2021 Continuum of Care Program Grants
DETAILED APPLICATION SUBMISSION TIMELINE

This timeline highlights the steps that your agency will take to participate in the local competition for NOFA funding. Please mark these dates in your calendar!

9/7 at 3:00-5:00pm   TA Workshop for all new and renewal grant recipients
During this session, Homebase will review all application materials. Materials will be posted on the CoC website.

9/7   Enter E-SNAPS and start your project application (formerly Exhibit 2).
- E-snaps can be accessed at http://www.hud.gov/esnaps
- Please read all HUD-published guidance and training modules before calling HomeBase for technical assistance. The training modules can be accessed at https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/e-snaps/
- Additional and updated information about the 2021 competition can be found at https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/e-snaps/fy-2021-coc-program-nofa-coc-program-competition/

10/1 by Noon   Submit Complete Application Package via email for Review and Rank
- Please see the 2021 Supplemental Application Form for a list of all the materials to submit.

PLEASE SUBMIT THESE MATERIALS to sccnofa@homebaseccc.org

10/11 – 10/15   Review and Rank Interviews:
- Applicants will participate in an interview (via Zoom) with the Review and Rank Panel during the assigned time slots. These sessions are designed to permit the Review and Rank Panel to ask questions about your applications and to give applicants ideas about how to improve applications. You do not need to prepare a presentation; come prepared to engage in a discussion. You may bring as many people as you feel is necessary to represent your project well, but **please be sure to bring those who know the most about the application and supplemental materials**.

- Applicants will be assigned a specific time to meet with the Review & Rank Panel. All appointments will be held **on Zoom**.

10/25 by midnight   **Applicant Notification**
- Applicants will receive email notification of the results of the Review and Rank process.
- If you receive notification that your project will be placed on the ranked list, you should begin finalizing your application for submission.

10/26 by 12pm (noon)   Notification of Appeals Due
- Applicants who intend to appeal should contact HomeBase at sccnofa@homebaseccc.org to request scoring information.

10/28 by 12pm (noon) Appeals Due
- Appeals to the Review and Rank decision must be submitted in writing to HomeBase at sccnofa@homebaseccc.org.
- The Appeals Panel will meet on **October 28, 2021** and applicants who submit appeals will be notified of the Appeals Panel decision by **9pm on October 28, 2021**

10/29 at 10:00am   **NOFA Committee**
- The NOFA Committee will meet to review Tier Two and develop recommendations regarding strategic allocation of CoC funding.

11/5 by 5pm   **HUD Project Applications Finalized in E-Snaps**
- THIS INCLUDES ENSURING THAT ALL NECESSARY ATTACHMENTS ARE UPLOADED TO E-SNAPS. HomeBase will review every submission for omissions or inconsistencies and work with grant recipients to correct them. **During the final two weeks, please be sure that someone at your agency is available to answer last minute application questions!**

11/10   **CoC Consolidated Application Posted.**
- Complete consolidated application is posted on CoC website for public review.

11/16   **HUD deadline for submission of the CoC's full Consolidated Application.**

HUD Continuum of Care Program Grants
2021 LOCAL COMMUNITY REVIEW PROCESS
Approved: April 30, 2021

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

Prior to NOFA release:
- The 2021 NOFA Committee met, reviewed and made recommendations based on feedback from FY 2020 applicants and the 2020 Review and Rank Panel Committee to modify the competition process and scoring materials.
- The Executive Committee of the CoC Board reviewed and approved the NOFA Committee's recommended changes to the process and scoring materials, subject to necessary changes due to the NOFA.
- At least 4-5 non-conflicted Review and Rank panelists will be recruited by Homebase and the Collaborative Applicant. The panel will include at least one CoC Board member and a non-conflicted provider (ideally a provider with experience administering Federal, non-CoC grants). In addition, a Collaborative Applicant representative will attend panel meetings to act as a resource (leaving the room when a conflict requires it).
  - For purposes of Review and Rank panel participation, conflict will not extend to a substantially independent program or arm of a CoC recipient, subrecipient, or applicant organization, so long as the program is controlled by an independent board and does not receive or directly benefit from CoC funding or the potential award of a CoC grant in the 2021 competition.
- Homebase will assemble supplemental information for the Review and Rank Committee, including HMIS performance data.
- Renewal Applicants will respond to the Pre-NOFA Agency Capacity Panel request for information (RFI).
- The Pre-NOFA Review and Rank Panel meets and creates preliminary scores for pre-NOFA factors for agencies with renewal projects.
  - Homebase will distribute a summary of general panel feedback to assist applicants in responding to scores.

The Ranking and Reviewing process will proceed as follows:
- TA Workshop to release information about 2021 CoC NOFA and Local Competition open to all prospective applicants will be held, date to be determine based on NOFA release.
- Renewal housing project applicants will receive a report with Pre-NOFA Panel scores and preliminary scaled scores.
- All applicants will prepare and submit project application materials.
  - *Late Applications*. Applications received after the deadline will receive zero points in the scoring process. Since this may result in the project not being funded, this can be considered an appealable ranking decision.

