

Governing Board Meeting: Thursday, July 28, 2022

In-Person Option: 3205 Freedom Drive, Entrance D, Suite 2000

Zoom: <https://zoom.us/j/92847713203?pwd=WTluSW9UdUYwdS9keDFqcGNXRy9Udz09>

Board Members			
Anna London, Chair	Deronda Metz, Vice Chair	Trish Hobson, Secretary	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
Sonia Jenkins	Brian Kovaleski	Karen Pelletier	Warren Wooten
James Searcy	Hope Marshall	Kaedon Grinnell	James Lee
Kenny Robinson	Jane Shutt	Timica Melvin	Elizabeth Trotman
Lucy Crain	Tiffany Price	Tchernavia Montgomery	Kim Ciepcielinski

Agenda

Time	Item	Facilitator
2:00pm-2:05pm	Welcome, attendance	Anna London (welcome) Branden Lewis (attendance)
2:05pm-2:10pm	Public Comment: General Remarks	Anna London
2:10pm	VOTE Motion: Approve meeting minutes (June 23, 2022)	Anna London
2:10pm-2:30pm	Agency Spotlight: Care Ring	Tchernavia Montgomery
2:30pm-2:40pm	A Home for All Framework Implementation	Kathryn Firmin-Sellers
2:40pm-2:50pm	Landlord Engagement Workgroup Report Out VOTE Motion: Execute contract with Erica Snyder Consulting, LLC	James Lee Branden Lewis
2:50pm-3:05pm	Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHV) Report Out	Timica Melvin
3:05pm-3:30pm	CoC Funding Priorities VOTE Motion: Approve ranking (funding) priorities for CoC funding (Unsheltered NOFO & regular NOFO) Motion: Approve scorecard components	Jessica Lefkowitz & Ginny McManus (co-chairs, unsheltered homelessness workgroup) Erin Nixon
3:30pm-3:40pm	Collaborative Applicant Staff Updates: 1. Unsheltered NOFO 2. National Alliance to End Homelessness Conference	Branden Lewis Erin Nixon
3:40pm-4:00pm	Agency Updates Request for August meeting agenda items	All
4:00pm	Adjourn	Anna London

Next CoC Governing Board meeting: Thursday, August 25, 2022; 2pm-4pm

Next CoC Full Membership meeting: Wednesday, October 12, 2022; 2:00pm-3:30pm

Our Vision: Homelessness is rare, brief and non-recurring in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Community. Everyone has housing choices and prompt access to a variety of housing resources and supports that meet their needs.

**CoC Governing Board
Meeting Minutes
June 23, 2022**

The meeting of the CoC Governing Board was held on June 23, 2022, as a hybrid in-person/virtual meeting. The in-person portion was held at the Valarie Woodard Center; Virtual was held via Zoom. Anna London, Board Chair called the meeting to order at 2:03pm.

Board Members Present: Trish Hobson, James Searcy, James Lee, Kenny Robinson, Tiffany Price, Kaedon Grinnell, Jane Shutt, Brian Kovaleski, Kathryn Firmin-Sellers, Tchernavia Montgomery, Kim Ciepielinski, Sonia Jenkins, Warren Wooten, Hope Marshall, Timica Melvin

Board Members Absent: Anna London, Lucy Crain, Deronda Metz, Karen Pelletier, Elizabeth Trotman

CoC Staff Present: Branden Lewis, Erin Nixon

Guests Present: Amanda Harry (QCity Metro), Valerie Townsend (CoC Lived Experience Committee), Amina Tillett (Atrium Health), Christopher Brzovic (intern, Lotus Campaign), Iris Hubbard (Shelter Health Services), Nicole Dewitt (Social Serve), Maya Marshall (Jubilee Empowerment), Janice Hinton (Hope House Foundation), Kim Sanders (Meck County CSS), Madeline Thomas (Mecklenburg County Shelter Plus Care)

Welcome (Trish Hobson), Attendance (Branden Lewis): Quorum present; Members of the public introduced themselves in the chat with name and organization.

Public Comment: General Remarks (Branden Lewis): Betty Alexander from Faith Liberation Community Christian Church introduced herself and shared her observations on the needs of the homeless she interacts with.

Vote: Approve meeting minutes from May 26, 2022, meeting (Motion: Kathryn Firmin-Sellers, Second: James Lee) – meeting minutes were approved.

Executive Committee Report (Trish Hobson): Trish explained that the Executive Committee is always open to Board members' suggestions when setting the agenda. She asked that anyone who requests to make a presentation at a CoC board meeting or CoC full membership meeting is a CoC member. Trish also requested for any questions or comments about the 2022-23 CoC Board Strategic Plan prior to the vote.

Vote: Approve the 2022-23 Board Strategic Plan (Motion: Kenny Robinson, Second: Jane Shutt). Motion was approved.

Agency Spotlight: The Relatives (Trish Hobson): Trish gave an overview of The Relatives and how the agency interacts with the CoC.

A Home for All Framework Implementation (Erin Nixon): Erin announced that United Way will be the enduring structure overseeing implementation. Kathryn Firmin-Sellers explained the steps she has

taken to move toward creating infrastructure including hiring consultants and posting new staff positions.

NC DHHS ESG & CoC Funding Priorities (Erin Nixon): Erin explained that the NOFO will be coming out soon. It is the board's responsibility to set the funding priorities. Erin recommend we put split the State ESG funding 50/50 between Crisis Response and Housing Stability.

Vote: Split State ESG 50/50 between Crisis Response and Housing Stability with priorities of Shelter within Crisis Response and Prevention within Housing Stability (Motion: Warren Wooten, Second: James Lee)

Amended motion: Split State ESG 50/50 between Crisis Response and Housing Stability with priorities of Shelter within Crisis Response and Rapid Rehousing within Housing Stability (Motion: Trish Hobson, Second: Kathryn Firmin-Sellers). Motion Approved

Erin recommended CoC funding priorities in this order: Permanent Supporting Housing, Coordinated Entry, Rapid Rehousing. The board decided to postpone the vote on this until there is more information from HUD.

Collaborative Applicant Staff Updates (Branden Lewis, Erin Nixon): Branden and Erin asked the board to approve submission of the YHDP program application

Vote: Approve submission of YHDP application to HUD (Motion: Kenny Robinson, Second Kathryn Firmin-Sellers). Motion was approved

Agency Updates (All):

1. **Kim Ciepielinski:** Crisis Assistance Ministry will receive a large shipment of air conditioning units. If you're agency knows of people with a specific need, please let Kim know.
2. **Kenny Robinson:** Freedom Fighting Missionaries received additional funding around healthcare. For anyone serving justice-involved people who are uninsured or underinsured, please let Kenny know.

Suggestions for Agenda items:

- Kathryn Firmin-Sellers -- Supportive Employment
- Tchernavia Montgomery -- Care Ring would like to share what they achieved with ESG funds

Vote: Trish asked the group to vote on whether they prefer to meet in the same location each month at the County building or rotate locations: There were 6 votes to rotate, 5 votes to remain in the same location

Motion to Adjourn the Meeting: Motion: Kathryn Firmin-Sellers

Meeting adjourned at 3:39pm.

