

SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD

CESH-2019 Funding Next Steps

- Presentation to CoC Board 9/8/21 (today)
- Presentation to Coordinated Entry System Committee for further discussion and refinement 9/9/21
- Inform the state of award CESH-19 funding to SSF by October 7, 2021 deadline
- Presentation to the Racial Equity Committee in October
- Post and recruit for positions in Q4 of 2021

CES Funding Sources Next Steps

CES is a work in progress, with planning and change efforts to be informed by ongoing CoC and other stakeholder input. Funding source next steps include:

- HHAP-2: CES investments pending state execution of standard agreement and disbursement of funding
- HHAP-3: CoC sets priorities and activities for the HHAP-3 application due in 2022
- HUD CoC: SSF prepares an application for a CES project for the FY2021 NOFO competition due this fall
- Local funding opportunities under development
- Other state or federal opportunities

HHAP-3

Part A

- Agreement to Apply

- Initial Standard Agreement, Contract for Funds

- If required, MOU or Board Resolution

- Initial Disbursement (20 or 25%)

Part B

- HHAP-3 Application Submission

- Remainder Standard Agreement, Contract for Funds

- Remainder Disbursement (80 or 75%)

Part C

- Bonus Funding