- o *Administrative Errors.* Panelists shall have discretion to deduct up to 10 points from a project's total score for administrative errors, taking into consideration factors such as the extent of the error, due diligence in resolving the error, impact on the competition, and other factors subject to panelist discretion.
- Low performing projects will be encouraged to reallocate and potential applicants are encouraged to apply for new projects through reallocation.
- Review and Rank Panel members will be oriented to the process and will receive applications, project performance data and scoring materials.
- Review and Rank Panel Committee members will review and tentatively score the applications prior to their first meeting in a Homebase-developed web-based platform called PRESTO.
  - o Homebase/CoC staff will ensure all applications meet certain Threshold Requirements (additional detail below).
  - o New housing projects, first-time renewals, transfer housing projects, and first-time renewals after transfer will be scored using the New/Transfer Scoring Tool.
  - o Housing projects without a full year of data for the evaluation year will be scored using the New/Transfer Scoring Tool.
  - o New Expansion projects will be scored using the New/Transfer scoring tool. However, a New Expansion project will not be ranked above the renewal project that it proposes to expand. If a New Expansion project receives a higher score than the associated renewal project, it will be ranked directly below the renewal project.
  - o All other renewal housing projects will be scored using the Renewal Scoring Tool.
    - ▪ Projects that scored in the top 25% of renewal housing projects with at least a year of data, based on Pre-NOFA Panel and preliminary scaled scores, **will not receive further review by the Review and Rank Panel**. They will be ranked in Tier 1.
  - o New HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects will be automatically ranked at the top of Tier Two, immediately below the project that straddles Tier One and Two.
- Review and Rank Panel will meet over the course of 2-3 days to jointly discuss each application, conduct short in-person interview sessions with applicants to have questions answered and to provide feedback on ways to improve the application, and individually score applications:
  - o Ranked list(s) will be prepared based on raw scores, then translated to a tiered list.
  - o Renewal HMIS and Coordinated Entry projects will be automatically ranked in Tier One, immediately above the project that straddles Tier One and Two, if any. Another mechanism will be used to evaluate HMIS and Coordinated Entry outside the CoC NOFA Review and Rank process.

- The Panel will consider reallocating renewal projects. (See additional detail below). In the event that the Review and Rank Panel identifies a renewal project (or projects) whose funding should not be renewed (or funding should be decreased), the Panel will then determine whether any new proposed projects should be awarded and will proceed with reallocation (see detail below).
- Panel releases scoring results to applicants with reminder of appeals process. Homebase will distribute a summary of general panel feedback on select scoring factors.
- Appellate hearings are held, if requested. Results from appeal(s) are distributed.
- CoC Board or its designee considers and modifies/approves Priority List of Projects, which is then included in the County's Consolidated NOFA Application.
- Projects are given feedback from Committee on quality of application and ways to improve.
- County's Consolidated NOFA Application is made available for public review and reference.
- 2021 Process Debriefs are held with Review and Rank Panel Committee members, project applicants, and the collaborative applicant. This information will support the 2022 NOFA Committee in making recommendations for improvement for the 2022 competition.

Requests to alter an application post-submission:
The CoC expects applicants to submit final project proposals for consideration by the Review and Rank Panel, and applicants should not plan to change their proposed program design during the local review and rank process.

However, an applicant may submit a request to the CoC Board to change a proposed project after the Review and Rank Panel Meeting, if:
- The change is the result of unforeseen circumstances that arose during or after the Review and Rank Panel Meeting; *and*
- The change does not substantially alter the scope of the proposed project, other than to increase the project's capacity.

To request a change to a proposed project, the applicant must submit an application supplement form provided by the Collaborative Applicant. If the CoC Board determines that the requested change meets the criteria above, they may forward the request to the NOFA Committee for consideration at the post-appeals NOFA Committee meeting.

All other changes to project design may be pursued with HUD during or after contracting and may require a HUD grant amendment.

Reallocation

It is possible that funds will be reallocated from projects that will not receive renewal funding, or whose funding will be reduced. This is a decision made by the Review and Rank Panel after extensive deliberation. Only eligible renewal projects that have previously been renewed under the CoC Program will be considered for reallocation. When considering reallocation, the Review and Rank Panel will:

- Consider unspent funds and the ability to cut grants without cutting service/housing levels.
    - Panel members will receive training about the limitations related to spending CoC funds.
    - For projects receiving leasing or rental assistance, information about unspent funds will be presented together with information about agency capacity (serving the number of people the project is designed to serve).
    - Spend-down Threshold:
        - If a recipient spends 85% or less of their most recent grant, they will be required to submit a narrative explanation.
        - If a recipient spends 85% or less of two consecutive grants, the Collaborative Applicant will send them a written warning and instruct them to take steps to resolve the underspending.
        - If a recipient spends 85% or less of three consecutive grants, the Review and Rank Panel will discuss reallocation. The Review and Rank Panel should seek input from the recipient about the feasibility and impact of partial reallocation for their project.
- Consider history of reductions (e.g., if grant reduced one year, will not be apparent in spending the following year)
- Consider specific new permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing project(s) and specific renewal project(s) at risk of not being funded
- Consider alternative funding sources available to support either new or renewal project(s) at risk of not being funding
- Consider renewal HUD "covenant" concerns
- Consider impact on system performance and consolidated application's score
- Consider impact on the community in light of community needs

The impact of this policy is that high scoring projects may be reallocated if these considerations warrant that decision. In addition, if a project receives less than 75 points, then the Panel should strongly consider reallocation of funding.

Threshold
In addition to the scoring criteria, all new and renewal projects must meet a number of threshold criteria. A threshold review will take place prior to the review and rank process to ensure baseline requirements are met. These threshold criteria may be found in the Scoring Factors in the sections below.

Strategic Allocation of CoC Funding

The CoC is committed to using Continuum of Care Program funding efficiently and strategically as a component of the community's broader continuum of homeless housing and services, to maximize availability of high performing programs to end homelessness.

Following the Appeals Committee, the 2021 NOFA Committee will convene to review the Appeals Committee Ranked List and may make recommendations to the CoC Board regarding changes to the ranking of projects in Tier Two. Recommendations may address ranking only; recommendations regarding reallocation developed by the Review and Rank Panel and sustained by the Appeals Committee may not be considered or modified by the NOFA Committee after appeals are complete.