SUBMITTAL COVER

*Response to request for scope for Charlotte-
Mecklenburg Continuum of Care:*

**LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT
SYSTEM CONSULTING**



Prepared by:

Erica Snyder Consulting, LLC

Erica Snyder, Founder
3700 Highland Dr.
Carlsbad, CA 92008
206.818.5244
esnuderconsulting@gmail.com

ERICA SNYDER
CONSULTING, LLC

PROPOSAL

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Continuum of Care (CoC) is seeking an experienced landlord engagement system consultant to assess and evaluate its current system. This process should result in recommendations for systemwide changes to increase/scale the existing strategy to allow for a steady pipeline of available housing units for to lease to those experiencing homelessness. Additionally, the CoC would to use this process to deepen the trust between all partners, ranging from service providers to the operator of the landlord engagement system, to ensure the community is moving forward with a collective vision and clarity over roles in the housing search and landlord engagement system.

The CoC has requested strategic consulting services to support the evaluation and partnership development for its existing landlord engagement system.

ERICA SNYDER CONSULTING, LLC EXPERIENCE

Erica Snyder Consulting was founded by Erica Snyder to provide innovative, strategic solutions to facilitate the growth of thriving, inclusive, and vibrant communities. Erica Snyder is a results-driven strategist with the ability to identify the big picture and create building blocks to achieve the vision. She has successfully guided organizational strategy, helping state and local governments identify their vision, to build consensus, to add value, and to inspire actions that move strategic priorities forward. Her specialties include: strategic planning, change management, community engagement, program development, contract monitoring, training, and research. Her broad experience spans the public and nonprofit sectors, including local, state, and federal governments, national networks of nonprofits, and philanthropy.

Erica has been involved at the inception of new ventures and instrumental in creating infrastructure and policy for entities impacting complex social issues, such as homelessness, housing, and community development. Her work includes the development and administration of San Diego's centralized landlord engagement program, [Housing Our Heroes](#), on behalf of the San Diego Housing Commission. This landlord engagement effort was designed to provide 1,000 housing placements to veterans experiencing homelessness. The program was designed to serve Veterans with a housing subsidy (rapid rehousing or a housing choice voucher). Housing Our Heroes used a combination of financial incentives and benefits, as well as a team of dedicated staff focused on landlord recruitment and retention. The incentive package was developed based on extensive research of similar communities, feedback from landlords and area apartment associations, service providers, and focus groups of Veterans experiencing homelessness. Below outlines the primary incentives and benefits offered through the program:

Landlord Incentives	Benefits
\$500 for first unit rented to a homeless Veteran	24-hour landlord assistance
\$250 for each additional unit	Security deposit & utility assistance
Holding Fees	Contingency Fund
	Supportive services
	Credit check & application fee assistance
	Pre-inspections
	Online listing service

San Diego historically has a tight rental market; at the launch of Housing Our Heroes the community had a 3.4% rental vacancy rate. The success of the landlord engagement program was contingent of extensive partnerships with the CoC, property owner industry partners, public partners (including electeds) and people searching for housing.

Housing Our Heroes used data from San Diego Housing Commission’s HUD VASH program (Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing) as a baseline for length of time Veterans were searching for housing. Prior to Housing Our Heroes, the average search time (as determined by the number of days from voucher issuance to lease up) for VASH voucher holders was 133 days. The median is 125 days. Housing Our Heroes tracked data from voucher issuance to lease-up to determine progress. Housing Our Heroes did not have initial data on rapid rehousing lease-up times, but used data from its first year to establish a baseline. Below provides the data for each subsidy type.

Subsidy Type	Mean	Median
VASH	80 days	69 days
RRH	48 days	34 days
Both Populations	72 days	57 days

Housing Our Heroes tracked multiple data points/outcomes, including landlord recruitment as measured by the number of new and existing landlords who advertised units through the program.

	Number (#)	Percentage (%)
New Landlords	180	41%
Existing Landlords	255	59%
Total Unique Landlords	435	100%

Housing Our Heroes used a collaborative approach to identify and implement landlord engagement strategies, ranging from media buys to having individual meetings with landlords. Through all these efforts, over 1,000 veterans were housed

over a period of 18-months. Based on the [success of the program](#), it was expanded to be offered to all populations experiencing homelessness and transitioned to [LEAP](#) (Landlord Engagement and Assistance Program) and grew the program's budget from an initial budget of \$3.4 million annually to over \$5 million, serving a minimum of 1,000 households a year.

Erica was also hired by HOM, Inc. to develop and launch Maricopa County's first-ever centralized landlord engagement program, [Threshold](#). Maricopa County's rapid population growth has caused the housing market to see unprecedented rent increases. Threshold was designed to provide landlord engagement services, including financial incentives and dedicated staff, to increase the available housing inventory for people experiencing homelessness. Lastly, Erica has facilitated strategic planning efforts for public entities such as the UC Davis Health System, the Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Sonoma County Community Development Commission to support the creation of large-scale goals and strengthening relationships between teams.

Erica is currently providing federal technical assistance on behalf of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) related to the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) funding, specifically the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG-CV) funding. This work includes guiding state and local governments to strategically invest and monitor their ESG-CV funding to effectively redesign the homeless service system, with an emphasis on rehousing people experiencing homelessness, while adhering to federal regulations. Erica is also providing HUD technical assistance to public housing authorities for the Emergency Housing Voucher program, focusing specifically on landlord engagement and retention. Erica holds a Masters in Social Work from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, focusing on community, management, and policy, and a Bachelor of Arts in Justice from American University, Washington, DC.

SCOPE OF WORK

Erica Snyder Consulting has expertise related to developing and administering landlord engagement programs, specifically for those experiencing homelessness. Erica Snyder will work with the CoC and relevant partners to review existing centralized landlord engagement materials, strategies, and local initiatives, and support the development of strategy needed for the landlord engagement system to achieve the needed community impact and deliverables.

Our proposed strategy for this scope of work includes:

1. Strategic thought partner with project leadership
2. Assessing & Scaling Existing Landlord Engagement Efforts
3. Stakeholder engagement and facilitation
4. Ongoing technical assistance

TASK 1, STRATEGIC THOUGHT PARTNER WITH PROJECT LEADERSHIP.

Erica Snyder Consulting will conduct initial information gathering, planning, and schedule a kick-off meeting with the Landlord Engagement Workgroup and

identified key partners. The purpose of this meeting will be to introduce the staff and project team, review the contract, confirm and revise the workplan, confirm roles and responsibilities, and coordinate start-up. Erica Snyder will coordinate and convene check-in meetings with the Landlord Engagement System Contract Project Manager virtually a minimum of once a month and will maintain regular communication throughout the contract. Lastly, Erica Snyder Consulting will create and adhere to a timeline for producing deliverables as agreed upon by the CoC, but prior to the end of the contract.