In recommending changes to the ranking of Tier Two projects, the NOFA Committee may consider the following:
- The project's ability to continue operations by accessing alternative sources of funding that are available if HUD CoC Program funding is not awarded.
- The impact on the CoC's bed or unit inventory and overall resources to address homelessness if a project is not awarded CoC funding. Information will be provided regarding number of beds and units, amount of grant request, operating year dates, population served, and current unit utilization rate.

Homebase will develop a process for providing information about projects to the NOFA Committee and guidelines for participation by applicants.

Any NOFA Committee recommendations to the CoC Board must be either:
- Consensus recommendations, or
- Recommendations based on a vote of at least 60% of the NOFA Committee members in attendance, in which case the vote must be recorded and given to the CoC Board alongside the recommendation of the voting majority as well as the grounds for opposition.
  - Each organization in attendance may cast one vote; each individual in attendance not representing an organization may cast one vote.

The CoC Board or its designee will approve the final project list for submission. The decision of the CoC Board will be final.

2021 Continuum of Care Program Grants
APPEALS PROCESS

The Review and Rank Panel Committee reviews all applications and ranks them for funding recommendations to HUD. That ranking decision will be communicated to all applicants by email by **midnight on October 25, 2021**. All applicants are directed to contact HomeBase at sccnofa@homebaseccc.org or 415-788-7961, ext. 305, if no email notice is received.

1.   **Who May Appeal**

An agency may appeal an "appealable ranking decision," defined in the next paragraph, made by the Review and Rank Panel concerning a project application submitted by that agency. If the project was submitted by a collaboration of agencies, only one joint appeal may be made.

2.   **What May Be Appealed**

"An appealable ranking decision" is a rank assigned by the Review and Rank Panel to a project that meets any of the following criteria:
   a) likely to result in the project not being funded, in whole or in part,
   b) places the project in the bottom 15% of Tier 1, or
   c) places the project in Tier 2.

3.   **Timing:**

The ranking decision is communicated to all applicants by **midnight on October 25, 2021**. Applicants have **until 12:00pm (noon) on October 26, 2021** to decide if they are going to appeal and notify HomeBase (sccnofa@homebaseccc.org) for more information, with a formal written appeal (no longer than 2 pages) due by **October 28, 2021 at 12:00pm (noon)**. If an appeal will be filed, other agencies whose rank may be affected will be notified as a courtesy. Such agencies will not be able to file an appeal after the appeals process is complete. They may file an appeal within the original appeals timeline.

4.   **Initiating the Formal Appeal**

The Formal Appeal must be submitted by **12:00pm (noon) on October 28, 2021** to Homebase at sccnofa@homebaseccc.org. The appeal document must consist of a short, written (no longer than 2 pages) statement of the agency's appeal of the Review and Rank Panel Committee's decision. The statement can be in the form of a letter, a memo, or an email transmittal.

5.   Members of the Appeal Panel

A 3-member Appeals Panel will be selected from the CoC Board or its designees. These individuals have no conflict of interest in serving, as defined by the existing Review and Rank Panel Committee conflict of interest rules. Voting members of the Appeal Panel shall not serve simultaneously on the Review and Rank Panel Committee; however, a Review and Rank Panel member and a staff person of the Collaborative Applicant will participate in the Appeals Panel meeting to inform discussion.

6. The Appeal Process, Including Involvement of Other Affected Agencies

The Appeal Panel will conduct a telephone meeting with a representative or representatives of the agency/collaborative who filed the appeal to discuss it on **October 28, 2021** if needed. The Panel will then deliberate.

The Appeal Panel will inform appealing agencies of its decision by **October 28, 2021 at 9:00pm.**

The CoC Board or its designee will approve the final project list for submission. The decision of the CoC Board will be final.

2021 Continuum of Care Grants
RENEWAL HOUSING PROJECTS
Scoring Tool
Approved: September 1, 2021

Summary of Factors	
Threshold Requirements	**Not Scored**
1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures[1]	**60 points**
2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity	**23 points**
3. HMIS Data Quality	**17 points**
Total	**100 points**
Component/Population-Type Prioritization Bonus Points[2]	Up to **17 points** per project

I.   Threshold Requirements

Threshold Criteria • These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates "no" for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency.
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry, when it is available for the project type.
HUD Threshold: Projects will be reviewed for compliance with the eligibility requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and Subsequent Notices and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2020 Notice of Funding Availability.
HUD Policies: Projects are required to have policies regarding termination of assistance, client grievances, Equal Access, ADA and fair housing requirements, VAWA protection, and confidentiality that are compliant with HUD CoC Program requirements.

---

[1] All of the scoring factors in this tool measure projects' contribution to improving Santa Clara County's System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care, through data collection, coordination, prioritization and increasing resources available to end homelessness in Santa Clara County. Certain scoring factors relate to specific Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor. Projects will be scored based on data in the CoC's HMIS, except for projects operated by victim service providers which will be scored based on data from the victim service provider's comparable database.

[2] Bonus points help ensure fairness and equal footing across scoring tools, which otherwise strongly advantage projects without data, and support prioritization of proven strong performers, while encouraging reallocation of projects not advancing system performance.

II.   Detail

1. Outcomes Supporting System Performance Measures: 60 Points

Overall, has the project been performing satisfactorily and effectively addressing the need(s) for which it was designed? Keep in mind that outcomes will naturally be lower in a population with more severe needs. Such populations include persons with low or no income, current or past substance abuse, a history of victimization (e.g., domestic violence, sexual assault, childhood abuse), criminal histories, and chronic homelessness.