Timeframe: Contract execution to contract completion

TASK 2, ASSESSING & SCALING EXISTING LANDLORD ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS

Erica Snyder Consulting will work in partnership with landlord engagement working group to gather information regarding historical and current landlord engagement efforts within the CoC. Additionally, Erica Snyder Consulting will gather best and promising practices for landlord engagement in our post-COVID housing market, acknowledging the new challenges due to tight rental markets and increased hesitancy from landlords to rent to households with barriers. The CoC will be presented with a summary of existing efforts, overview of best practices in landlord engagement, and recommendations for areas to scale and/or consider implementing to increase landlord recruitment and retention relevant to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg community. Additionally, the CoC will receive recommended metrics to regularly review and track to demonstrate progress.

This process will also include mechanisms to receive feedback from key stakeholders, including landlords, to allow for ongoing process improvement. Methods used may include key informant interviews, focus groups, literature review, local data review, etc.

Timeframe: ~6-8 weeks from contract execution

TASK 3, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND FACILITATION. In partnership with Landlord Engagement Workgroup staff, Erica Snyder Consulting will engage stakeholders throughout the CoC to increase buy-in on a community landlord engagement strategy. Stakeholders may include public and private funders, homeless service providers, the local Continuum of Care, as well as other community and industry partners. It is recommended that this process includes an onsite travel to facilitate in-person meeting(s). The focus of this task will be to bring partners together to assess engagement strategies, identifies areas of strength/challenges in partnership, and work towards a collective vision for roles and responsibility in housing search and landlord engagement efforts within the homelessness service system. The ultimate goal of this task will be to increase trust amongst partners and align landlord engagement efforts with local initiatives. Examples of stakeholder engagement may include facilitating stakeholder engagement sessions, participation in relevant community meetings, presentations on behalf of the CoC, individual interviews.

Timeframe: ~3-4 months from contract execution. This task may be completed in parallel with Task 2

TASK 4, ONGOING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. Given the unprecedented times we are living in due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent impacts to funding, staffing, and capacity, Erica Snyder Consulting will be available to capture the knowledge and potential pathways to package centralized landlord engagement services. This portion of the scope of work will be further refined based upon the CoC's emerging needs and throughout the life of the contract within the schedule of deliverables described in Task 1, Strategic thought partner with project leadership.

Timeframe: Contract execution to contract completion

BUDGET

The budget for this proposal is not to exceed \$30,000, with up to \$5,000 available to travel for two site visits to Charlotte. Cost estimates include airfare, local transportation, lodging, and meals from San Diego.

Erica Snyder Consulting agrees to use an hourly-based billing structure and to bill at the rate of \$165/hour for work completed within this scope of work.

REFERENCES

CURRENT CLIENTS

Michael Shore
CEO & President
HOM, Inc.
MikeShore@hominc.com

Chris Pitcher
Lead Homeless Service Specialist
ICF
Chris.pitcher@icf.com

COMMUNITY LEADER

Melissa Peterman*
Former Vice President Homeless Housing Innovations
San Diego Housing Commission
Melissa@townspeople.org

*Melissa is currently the Executive Director of Townspeople, but previously oversaw Erica Snyder's work while employed by the San Diego Housing Commission

Charlotte-Mecklenburg CoC
FY22 NOFO Project Scoring Process

This document provides the policies by which projects seeking funding in the FY2022 Continuum of Care competitions will be prioritized and ranked. These priorities are subject to change based on HUD's funding priorities.

I. FY2022 Charlotte-Mecklenburg Continuum of Care Project Priority Ranking Policies

A. Project Priority Ranking Order

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Continuum of Care (CoC) is required to prioritize and rank projects applying for Continuum of Care (CoC) funding in the annual CoC competition. Projects seeking renewal or new funding in the FY2022 CoC competition will be prioritized and ranked as follows.

1. The CoC's **renewal infrastructure projects** will be ranked first. Infrastructure projects are defined as dedicated HMIS grants and Coordinated Entry Supportive Services Only (CE-SSO) grants. Renewal CE-SSO project will be ranked above renewal HMIS project as CE-SSO project provides direct services to people experiencing homelessness.
2. **Renewal projects that have not yet completed one full calendar year** of operations as of 12/31/2021 will be ranked in the following order by how they were ranked in the FY21 priority list:
 - a. PSH projects
 - b. RRH projects
 - c. TH-RRH projects
3. **Renewal Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects** ranked by overall percentage scored on the renewal application, from highest to lowest.
4. **Renewal Rapid Rehousing (RRH) projects** ranked by overall percentage scored on the renewal application from highest to lowest.
5. **New, including expansion project(s)** created via reallocation and/or CoC Bonus in the following order by overall project score:
 - a. New or expansion PSH LEASING (master leasing) projects
 - b. New or expansion PSH RENTAL ASSISTANCE (scattered site) projects
 - c. New or expansion RRH projects
 - d. New or expansion CE-SSO (Coordinated Entry-Support Services Only) projects
 - e. New or expansion dedicated HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) projects
6. **New Domestic Violence Bonus projects** by overall project score in the following order by overall project score:
 - a. New or expansion RRH or Joint TH-RRH (Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing) projects
 - b. New or expansion CE-SSO projects

B. Tiebreaking Criteria

Tiebreakers for ranking policies 3 & 4 (renewal) will be applied in the following order:

1. First tiebreaker: points earned on Length of Time Homeless component
2. Second tiebreaker: points earned on percentage of participants who gained or increased income from entry to exit.
3. Third tiebreaker: points earned on exits to permanent housing component
4. Fourth tiebreaker: the percentage of points earned on component that addresses involving persons with lived experience in the delivery of services

Tiebreakers for ranking policies 5 & 6 (new) will be applied in the following order:

1. First tie-breaker (for PSH, RRH, TH-RRH project applications): Points earned on Housing First Assessment component

First tie breaker (for infrastructure projects: Points earned on Project Description component

2. Second tie-breaker (for all applications): Points earned on Equity Factor component addressing under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial & leadership positions.

C. Projects Straddling Tier 1/Tier 2

If a project, once listed in ranking order, straddles the Tier 1/Tier 2 funding line with a portion of the project budget falling within Tier 1 and the remaining within Tier 2, the feasibility of the project to operate with only the Tier 1 amount will be determined as follows:

1. Utilizing the response to the question that asks the impact on the project if it does not receive full funding, the Ranking Committee will decide whether the project would be feasible & still have impact at the reduced amount. If the committee determines it would be feasible, the project will be submitted as is, straddling the Tier 1/Tier 2 line. If the committee determines it would not be feasible, that project will be dropped down so that it is entirely in Tier 2, and the next ranked project will be moved up. The feasibility of this project will then be determined.
2. If an agency indicates a minimum amount needed to still be feasible exceeding the project's Tier 1 amount, that project will be automatically moved into Tier 2, and the next ranked project will be moved up and the process given in #1 above will then be repeated with the next ranked project.
3. This process will continue until the following are realized:
 - a. All Tier 1 funds are allocated; OR
 - b. The amount of funds remaining in Tier 1 are a negligible amount. If this occurs, the ranking committee retains the discretion to allocate the remaining funds to another project in Tier 1 that can accept additional funds.
4. If the amount remaining in Tier 1 is of such a small amount that no project indicates it would be feasible at that reduced amount, steps 2 & 3 will not apply, but rather project will be ranked according to their original order

D. Renewal Project Threshold Score

All project applying for renewal funding will be evaluated and scored on a given point scale on the scorecard. In the FY2022 competition, renewal projects must score at least 70% of the points possible

to be placed on the project ranking list. Renewal projects that do not score at least 70% will be able to submit an appeal. Projects should anticipate the 70% threshold may increase in subsequent competitions

E. Final Ranking List Review and Recommendation

Following the review, scoring and appeals of renewal & new project applications, a preliminary project ranking list will be developed in accordance with the above priority ranking order. This ranking list, with projects identified by name and type, will be reviewed by the Ranking Committee. The committee will present its final recommended project ranking list to the CoC board in accordance with the timeframe required by HUD. The CoC board will vote to approve the final project ranking list

F. Renewal Project Appeals

Renewal projects can appeal their project score but may not appeal its placement on the project priority ranking list.

DRAFT

II. FY22 Special Unsheltered NOFO Project Priority Ranking Policies

On June 28, 2022, HUD released a Special NOFO to address unsheltered homelessness. Charlotte-Mecklenburg is eligible to apply for \$5,719,795 through this opportunity. This funding would be for a 3-year grant term. To determine the funding priorities for this special opportunity, the CoC's Unsheltered Homelessness Workgroup reviewed data to determine the overall characteristics of those experiencing unsheltered homelessness (who are entered into HMIS) and relied on the expertise of those conducting street outreach in the CoC's geographic area. From this information, the following are the projects that will be considered for funding in this order:

A. Project Priority Ranking Order

1. SSO-Only (Supportive Services Only projects)

- i. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg CoC lacks the bandwidth necessary to conduct comprehensive street outreach. Thus, the first priority for this funding is to fund new or expanded street outreach team(s). Projects should include how the team will address households with high vulnerabilities: children, elderly, disabled, severe & persistent mental health and chronic substance use. Projects must demonstrate how they will quickly connect unsheltered households to temporary shelter & housing and permanent housing while connecting them to mainstream resources and income resources. This includes purchasing a vehicle that would allow for the outreach team to provide immediate transportation for unsheltered clients seeking services.

2. SSO-CE (Supportive Services Only-Coordinated Entry projects—only the CE Lead can apply)

- i. The data shows that a large number of the households that presented for CE and reported being unsheltered were homeless for the first time and had been homeless for 1-2 months. Building upon the successes of the System Navigators funded through ESG-CV, additional funding is needed to assist clients with navigating the system and connecting to resources that will end their homelessness.

3. Joint TH-RRH (Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing)

- i. Low barrier, small units of transitional housing available to households experiencing unsheltered homelessness that work to quickly move clients to Rapid Rehousing.

4. PSH (Permanent Supportive Housing): Long-term rental assistance & supportive services that serve the most vulnerable households. Projects must accommodate shared housing.

- i. Projects that leverage housing resources: This means that a project will form a partnership with another entity to provide 50% of the subsidies requested for the project and can apply for funding for the remaining 50% and support services for 100% of the subsidies.
- ii. Projects that leverage healthcare resources: This means that a project will form a partnership with a healthcare provider that will provide in-kind healthcare services for the clients served in the project.
- iii. Projects with no leveraging: The applicant will apply for the full amount of subsidy from HUD.

5. RRH (Rapid Rehousing): Up to 24 months of rental assistance. Projects must accommodate shared housing

- i. Projects that leverage housing resources: This means that a project will form a partnership with another entity to provide 50% of the subsidies requested for the project and can apply for funding for the remaining 50% and support services for 100% of the subsidies.
 - i. Projects that leverage healthcare resources: This means that a project will form a partnership with a healthcare provider that will provide in-kind healthcare services for the clients served in the project.
 - ii. Projects with no leveraging: The applicant will apply for the full amount of subsidy from HUD.
6. **HMIS-Only (Homeless Management Information System)-only the current HMIS Lead can apply)**
- i. Project that will upgrade, customize and enhance the HMIS
7. **CoC Planning Costs**-only the CoC Collaborative Applicant can apply (Max amount is \$171,593 for 3 years)
- i. A staff person to oversee & coordinate the implementation & evaluation of the CoC's strategies to address unsheltered homelessness
 - ii. Technology to assist with coordinating a street outreach strategy

B. Tiebreaking Criteria

Tiebreakers will be applied in the following order:

1. First tie-breaker (for PSH, RRH, TH-RRH, SSO, SSO-CE project applications): Number of points earned on Housing First response.
First tie breaker (for HMIS & Planning project application): Number of points earned on project description component
2. Second tie-breaker (for all applications): Points earned on Equity Factor component addressing under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial & leadership positions.

C. Final Ranking List Review and Recommendation

Following the review, scoring and appeals of new project applications, a preliminary project ranking list will be developed in accordance with the above priority ranking order. This ranking list, with projects identified by name and type, will be reviewed by the Ranking Committee. The committee will present its final recommended project ranking list to the CoC board in accordance with the timeframe required by HUD. The CoC board will vote to approve the final project ranking list

HOUSING STABILITY RENEWAL PROJECTS

Components	Sources	Calculation	Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	Full Points (Section Weight)
Performance Measures						
Length of Time Homeless						
1. Length of Time between project start date & Housing Move-in Date	ESG CAPER: 22c-Total Average length of time to housing <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	Average length of time to housing (Total) - # of days	75	76-90	>90	10
Exits to Permanent Housing						
2. Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination	ESG CAPER: 23c <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	85%	75-84%	<75%	15
New or Increased Income						
3. Percentage of participants who gained or increased overall income from entry to exit.	ESG CAPER: Q19b, Rows 12 & 13 <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	20%	18-19%	<18%	10
Project Effectiveness						
4. Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization	ESG CAPER: 8b <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	January Total + April Total + July Total + October Total=SUM SUM/4=AVG AVG/Proposed # from application	90%	80-89%	<80%	15
5. Costs are within local average cost for project type	Project application: Q10	STD Deviation				10
6. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire		13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
7. 50% of project enrollments are from Coordinated Entry match	Renewal Project Addendum	Number of enrollments that were referred from CE match/Number of total enrollments	50%	45-49%	<45%	10
Equity Factors						
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies						
8. Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	Renewal Project Addendum		25%	10-24%	<10%	10
9. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience (ex. homelessness, substance use, mental health, criminal justice involvement, frontline case manager, etc).	Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience		Yes		No	10
10. Recipient describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	Source: Project Application: Organizational Capacity to Address Racial Equity: Q3.		Recipient identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Recipient identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Recipient identifies 0 examples	10
11. Recipient has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	Source: Project Application: Organizational Capacity to Address Racial Equity Q4.		Recipient describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Recipient has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Recipient has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes						
12. Recipient has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	Renewal Project Addendum		Recipient describes 1 thing they learned about outcomes	Recipient has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Recipient has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database						
13. HMIS Data Quality error rate is no higher than 5%.	ESG CAPER Q6a, Q6b, Q6c, Q6d, Q6e <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	See Renewal Data Quality tab	Meets all 19 Data Quality Standards	Meets 15-19 Data Quality Standards	Meets <15 Data Quality Standards	15
Financial						
14. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit		Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
15. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Source: Agency Operating Budget & Project		<25% of overall	25%-50%	>50% of overall	10