1A: Utilization • Report average utilization of total project beds based on four points during the year • Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal
Criteria: Is the project serving the number of homeless people it was designed to serve? Panelists are encouraged to exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to average annual occupancy HMIS data provided by the applicant, occupancy rate trending up or down, project size, population served, and facility status issues beyond the project's sphere of influence. *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3*
Calculation: Average Number of Households Served Across Four Points in Time ÷ Units Funded **Data Sources:** [(APR 8b January Total + APR 8b April Total + APR 8b July Total + APR 8b October Total) ÷ 4] ÷ Project Application 4B Total Units OR 6A Total Households

Year 1 Scale	
85 – 100%	10 points
70 – 84.9%	8 points
55 – 69.9%	6 points
30 – 54.9%	2 points
0 – 29.9%	0 points
Scale for Older Projects	
90 – 100%	10 points
80 – 89.9%	8 points
70 – 79.9%	6 points
50 – 69.9%	2 points
0 – 50%	0 points

1B: Housing Stability (PSH Only)
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

For permanent supportive housing: The percentage of formerly homeless individuals who remain housed in the HUD permanent supportive housing project or exited to other permanent housing, excluding participants who passed away and participants who exited to non-psychiatric hospitals, foster care, or long-term care or nursing homes.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, population served and severity of barriers, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

2020-21 Community Benchmark: 98%

HUD System Performance Measures 3, 7

Calculation: (Total Stayers + Total Exits to PH) ÷ (Total Clients - Total Deceased)

APR Sources:
[APR 5a Stayers + APR 23c Permanent Dest. Subtotal] ÷ [APR 5a Persons Served - APR Q23c Deceased - APR Q23c Hospital – APR 23c Foster Care – APR 23c Long-term Care or Nursing Home]

Scale	
≥98%	15 points
96-97.9%	13 points
94-95.9%	11 points
92-93.9%	9 points
90-91.9%	7 points
85-89.9%	5 points
80-84.9%	4 points
75-79.9%	3 points
67.5-74.9%	2 points
60-67.4%	1 points
<60%	0 points

1B: Housing Stability (RRH/Youth TH Only)
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

For rapid rehousing/transitional housing: The percentage of homeless persons who exited the project to/in a form of permanent housing, excluding participants who passed away and participants who exited to non-psychiatric hospitals, foster care, or long-term care or nursing homes.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, the number of persons who exited the project, population served and severity of barriers, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.
- Projects with no leavers will receive full points.

2020-21 Community Benchmark:
RRH: 80%
TH: 50%

HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7

Calculation: Total Exits to PH ÷ (Total Leavers - Total Deceased)

APR Sources:
APR 23c Permanent Destinations Subtotal ÷ [APR 5a Leavers - APR 23c Deceased - APR Q23c Hospital – APR 23c Foster Care – APR 23c Long-term Care or Nursing Home]

Year One Scale	
≥95%	15 points
75-94.9%	14 points
60-74.9%	13 points
45-59.9%	12 points
40-44.9%	11 points
30-39.9%	9 points
20-29.9%	7 points
10-19.9%	3 points
<10%	0 points
RRH Scale	
≥95%	15 points
75-94.9%	13 points
60-74.9%	11 points
45-59.9%	9 points
40-44.9%	7 points
30-39.9%	5 points
20-29.9%	3 points
10-19.9%	1 points
<10%	0 points
Youth TH Scale	
≥90%	15 points
85-89.9%	13 points
80-84.9%	11 points
75-79.9%	9 points
70-74.9%	7 points
65-69.9%	5 points
60-64.9%	3 points
50-59.9%	1 points
<50%	0 points

1C: Returns to Homelessness Within 12 Months (Non-DV Projects Only)
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
The percentage of leavers to permanent housing destinations in the year prior to the measurement period who returned to a homeless project in HMIS within 12 months.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, household size, and the number of persons who exited the project in the prior year.
- Projects with no leavers in the prior year and projects without at least 2 years of performance data will receive full points.

2020-21 Community Benchmarks:
PSH: 5%
RRH: 8%
TH: 8%

HUD System Performance Measure 2

Calculation: Number of People Who Exited to PH in 2017 who Returned to Programs in HMIS ÷ Number of Exits to PH in 2016

Data Sources: [Looker Project Exit Date is in Exit Year; Exit Destination is permanent; Next Entry Without Stable Housing Date is within 12 months of exit] ÷ [Looker Project Exit Date is in Exit Year; Exit Destination is permanent]

PSH Scale	
<5%	7 points
5-7.9%	6 points
8-9.9%	5 points
10-29.9%	4 points
30-39.9%	3 points
40-59.9%	2 points
60-70%	1 points
>70%	0 points
RRH Scale	
<5%	7 points
5-7.9%	6 points
8-9.9%	5 points
10-29.9%	4 points
30-39.9%	3 points
40-49.9%	2 points
50-60%	1 points

>60%	0 points
Youth TH Scale	
<5%	7 points
5-9.9%	6 points
10-14.9%	5 points
15-34.9%	4 points
35-44.9%	3 points
45-54.9%	2 points
55-70%	1 points
>70%	0 points

1C1: Improving Safety through Safety Planning (DV Projects Only)
- Calculated based on HMIS data and supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
The percentage of survivors for whom a safety plan was completed.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size and the number of households served.