	Budget Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget		agency budget		agency budget	
16. Agency describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	Renewal Project Addendum		YES	N/A	NO	5
17. Project expended at least 90% of total award	NCDHHS ESG Office		90% or greater	80-89%	<80%	10
Continuum of Care Activities						
18. Agency staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings & number of meetings attended	Source: CoC Participation and Coordination Agreement Form	Includes the following CoC meetings/activities: -CoC Full Membership -CoC Governing Board -CoC Committees -CoC Workgroups -PIT Count participation	10-12 Meetings Attended	7-9 Meetings Attended	<7 Meetings Attended	10
SUB TOTAL						190
Penalty						
Program did NOT submit Data Quality Report as outlined in the Char-Meck CoC Data Quality Monitoring Plan	Report was due 7/15/22					-10
Late Submittal of Documents						-15
FINAL TOTAL						

CRISIS RESPONSE RENEWAL PROJECTS

Components	Sources	Calculation	Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	Full Points (Section Weight)
Performance Measures						
1a: ES Programs only: Avg Length of Participation: Leavers	ESG CAPER: 22a2 <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	see Length of Particip (ES) tab	100 days	101-120 days	>120 days	15
1b: VSP Programs only: Avg Length of Participation: Leavers	ESG CAPER: 22a2 <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	see Length of Particip (VSP) tab	45	46-55	>55	15
2: ES Programs: Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination	ESG CAPER: 23c <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	40%	35-39%	<35%	10
1. SO Programs: Contact	ESG CAPER: 9a & 7a <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	Total persons contacted (9a)/Total persons served (7a)	35%	30-34%	<30%	10
2. SO Programs: Engagement	ESG CAPER 9b <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	Rate of engagement for all persons contacted	50%	45-49%	<49%	15
3. SO Programs: Percentage of participants who exit to any destination other than unsheltered	ESG CAPER: 23c <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	50%	45-49%	<45%	15
Project Effectiveness						
4. All Project Types: Costs are within local average cost for project type	Project application: Q10	STD Deviation				10
5. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire		13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
6. All Project Types: Project partners with Coordinated Entry to receive referrals	Project application: Q9		ES Only: Project matches open beds from CE VSP: Project describes how they connect clients to CE after assessing for safety SO: Project receives referrals from CE	N/A	Does not partner with CE	10
7. ES Programs: Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization	ESG CAPER: 8b <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	January Total + April Total + July Total + October Total=SUM SUM/4=AVG AVG/Proposed # from application	55%	50-54%	<50%	10
8. SO Programs: Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization	ESG CAPER: 8b <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/222</i>	January Total + April Total + July Total + October Total=SUM SUM/4=AVG AVG/Proposed # from application	55%	50-54%	<50%	10
Equity Factors						
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies						

9. All Project Types: Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	Renewal Project Addendum		25%	10-24%	<10%	10
10. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience (ex. homelessness, substance use, mental health, criminal justice involvement, frontline case manager, etc).	Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience		Yes	N/A	No	10
11. All Project Types: Recipient describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	Source: Project Application: Organizational Capacity to Address Racial Equity: Q3.		Recipient identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Recipient identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Recipient identifies 0 examples	10
12. All Project Types: Recipient has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	Source: Project Application: Organizational Capacity to Address Racial Equity Q4.		Recipient describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Recipient has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Recipient has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes						
13. All Project Types: Recipient has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	Renewal Project Addendum		Recipient describes 1 insight they learned about outcomes	Recipient has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Recipient has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database						
14. HMIS Data Quality error rate is no higher than 5%.	ESG CAPER Q6a, Q6b, Q6c, Q6d, Q6e <i>Reporting period: 07/01/21-06/30/22</i>	See Renewal Data Quality tab	Meets all 19 Data Quality Standards	Meets 15-19 Data Quality Standards	Meets <15 Data Quality Standards	15
			Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
15. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit		Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
16. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Source: Agency Operating Budget & Project Budget Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget		<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
17. Agency describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	Renewal Project Addendum		YES	N/A	NO	5
18. Project expended at least 90% of 2021 award	NCDHHS ESG Office		90% or greater	80-89%	<80%	10
Continuum of Care Activities						
19. Agency staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings & number of meetings attended	Source: CoC Participation and Coordination Agreement Form	Includes the following CoC meetings/activities: -CoC Full Membership -CoC Governing Board -CoC Committees -CoC Workgroups -PIT Count participation	10-12 Meetings Attended	7-9 Meetings Attended	<7 Meetings Attended	10
SUB TOTAL						120
Penalty						
Program did NOT submit Data Quality Report as outlined in the Char-Meck CoC Data Quality Monitoring Plan	Report was due 7/15/22					-10
Late Submittal of Documents						-15
FINAL TOTAL						

NEW PROJECTS

Components	Source & Calculation	Points Allocation			Full Points (Section Weight)
Project Description		Full Points	75 Points	0 Points	
1. Application addresses the following components: a) Population served: Q2 b) Program eligibility requirements: Q4 c) Program design & philosophy: Q5 d) Types of assistance provided: Q6 e) Program staffing structure & agency experience in providing service: Q7 f) How project will work with other CoC and community partners including how participants will be connected to benefits and/or employment to ensure participants increase overall income: Q8 g) How projects will work with Coordinated Entry: Q9 h) RRH & HP PROJECTS ONLY: How project will work with landlords and who conducts housing search: Q10	Source: Project Application	>=10 components from column A addressed	9 components from column A addressed	<9 components from column A addressed	85
Project Effectiveness		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
2. All Project Types: Costs are within local average cost for project type	Project application: Q10	STND DEV			10
3. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire	13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
Equity Factors		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies					
4. All Project Types: Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	Source: New Project Addendum	25%	10-24%	<10%	10
5. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience (ex. homelessness, substance use, mental health, criminal justice involvement, frontline case manager, etc).	Source: Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience	Yes	N/A	No	10
6. All Project Types: Recipient has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	Source: Project Application: Organizational Capacity to Address Racial Equity: Q3.	Recipient describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Recipient has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Recipient has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
7. All Project Types: Recipient describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	Source: Project Application: Organizational Capacity to Address Racial Equity Q4.	Recipient identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Recipient identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Recipient identifies 0 examples	10
Program Participant Outcomes					
8. All Project Types: Recipient has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	Source: New Project Addendum	Recipient describes 1 insight they had about outcomes	Recipient has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Recipient has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
9. Agency has read and agrees to adhere to the CoC's Data Quality Monitoring Plan	Source: New Project Addendum	YES	N/A	NO	10
Financial		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
10. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Source: Last completed Agency Audit	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
11. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Source: Agency Operating Budget & Project Budget Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget	<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
12. Agency describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	Source: New project addendum	YES	N/A	NO	5
Continuum of Care Activities		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
13. Agency is a member organization of the CoC	Source: Membership roster	Yes	N/A	No	10
14. Agency staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings & number of meetings attended	Source: CoC Participation and Coordination Agreement Form	Attended any # of CoC meetings	N/A	Attended 0 meetings	10
SUB TOTAL					
Penalty					
Late Submittal of Documents					-15
FINAL TOTAL					