Calculation: Number of Survivors with Completed Safety Plans ÷ Number of Households Served

Data Sources: Number of Completed Safety Plans Reported by Project ÷ APR 8 Households Served

Scale	
100%	4 points
90-99.9%	3 points
<90%	0 points

1C2: Improving Safety through Services Provided
- Calculated based on supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
The number of supportive services categories available to clients on a voluntary basis, through referral or provided by the program, to support clients' physical, emotional, and economic safety and autonomy. Applicant will indicate which of the following services are available to clients enrolled in the project:
- Individual Counseling
- Group Counseling
- Criminal Justice Advocacy and Court Accompaniment
- Social Services Advocacy (e.g. Cal WORKS, schools, benefits applications, etc)
- Legal Assistance
- Employment Services
- Childcare

• Transportation • Landlord Outreach and Education • Education Advocacy and Support for School-Aged Children	

Scale	
9-10 Service Categories	3 points
7-8 Service Categories	2 points
5-6 Service Categories	1 point
<5 Service Categories	0 points

1D: Client Cash Income Change
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
The percentage of adult stayers/leavers that increase cash income from entry to latest annual assessment/exit, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, population served and severity of barriers, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

2020-21 Community Benchmarks:
Stayers: 35%
Leavers: 40%

HUD System Performance Measure 4

Calculation:
(Adults Who Gained Income + Adults Who Increased Amount of Income) ÷ (Adults - Stayers Not Required to Have Assessment)

APR Sources:
[APR19a3 Row 5 Column 4 + APR19a3 Row 5 Column 5] ÷ [APR5a Adults - APR18 Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment]

Year One Scale	
≥55%	5 points
35-54.9%	4 points
25-34.9%	3 points
15-24.9%	2 points
10-14.9%	1 points
<10%	0 points
Scale for Older Projects	

≥55%	5 points
40-54.9%	4 points
30-39.9%	3 points
20-29.9%	2 points
15-19.9%	1 points
<15%	0 points

1E: Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
The percentage of adult stayers/leavers with non-cash benefit sources, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

No Related Community Benchmarks

HUD System Performance Measure 2, 7b

Calculation:
(Adult Leavers with At Least 1 Benefit + Adult Stayers with At Least 1 Benefit) ÷ (Total Adults - Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment)

APR Sources:
[APR 20b 1Plus Sources Leavers + APR 20b 1Plus Sources Stayers] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

Scale	
≥60%	3 points
40-59.9%	2 points
10-39.9%	1 points
<10%	0 points

1F: Health Insurance
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
The percentage of stayers/leavers with health insurance, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to project size, population served, and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

No Related Community Benchmarks

HUD System Performance Measure 2, 7b

Calculation:
(Adult Stayers with 1 or More Sources of Health Insurance + Adult Leavers with 1 or More Sources of Health Insurance) ÷ (Total Adults - Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment)

APR Sources:
[APR 21 Stayers 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Stayers More than 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Leavers 1 Source of Health Insurance + APR 21 Leavers More than 1 Source of Health Insurance] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR 18 Adult Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Assessment]

Scale	
≥95%	5 points
85-94.9%	4 points
75-84.9%	3 points
65-74.9%	2 points
55-64.9%	1 points
<55%	0 points

1G: Alignment with Housing First Principles
- Based on written policies and procedures and narrative response submitted as part of the proposal.
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 15

Criteria:
5 Points: To what extent do the project's written policies and procedures ensure that participants are not screened out based on the following criteria?
- Having too little or no income
- Active, or history of, substance use or a substance use disorder
- Having a criminal record (with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions)
- History of domestic violence (e.g., lack of a protective order, period of separation from abuser, or law enforcement involvement)

5 Points: To what extent do the project's written policies and procedures ensure that participants are not terminated from the program for the following reasons?
- Failure to participate in supportive services (with exception for HUD-mandated monthly case management meeting for RRH program participants)
- Failure to make progress on a service plan
- Loss of income or failure to improve income

- Being a survivor of domestic violence
- Any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found in the project's geographic area

5 Points: Does the project take proactive steps to minimize barriers to entry and retention?

HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7

2. Agency/Collaborative Capacity: 23 Points

2A: Compliance
- Based on any financial audit, HUD monitoring report and correspondence, and supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal.
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 5

Criteria:
To what extent do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have:
- Any outstanding financial audit findings or concerns?
- Any outstanding HUD monitoring findings or concerns and/or any history of sanctions imposed by HUD, including – but not limited to – suspending disbursements (e.g., freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues?
- If yes, what steps is the agency taking to resolve the findings or concerns and to what extent has the program advised the Collaborative Applicant of issues identified by HUD?

If an agency has no outstanding audit or monitoring findings or concerns and no history of sanctions imposed by HUD, the agency should receive full points.

2B: Unspent Grant Funds
- Based on supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
Has the agency left project grant funds unspent in the past 3 years?
- Consider if the program is running at capacity (at four points during the year), and if the project receives leasing or rental assistance funding.
Panelists may score programs up or down from the scaled score.

Scale	
0-3%	5 points
3.1-9%	3 points
9.1-15%	1 points
15-100%	0 points

2C: Alignment with CoC Priorities
- Based on narrative submitted as part of the proposal
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 8

Criteria:
Do the project and agency align with and support CoC priorities, including but not limited to:

1 Point: CoC participation (meeting and training attendance)

3 Points: Services provided or described are adequate to meet the needs of the population served, as indicated by:
- Case manager to client ratio
- The type of services provided (housing navigation, substance use treatment, trauma informed care, youth-targeted programming, etc.)
- A clear, comprehensive service delivery strategy/plan
- For projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, the degree to which agency's program design promotes client safety.

3 Points: The project contributes to the community plan goal of 6,000 new housing opportunities and maximizes the number of people exiting homelessness. For example:
- Project employs landlord engagement strategies
- Project proposes to increase the number of persons served
- Contribution of project to improving system performance
- Project has or participates in a move on program or strategy

1 Point: Sources of match funding are stable and sustainable

2D: Client Participation in Program Design and Policy-Making
- This will be scored based on a narrative response demonstrating client participation in program design and policy-making.
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 5

Criteria:
Does the agency engage homeless and formerly homeless clients in program design and policy-making?

2 Points: Agency has at least one strategy for gathering client feedback and input. Strategies may include, but are not limited to:
- Having at least one homeless or formerly homeless person on its staff or board
- Having a consumer advisory board that meets regularly
- Administering consumer satisfaction surveys
- Convening client focus groups

3 Points: Agency incorporates client feedback in program design and/or policy-making.

3. HMIS Data Quality: 17 Points

3A: Exits to Known Destinations
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
Percentage of clients who exit to known destinations.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to limited project exits and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

PSH with 0 exits receive full points.

Calculation:
(Total Leavers - Leavers With Don't Know/Refused Destinations - Leavers With Missing Destinations) ÷ Total Leavers

APR Sources:
[APR5a Leavers - APR23a Total Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused - APR23b Total Client Doesn't Know/Client Refused - APR23a Total Data Not Collected - APR23b Total Data Not Collected] ÷ APR5a Leavers

Scale	
95-100%	4 points
90-94.9%	3 points
80-89.9%	2 points
60-79.9%	1 points
<60%	0 points

3B: Complete Data
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
Percentage of complete data (not null/missing, "don't know" or "refused" data, "data issues" or "error"), as reported in APR 6a, 6b, and 6c, except for Social Security numbers.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to limited project exits and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Community Performance Measure: 95%

Calculation:
(Sum of Client Doesn't Know/Refused + Information Missing + Data Issues + Error Count for 14 data elements in APR Questions 6a-6c, excluding SSN) ÷
(14 * Total Served)

APR Sources:
[**APR6a Client Don't Know Refused** for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender **+**
APR6a Information Missing for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender **+**
APR6a Data Issues for Name, Date of Birth, Race, Ethnicity, Gender **+**
APR 6b Error Count for Veteran Status, Project Start Date, Relationship to Head of Household, Client Location, Disabling Condition **+**
APR 6c Error Count for Destination, Income and Sources at Start, Income and Sources at Annual Assessment, Income and Sources at Exit] **÷**
[14 * APR5a Total Served]

Scale	
99.5-100%	5 points
97-99.4%	4 points
94.5-96.9%	3 points
92-94.4%	2 points
90.1-91.9%	1 points
<90%	0 points

3C: Known Income
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
Percentage of adult clients with known income at latest annual assessment or exit, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to small project size and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation:
(Adult Stayers With Known Income + Adult Leavers With Known Income) ÷ (Adults - Stayers Not Yet Required to Have an Annual Assessment)

APR Sources:
[APR18 Adults with Income Information at Annual Assessment + APR18 Adults with Income Information at Exit] ÷ [APR5a Adults - APR18 Stayers Not Yet Required]

Scale	
95-100%	4 points
90-94.9%	3 points
80-89.9%	2 points
60-79.9%	1 points
<60%	0 points

3D: Known Benefits
- Calculated based on HMIS data
- Informed by supplemental information submitted as part of the proposal

Criteria:
Percentage of adult clients with known benefits at latest annual assessment or exit, excluding all stayers not yet required to have an annual assessment.
- Panelists may exercise discretion based on factors including but not limited to small project size and circumstances beyond the project's sphere of influence.

Calculation:
(Adult Stayers With Known Non-Cash Benefits + Adult Leavers With Known Non-Cash Benefits) ÷ (Total Adults - Stayers Not Yet Required to Have Annual Assessments)

APR Sources:
[APR20b Adult Leavers No Sources + APR20b Adult Leavers 1Plus Sources + APR20b Adult Stayers No Sources + APR20b Adult Stayers 1Plus Sources] ÷ [APR 5a Adults - APR18 Stayers Not Yet Required]

Scale	
95-100%	4 points
90-94.9%	3 points
80-89.9%	2 points
60-79.9%	1 points
<60%	0 points

3E: Data Accuracy

Penalty: -1

Criteria:
- Applicants who request to correct HMIS data past the APR review deadline and during the evaluation report review process will be penalized by 1 point.

---

4. **Component/Population Type Prioritization: Up to 17 Bonus Points**

4A: Permanent Housing

Total Points: 10

Criteria:
10 Points: Permanent supportive housing will be awarded 10 bonus points to demonstrate the CoC's funding priorities.

5 Points: Rapid rehousing projects will be awarded 5 bonus points to demonstrate the CoC's funding priorities.

4B: Chronic Homelessness

Total Points: 5

Criteria:
Percentage of beds dedicated to/prioritized for chronically homeless persons.
- DedicatedPLUS PSH projects receive full points.

Scale	
100%	5 points
>75%	3 points

4C: Other Priority Populations
Total Points: 2

Criteria:
Is the program dedicated to a priority population?
    • Youth
    • Survivors of Domestic Violence
    • Families with Children
    • Veterans

2021 Continuum of Care Grants
NEW/TRANSFER PROJECTS AND PROJECTS WITHOUT A FULL YEAR OF DATA
Approved: September 1, 2021

Summary of Factors	
Threshold Requirements	**Not Scored**
1. Project's Work Consistent with Community Needs	**10 points**
2. Project Ability to Enhance System Performance[*]	**50 points**
3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity to Enhance System Performance	**34 points**
4. HMIS Participation	**6 points**
Total	**100 points**
5. Component/Population-Type Prioritization Bonus Points[†]	Up to **10 points** Per Project

I.   Threshold Requirements

Threshold Criteria   • These factors are required, but not scored. If the project indicates "no" for any threshold criteria, it is ineligible for CoC funding.
HMIS Implementation: Projects are required to participate in HMIS, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency.
Coordinated Entry: Projects are required to participate in Coordinated Entry, when it is available for the project type.
Eligible Applicant: Applicants and subrecipients (if any) are eligible to receive CoC funding, including non-profit organizations, States, local governments, and instrumentalities of state and local governments.
Eligible New Project Type: If the project is a new project in 2021, it is an eligible new project type authorized by the FY 2021 CoC Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO): Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), or joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Re-Housing (TH-RRH) serving eligible populations; Homeless Management Information System (HMIS); or Supportive Services Only for Coordinated Entry (CE).
HUD Threshold: All projects will be reviewed for compliance with the eligibility requirements of the CoC Interim Rule and Subsequent Notices and must meet the threshold requirements outlined in the 2021 NOFO.