2019 CoC Renewal Projects Scorecard

Components	Sources	Calculation	Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	Full Points (Section Weight)
Performance Measures						
Length of Time Homeless						
1a: RRH Programs: Length of Time between project start date & Housing Move-in Date	APR: Q22c <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Average length of time to housing (Total) - # of days	75	76-90	>90	10
1b: PSH Programs: Length of Time between project start date & Housing Move-in Date	APR: Q22c <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Average length of time to housing (Total) - # of days	120	121-150	>150	10
Exits to Permanent Housing						
2a: RRH Programs: Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination	APR: Q23c <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Percentage (Total Number of Persons Exiting to Permanent Housing Destination/ (Total Number of Persons Leaving - Persons Excluded)	85%	75-84%	<75%	15
2b: PSH Programs: Percentage of persons participating with a Permanent Exit Destination	APR: Q5.9 (Stayers) & Q23c <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Percentage (Total Number of Stayers + Total Number of Persons Exiting to Permanent Housing Destination)/(Total Number of Persons Served - Persons Excluded)	40%	35-39%	<35%	15
New or Increased Income						
3a: RRH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased overall income from entry to exit.	APR: Q19A2, Row 5 <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	20%	18-19%	<18%	10
3b: PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased overall income from entry to latest status	APR: Q19A1, Row 5 <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	10%	8-9%	<8%	10
3c: PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who gained or increased overall income from entry to exit.	APR: Q19A2, Row 5 <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	Percent of persons who accomplished this measure (%)	75%	60%-74%	<60%	10
Project Effectiveness						
4. All Project Types: Costs are within local average cost for project type	esnaps application: Q4B.2b & Q61.9	4B.2b/61.9 STD Deviation				10
5. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire		13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
6a. RRH Programs: 50% of project enrollments are from Coordinated Entry match	Renewal Project Addendum	Number of enrollments that were referred from CE match/Number of total enrollments	50%		<50%	
6b. DV RRH Programs: 50% of project enrollments received through identified referral process	Renewal Project Addendum	Number of enrollments that were referred from CE match/Number of total enrollments	50%		<50%	
6c. PSH Programs: 100% of project enrollments are from Coordinated Entry match or CoC transfer process	Renewal Project Addendum	Number of enrollments that were referred from CE match/Number of total enrollments	100%		<100%	
7a. RRH Programs: Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization	APR: Q8b <i>Reporting period: 7/1/20-6/30/21</i>	January Total + April Total + July Total + October Total=SUM SUM/4=AVG AVG/Proposed # from application	90%	81-89%	<81%	15
7b. PSH Programs: Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization	APR: Q8b <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	January Total + April Total + July Total + October Total=SUM SUM/4=AVG AVG/Proposed # from application	90%	81-89%	<81%	15
Equity Factors						
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies						
8. All Project Types: Recipient has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	Renewal Project Addendum		25%	10-24%	<10%	10
9. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience	Board Roster noting which members have lived experience		Yes		No	10

2019 CoC Renewal Projects Scorecard

10. All Project Types: Applicant describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	Project Addendum		Applicant identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 0 examples	10
11. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	Project Addendum		Applicant describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Applicant has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Applicant has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes						
12. All Project Types: Recipient has reviewed program participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	Project Addendum		Applicant describes 1 thing they learned about outcomes	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database						
13. HMIS Data Quality error rate is no higher than 5%.	APR Q6a, Q6b, Q6c, Q6d, Q6e <i>Reporting period: 7/1/21-6/30/22</i>	See Renewal Data Quality tab	Meets all 19 Data Quality Standards	Meets 15-19 Data Quality Standards	Meets <15 Data Quality Standards	15
Financial			Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
14. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit		Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
15. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Agency Operating Budget esnaps application Q6I.9 Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget		<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
16. Agency describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	New project addendum		YES	N/A	NO	5
17. Project demonstrates match for at least 25% of the total budget	Amount of match: esnaps application Q6I.12 Total assistance plus admin requested: esnaps application Q6I.9		Agency demonstrates at least 25% match	N/A	Agency demonstrates less than 25% match	10
18. Project expends at least 90% of total award	Total Expenditures: Sage for last completed project Total award: Grant Agreement	Percentage (Total Expenditures/Grant Award Amount) (%)	90%	85-89%	<85%	10
Continuum of Care Activities						
19. Agency staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings & number of meetings attended	Project Addendum <i>Reporting period: 07/01/2021-06/30/2022</i>	Includes the following CoC meetings/activities: -CoC Full Membership -CoC Governing Board -CoC Committees -CoC Workgroups -PIT Count participation	10-12 Meetings Attended	7-9 Meetings Attended	<7 Meetings Attended	10
SUB TOTAL						
						150
Penalty						
Program did NOT submit Data Quality Report as outlined in the Char-Meck CoC Data Quality Monitoring Plan	Report was due 7/15/22					-10
Late Submittal of Documents						-15
FINAL TOTAL						