---

[*] All of the scoring factors in this tool measure projects' anticipated contribution to improving Santa Clara County's System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care, through data collection, coordination, prioritization and increasing resources available to end homelessness in Santa Clara County. Certain scoring factors relate to specific Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor.

[†] Bonus points help ensure fairness and equal footing across scoring tools, which otherwise strongly advantage projects without data, and support prioritization of proven strong performers, while encouraging reallocation of projects not advancing system performance.

HUD Policies: Projects are required to have compliant policies regarding termination of assistance, client grievances, Equal Access, ADA and fair housing requirements, VAWA protection, and confidentiality.

Renewable Activities: Projects are required to utilize the grant funds for renewable activities (e.g., leasing rental subsidies, and housing operations) as opposed to non-renewable ones (e.g., acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation).

II.   Detail

1.   Project's Work Consistent with Community Needs: 10 Points

1A: Project Readiness
Total Points: 10
Criteria: The project will be ready to start by HUD's statutory deadlines. Consider: • Regulatory obstacles such as tenant displacement or relocation, environmental or zoning issues anticipated; • Whether the agency has a feasible timeline for staffing the project, establishing site control, beginning to draw down funds, and otherwise complying with CoC Program deadlines; 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.   Project Ability to Enhance System Performance: 47 Points

Consider the overall design of the project in light of its outcome objectives, and the Continuum of Care's goal that permanent housing programs for homeless people result in stable housing and increased income (through benefits or employment).

2A: Program Design
Total Points: 15
Criteria: Program design includes provision of comprehensive/intensive case management and appropriate supportive services of the appropriate type, scale and location to meet the needs of program participants (as well as transportation if necessary), using a Housing First model. [†] Consider: **7 Points:** Has the agency developed a concrete plan for providing services to clients and/or referring clients to outside services for support*, including: • What is the step-by-step process for connecting clients to services outside the agency? • What types of services will be provided in-house? • What types of services will require referrals? • What agencies will accept referrals? • What is the step-by-step process for developing client service plans and matching clients with services? What tools and evidence-based practices will be used? * For RRH applicants: Will services described adequately support clients in securing employment and achieving long-term housing stability? **3 Points:** Will the project be staffed appropriately to provide the services? **2 Points:** Will the staff be trained to meet the needs of the population to be served?

3 Points: To what extent will the program be able to effectively serve eligible clients of different backgrounds, experiences, cultures, abilities, and language proficiencies?

[†] For projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, safety is a primary need of the population served. Among other needs, the panel should consider the extent to which program design promotes client safety. It is considered a best practice for programs serving survivors of domestic violence to have certified domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or human trafficking advocates (40- or 65-hour training course) to provide confidential supportive services.

HUD System Performance Measures 2, 3, 7b

2B: Program Outcomes

Total Points: 15

Criteria:
Has the agency demonstrated, through past performance, the ability to successfully carry out the work proposed and effectively provide services to people experiencing housing crises? [†] Consider:

5 Points: The agency's experience and outcomes related to the following or comparable measures of housing stability and increased income in any prior housing projects:
- **For permanent supportive housing:** The percentage of formerly homeless individuals who remain housed in the HUD permanent supportive housing project or exited to other permanent housing, excluding participants who passed away;
- **For rapid rehousing/transitional housing:** The percentage of homeless persons who exited the project to/in a form of permanent housing, excluding participants who passed away;
- **For all projects:** The percentage of stayers/leavers that increase cash income from entry to latest status/exit;
- **For all projects:** The percentage of stayers/leavers with non-cash benefit sources.

5 Points: How the agency has analyzed the outcomes and improved program design and service delivery.

5 Points: The extent to which the agency has taken proactive steps to minimize barriers to housing placement and retention and actively support highly vulnerable and high-needs clients to obtain and maintain housing in prior housing projects.

[†] For projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, the agency should provide examples of outcomes and program operations for existing or prior housing projects that serve(d) a similar population.

HUD System Performance Measures 2, 3, 4, 7b

2C: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

Total Points: 5

Criteria:
The program design ensures that housing will be available and accessible to the diverse population of persons experiencing homelessness, and the agency will take proactive steps to promote fair access to housing without regard to race, ancestry, religion, disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, genetic information, marital status, familial status, and source of income. Consider:

- How will the program ensure clients receive reasonable accommodations whenever they are needed?

- How will the program ensure that clients know their housing rights and are protected from housing discrimination based on race, ancestry, religion, disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, genetic information, marital status, familial status, and source of income?

HUD System Performance Measures 2, 3, 7b

2D: Alignment with Housing First Principles
- This will be scored based on written policies and procedures submitted by the project and responses to supplemental questions.
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 15

Criteria:
5 Points: To what extent do the project's written policies and procedures ensure that participants will not be screened out based on the following criteria?
- Having too little or no income;
- Active, or history of, substance use or a substance use disorder;
- Having a criminal record (with exceptions for state-mandated restrictions);
- History of domestic violence (e.g., lack of a protective order, period of separation from abuser, or law enforcement involvement).

5 Points: To what extent do the project's written policies and procedures ensure that participants will not be terminated from the program for the following reasons?
- Failure to participate in supportive services (with exception for HUD-mandated monthly case management meeting for RRH program participants);
- Failure to make progress on a service plan;
- Loss of income or failure to improve income;
- Being a survivor of domestic violence;
- Any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found in the project's geographic area.