Components	Source & Calculation	Points Allocation			Full Points (Section Weight)
		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
Applicant Experience					
1. All Project Types: Applicant's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) experience in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities proposed in the application including agency leadership & frontline staff	esnaps application Q2B	3-5 years experience	1-2 years experience	<1 year experience	20
Project Description					
2. Applicant provides detailed project description including: a) How project will receive referrals/determine who it will serve b) How project addresses an identified gap/need in the homeless to housing continuum c) Types of services provided: support services, financial assistance	esnaps application Q3B.1	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	20
Supportive Services for Participants					
3. Applicant describes how participants will be assisted in obtaining & maintaining housing a) How project will house participants in <30 days for RRH and <90 days for PSH (include housing search support provided b) Project describes reasons for program termination c) Project describes how they will ensure 0 households return to homelessness at exit	esnaps application Q4A.1	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	15
4. Project describes how support services will be provided by coordinating & integrating with other mainstream resources in the following areas: a) healthcare (mental health, substance use, physical health) b) social services c) employment & income (SOAR) programs	esnaps application Q4A.2	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	15
Serve High Need Population					
5. Chronically homeless: at least 75% of households served in project will be chronically homeless	esnaps Q3B.1 & esnaps Q3B.3 (population served)	>75%	50-74%	<50%	15
6. Household Type: Project serves households other than just individual adult households	esnaps Q3B.1 & esnaps Q3B.3 (population served)	All household types & sub-populations	5-8 sub-populations	Individuals only	15
7. Unsheltered homeless: At least 75% of households served in project will be unsheltered or have a history of unsheltered homelessness	esnaps Q3B.1 & esnaps Q3B.3 (population served)	YES		NO	15
Project Effectiveness					
8. All Project Types: Costs are within local average cost for project type	esnaps application: 4B.2b (beds)/esnaps application: 6J.9	STND DEV			10
9. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire	13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
Equity Factors					
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies					
10. All Project Types: Applicant has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	New Project Addendum	25%	10-24%	<10%	10
11. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience (ex. homelessness, substance use, mental health, criminal justice involvement, frontline case manager, etc)	Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience	Yes		No	10
12. All Project Types: Applicant describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience: homelessness, substance use, mental health, criminal justice involvement, frontline case manager, etc)	New Project Addendum	Applicant identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 0 examples	10
13. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Applicant has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Applicant has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes					
14. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 thing they learned about outcomes	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database					
15. Applicant has read and agrees to adhere to the CoC's Data Quality Monitoring Plan	New Project Addendum	YES		NO	10
Financial		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	

16. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
17. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Agency Operating Budget esnaps application Q6J.9 Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget	<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
18. Applicant describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	New project addendum	YES	N/A	NO	5
19. Project demonstrates match for at least 25% of the total budget	Amount of match: esnaps application Q6J.12 Total assistance plus admin requested: esnaps application Q6J.9	Applicant demonstrates at least 25% match	N/A	Applicant demonstrates less than 25% match	10
Continuum of Care Activities		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
20. Applicant is a member organization of the CoC	CoC Membership roster	Yes	N/A	No	10
21. Applicant describes how agency staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings and work groups.	New project addendum <i>Reporting period: 07/01/2021-06/30/2022</i>	Attended any # of CoC meetings	N/A	Attended 0 meetings	10
SUB TOTAL					
Bonus					
1. Applicant involved person(s) experiencing UNSHELTERED homelessness in shaping delivery of services	New project addendum	YES		NO	10
2. If the Applicant currently receives CoC funding, they have an agreement with an Applicant that has not received CoC funding to be a sub-recipient	esnaps application Q2A	<25% of the requested funding will go to sub-recipient	15-24% of requested funding will go to sub-recipient	>15% of requested funding will go to sub-recipient	15
Penalty					
Late Submittal of Documents					-15
FINAL TOTAL					

Components	Source & Calculation	Points Allocation			Full Points (Section Weight)
		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
Applicant Experience					
1. Applicant's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) experience in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities proposed in the application including agency leadership & frontline staff	esnaps application Q2B	3-5 years experience	1-2 years experience	<1 year experience	20
Providing Housing to DV Survivors					
2. Applicant provides detailed project description: a) How applicant ensured DV survivors experiencing homelessness were assisted to quickly move to safe, affordable housing c) Describe process used to prioritize or match clients to your project (Coordinated Entry, prioritization list, etc) d) Describe how the project will ensure the safety of DV survivors experiencing homelessness (training staff on safety planning, adjusting intake space, work with survivors to have them identify what is safe for them)	esnaps application Q3B.1	4 components addressed	3 components addressed	<3 components addressed	15
Supportive Services for Participants					
3. Applicant describes how participants will be assisted in obtaining & maintaining housing a) How project will house participants in <30 days for RRH and <90 days for PSH (include housing search support provided b) Reasons for program termination c) Applicant describes how they will ensure 0 households return to homelessness at exit	esnaps application Q4A.1	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	15
4. Applicant describes how support services will be provided by coordinating & integrating with other mainstream resources in the following areas: a) healthcare (mental health, substance use, physical health) b) social services c) employment & income (SOAR) programs	esnaps application Q4A.2	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	15
Trauma-Informed, Victim-Centered Approaches					
5. Describe examples of your agency's experience in using trauma-informed, victim-centered approaches to meet needs of DV survivors in each of the following: a) Prioritizing program participant choice and rapid placement & stabilization in permanent housing b) Establishing & maintaining an environment of agency and mutual respect (ex. do not use punitive interventions, minimize power differentials) c) Providing participants access to information on trauma d) emphasize program participants' strengths (ex. strength-based coaching & assessment tools; case plans focus on participant strengths and work toward goals e) centering on cultural responsiveness & inclusivity f) providing opportunities for connection for participants (groups, mentorships, etc) g) offering support for parenting (ex. parenting classes, childcare)	New Project Addendum	6 components addressed	4-5 components addressed	<4 components addressed	15
Project Effectiveness					
6. All Project Types: Costs are within local average cost for project type	esnaps application: 4B.2b (beds)/esnaps application: 6I.9	STND DEV			10
7. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire	13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
Equity Factors					
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies					
8. All Project Types: Applicant has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	New Project Addendum	25%	10-24%	<10%	10
9. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience	Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience	Yes		No	10

10. All Project Types: Applicant describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	New Project Addendum	Applicant identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 0 examples	10
11. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Applicant has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Applicant has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes					
12. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 thing they learned about outcomes	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database					
13. All Project Types: Applicant has read and agrees to adhere to the CoC's Data Quality Monitoring Plan	New Project Addendum	YES		NO	10
Financial		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
14. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
15. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Agency Operating Budget esnaps application Q6J.9 Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget	<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
16. Applicant describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	New project addendum	YES	N/A	NO	5
17. Project demonstrates match for at least 25% of the total budget	Amount of match: esnaps application Q6J.12 Total assistance plus admin requested: esnaps application Q6J.9	Applicant demonstrates at least 25% match	N/A	Applicant demonstrates less than 25% match	10
		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
18. Applicant is a member organization of the CoC	CoC Membership roster	Yes	N/A	No	10
19. Project describes how Applicant staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings and work groups.	New project addendum <i>Reporting period: 07/01/2021-06/30/2022</i>	Attended any # of CoC meetings	N/A	Attended 0 meetings	10
SUB TOTAL					125
Bonus					
1. If the Applicant currently receives CoC funding, they have an agreement with an Applicant that has not received CoC funding to be a sub-recipient	esnaps application Q2A	<25% of the requested funding will go to sub-recipient	15-24% of requested funding will go to sub-recipient	>15% of requested funding will go to sub-recipient	15
Penalty					
Late Submittal of Documents					-15
FINAL TOTAL					