5 Points: What proactive steps does the agency propose to take to minimize barriers to housing placement and retention in the proposed project?

HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7

---

3. Agency/Collaborative Capacity to Enhance System Performance: 28 Points

---

3A: Administrative Capacity

Total Points: 10

Criteria:
Do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have the expertise, staff, procedural, and administrative structure needed to meet all administrative requirements? Consider:
- Has the agency successfully handled at least one other federal grant or other major grant of this size and complexity, either in or out of the CoC?
- Does the agency have a clear staffing plan and a project budget that covers grant management?
- Does the budget show that the project will have enough resources to provide high-quality, reliable services to the target population?

> - Does the budget show that the project will leverage significant outside resources (funding, staff, building space, volunteers, etc.) rather than rely entirely on CoC funds?
>
> Does the budget show that the project is taking appropriate measures promote cost effectiveness?

3B: Compliance
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 5

Criteria:
To what extent do the agencies (especially the lead agency)/does the agency have:
- Any outstanding financial audit findings or concerns?
- Any outstanding HUD monitoring findings or concerns and/or any history of sanctions imposed by HUD, including – but not limited to – suspending disbursements (e.g., freezing LOCCS), requiring repayment of grant funds, or de-obligating grant funds due to performance issues?
- If yes, what steps is the agency taking to resolve the findings or concerns and to what extent has the program advised the Collaborative Applicant of issues identified by HUD?

If an agency has no outstanding audit or monitoring findings or concerns and no history of sanctions imposed by HUD, the agency should receive full points.

3C: Alignment with CoC Priorities
- Agencies can submit an essay answer demonstrating CoC alignment.
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 10

Criteria:
Do the project and agency align with and support CoC priorities, including but not limited to:

1 Point: CoC participation (meeting and training attendance)

5 Points: Services provided or described are adequate to meet the needs of the population served, as indicated by:
- Case manager to client ratio;
- The type of services provided (housing navigation, substance use treatment, trauma informed care, youth-targeted programming, etc.);
- A clear, comprehensive service delivery strategy/plan;
- For projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and/or human trafficking, the degree to which agency's program design promotes client safety.

3 Points: The project will contribute to the community plan goal of 6,000 new housing opportunities and maximizes the number of people exiting homelessness. For example:
- Project will employ landlord engagement strategies;
- Project will contribute to improving system performance;
- Project has a move on program or strategy.

1 Point: Sources of match funding are stable and sustainable.

3D: Client Participation in Program Design and Policy-Making
- This will be scored based on written policies and procedures submitted by the project and a narrative response demonstrating client participation in program design and policy-making.
- This factor is scored by the Pre-NOFA Panel.

Total Points: 9

Criteria:
Does the agency engage homeless and formerly homeless clients in program design and policy-making?

6 Points: Agency commits to having one or more of the following strategies for gathering client feedback and input.

High-Priority Strategies
- Having at least one homeless or formerly homeless person on its board;
- Having a consumer advisory board that meets regularly.

Additional Strategies
- Having at least one homeless or formerly homeless person on its staff;
- Administering consumer satisfaction surveys;
- Convening client focus groups;
- Other strategies

3 Points: Agency has a plan for incorporating client feedback in program design and/or policy-making.

4. HMIS Participation: 6 Points

4: HMIS Participation

Total Points: 6

Criteria:
If the agency has other programs, do they demonstrate HMIS participation or participation in a similar database? The panel may consider:
- Percentage of null/missing, "don't know," or "refused" data\
- The percentage of clients that exit to known destinations
- The percentage of clients with known income and benefits
- Percent of clients who are required to have annual assessments and do not have them
- Average length of time between when a client enters or exits a program and when the project records the entry or exit
- Other data quality measures provided by the agency

Does the agency have a process for analyzing and improving data quality?

5. Component/Population-Type Prioritization: Up to 15 Bonus Points

5A: Permanent Supportive Housing

Total Points: 10

Criteria:
Permanent supportive housing serving chronically homeless individuals and families will be awarded bonus points to demonstrate the CoC's funding priorities.

5B: Rapid Rehousing
Total Points: 5
Criteria: Rapid rehousing projects serving high priority populations (such as families and transition-aged youth coming directly from streets, shelter, or other places not meant for human habitation, or persons fleeing domestic violence or trafficking) will be awarded bonus points to demonstrate the CoC's funding priorities. These points will not be awarded to joint TH-RRH projects.

5C: Leveraging Housing or Healthcare Resources
Total Points: 5
Criteria: Permanent supporting housing or rapid rehousing projects that submit at least one written commitment that meets **at least one** of the criteria below will be awarded bonus points. The written commitment can be a letter of commitment, contract, or other formal written documents that demonstrates one of the criteria below. *Criteria 5C1: Leveraging Housing Resources:* Housing subsidies or subsidized housing units not funded through the CoC or ESG programs that account for: • 25% of PSH units; **OR** • Housing for 25% of RRH participants. *Criteria 5C1: Leveraging Healthcare Resources:* Resources from a healthcare provider or public or private health insurance provider of at least: • In the case of a substance abuse treatment or recovery provider, access to treatment or recovery services for all qualifying and interested program participants; **OR** • An amount that is equivalent to 25% of the funding being requested for the project will be covered by the healthcare organization. Sources of health care resources include direct contributions from a public or private health insurance provider to the project, or provision of health care services by a private or public organization tailored to the program participants of the project. **Partial Points:** New PSH and RRH project applications will receive 2 of the 5 bonus points for attaching any written commitment of housing or healthcare resources, even if they do not meet the threshold for amount of commitment (e.g. a housing commitment of fewer than 25% of PSH units).