Components	Source & Calculation	Points Allocation			Full Points (Section Weight)
		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
Applicant Experience					
1. Applicant's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) experience in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities proposed in the application including agency leadership & frontline staff	esnaps application Q2B	3-5 years experience	1-2 years experience	<1 year experience	20
Providing Housing to DV Survivors					
2. Applicant provides detailed project description: a) How applicant ensured DV survivors experiencing homelessness were assisted to quickly move to safe, affordable housing c) Describe process used to prioritize or match clients to your project (Coordinated Entry, prioritization list, etc) d) Describe how the project will ensure the safety of DV survivors experiencing homelessness (training staff on safety planning, adjusting intake space, work with survivors to have them identify what is safe for them)	esnaps application Q3B.1	4 components addressed	3 components addressed	<3 components addressed	15
Supportive Services for Participants					
3. Applicant describes how participants will be assisted in obtaining & maintaining housing a) How project will house participants in <30 days for RRH and <90 days for PSH (include housing search support provided b) Reasons for program termination c) Applicant describes how they will ensure 0 households return to homelessness at exit	esnaps application Q4A.1	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	15
4. Applicant describes how support services will be provided by coordinating & integrating with other mainstream resources in the following areas: a) healthcare (mental health, substance use, physical health) b) social services c) employment & income (SOAR) programs	esnaps application Q4A.2	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	15
Trauma-Informed, Victim-Centered Approaches					
5. Describe examples of your agency's experience in using trauma-informed, victim-centered approaches to meet needs of DV survivors in each of the following: a) Prioritizing program participant choice and rapid placement & stabilization in permanent housing b) Establishing & maintaining an environment of agency and mutual respect (ex. do not use punitive interventions, minimize power differentials) c) Providing participants access to information on trauma d) emphasize program participants' strengths (ex. strength-based coaching & assessment tools; case plans focus on participant strengths and work toward goals e) centering on cultural responsiveness & inclusivity f) providing opportunities for connection for participants (groups, mentorships, etc) g) offering support for parenting (ex. parenting classes, childcare)	New Project Addendum	6 components addressed	4-5 components addressed	<4 components addressed	15
Project Effectiveness					
6. All Project Types: Costs are within local average cost for project type	esnaps application: 4B.2b (beds)/esnaps application: 6I.9	STND DEV			10
7. All Project Types: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire	13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
Equity Factors					
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies					
8. All Project Types: Applicant has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	New Project Addendum	25%	10-24%	<10%	10
9. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience	Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience	Yes		No	10

10. All Project Types: Applicant describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	New Project Addendum	Applicant identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 0 examples	10
11. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Applicant has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Applicant has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes					
12. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 thing they learned about outcomes	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database					
13. All Project Types: Applicant has read and agrees to adhere to the CoC's Data Quality Monitoring Plan	New Project Addendum	YES		NO	10
Financial					
14. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
15. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Agency Operating Budget esnaps application Q6J.9 Calculation: Project funding request/Total operating budget	<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
16. Applicant describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	New project addendum	YES	N/A	NO	5
17. Project demonstrates match for at least 25% of the total budget	Amount of match: esnaps application Q6J.12 Total assistance plus admin requested: esnaps application Q6J.9	Applicant demonstrates at least 25% match	N/A	Applicant demonstrates less than 25% match	10
Continuum of Care Activities					
18. Applicant is a member organization of the CoC	CoC Membership roster	Yes	N/A	No	10
19. Project describes how Applicant staff participates in Continuum of Care meetings and work groups.	New project addendum <i>Reporting period: 07/01/2021-06/30/2022</i>	Attended any # of CoC meetings	N/A	Attended 0 meetings	10
SUB TOTAL					125
Bonus					
1. If the Applicant currently receives CoC funding, they have an agreement with an Applicant that has not received CoC funding to be a sub-recipient	esnaps application Q2A	<25% of the requested funding will go to sub-recipient	15-24% of requested funding will go to sub-recipient	>15% of requested funding will go to sub-recipient	15
Penalty					
Late Submittal of Documents					-15
FINAL TOTAL					

Components	Source & Calculation	Points Allocation			Full Points (Section Weight)
		Full Points	5 Points	0 Points	
Applicant Experience					
1. Applicant's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) experience in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities proposed in the application including agency leadership & frontline staff	esnaps application Q2B	3-5 years experience	1-2 years experience	<1 year experience	20
Project Description					
2. Applicant provides detailed project description including: a) How project addresses an identified gap/need in the homeless to housing continuum b) Stakeholders involved in determining project scope c) Best practices consulted/employed when determining project scope	esnaps application Q3B.1	Application addresses all 3 components	Application addresses 2 components	Application addresses <2 components	20
Project Effectiveness					
3. SSO-CE ONLY: Housing First and/or Low Barrier Implementation	Housing First Assessment Questionnaire	13-15	10pts to 13 pts	<10	10
Equity Factors					
Agency Leadership, Governance & Policies					
4. All Project Types: Applicant has under-represented individuals (BIPOC, LGBTQ+, etc) in managerial AND leadership positions	New Project Addendum	25%	10-24%	<10%	10
5. All Project Types: Applicant's Board of Directors includes representation from more than one person with lived experience	Board Roster identifying which members have lived experience	Yes		No	10
6. All Project Types: Applicant describes how they involve individuals & families with lived experience in homelessness in the delivery of services (ex. hiring people with lived experience)	New Project Addendum	Applicant identifies 2 or more examples of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 1 example of how persons with lived experience shape the delivery of services	Applicant identifies 0 examples	10
7. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed internal policies & procedures with an equity lens and has a plan for updating policies that currently center white dominant culture	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 policy they identified and changed	Applicant has not yet reviewed policies & procedures, but provides a timeline for this review including responsible parties	Applicant has not reviewed policies & procedures and does not provide a timeline	10
Program Participant Outcomes					
8. All Project Types: Applicant has reviewed agency participant outcomes with an equity lens, including the disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender identity and/or age	New Project Addendum	Applicant describes 1 thing they learned about outcomes	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data, but describes plan & timeline for doing so	Applicant has not yet disaggregated data and does not provide a timeline	10
HMIS/Comparable Database					
9. SSO-CE ONLY: Applicant has read and agrees to adhere to the CoC's Data Quality Monitoring Plan	New Project Addendum	YES		NO	10
Financial					
10. Most recent agency audit demonstrating there were no unresolved material findings.	Last completed Agency Audit	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee & no findings	Audit shows agency as low risk auditee or no findings	Audit shows agency as high risk auditee AND findings	10
11. % of overall agency budget that this request equals	Agency Operating Budget esnaps application Q6J.9	<25% of overall agency budget	25%-50%	>50% of overall agency budget	10
12. Applicant describes impact of not receiving full amount of funding requested on project sustainability	New project addendum	YES	N/A	NO	5
13. Applicant demonstrates match for at least 25% of the total project budget	Amount of match: esnaps application Q6J.12	Applicant demonstrates at	N/A	Applicant demonstrates less	10
SUB TOTAL					
Bonus					
1. Applicant involved person(s) experiencing UNSHELTERED homelessness in shaping of project	New project addendum	YES		NO	10
Penalty					
Late Submittal of Documents					-15
FINAL TOTAL					