

Yakima Valley Conference of Governments

2016 Continuum of Care Rating and Review Procedure

For the 2016 CoC Consolidated Grant competition, the CoC Application Review Committee will review new and renewal project applications to determine if they meet the following project quality threshold requirements with clear and convincing evidence. The housing and services proposed must be appropriate to the needs of the program participants and the community.

Renewal projects will be scored and ranked using the rubric shown in Attachment 1.

Scoring criteria showed in Attachment 1 include consideration of factors relevant to renewal applications that are required or encouraged by HUD, including:

- % permanent housing exit destinations (5.)
- % increases in income (6.)
- Bed utilization rates (2.)
- Organization drawdown rates (13.)
- Frequency or amount of funds recaptured by HUD (15.)
- Services to specialized populations, including youth, victims of domestic violence, families with children, persons experiencing chronic homelessness, and veterans (3.)

New projects will be scored as shown in Attachment 2. Scoring for new projects will be distributed as follows:

- Program Description and Design 50%
- Management of Program 15%
- Fiscal Management 15%
- Diversity and Multi-Cultural Competence 10%
- Budget 10%

Scoring criteria showed in Attachment 2 include consideration of factors relevant to new applications that are required or encouraged by HUD, including:

- Organization drawdown rates (2. – d.)
- Services to specialized populations, including youth, victims of domestic violence, families with children, persons experiencing chronic homelessness, and veterans (1. – e.)

After the application submittal deadline of August 12, 2016, the CoC Application Review Committee will convene one or more times to review and rank all submitted applications using the above scoring criteria. By August 30, 2016, all applicants will be informed as to whether or not their applications will be included in the Final Prioritization List that will be submitted to HUD for funding as part of the CoC Consolidated Application. Any applicants that are rejected will receive a written explanation for the decision. Applicants whose project was rejected may appeal the local CoC competition decision to HUD if the project applicant believes it was denied the opportunity to participate in the local CoC competition decision process in a reasonable manner, by submitting a Solo Application in e-snaps directly to HUD prior to the application deadline of 7:59:59 p.m. eastern time on September 14, 2016.

Attachment 1



Yakima Valley Conference of Governments
FY 2016 CoC Project Application Scoring Rubric

Project Name _____

	Standard	Scoring	Data Source	Points Possible	Points Awarded
PERFORMANCE CRITERIA					
1.	PSH & TH Programs: Proposed vs. Actual Bed and Unit Inventory	90%	90% or > = 10 80-89% = 5 Below 80% = 0	APR Q5	10
2.	Bed Utilization Rates (Average Daily)	90%	> 125% = 0 100-125% = 5 90% or > = 10 80-89% = 5 Below 80% = 0	APR Q10	10
3.	HUD Priority Populations	Binary	10 points if project targets families, veterans, youth, or domestic violence	App 3B – Q3a	10
4.	Dedicated Chronically Homeless Capacity (Beds)	% of Beds Dedicated to CH	2 pts per 10% of bed capacity dedicated to CH	App 4B	20
5.	Permanent Housing Stability	TH: % Exits with permanent destination PSH: % of those meeting housing stability performance measures	85% or > = 20 75-84% = 15 66-74% = 10 <66% = 0	APR Q29A1 Q36A – Q1	20
6.	PSH Programs: Increase or Maintain Total Income (all cash sources including benefit income)	45%	45% or > = 10 30-45% = 5 Below 45% = 0	APR Q24b – 3 rd table	10
7.	TH Programs: Increase Total Income	25%	25% or > = 1 15-25% = .5 Below 15% = 0	APR Q24B3	5
8.	TH Programs: Employment Income for Adult Leavers	40%	40% or > = 1 20-39% = .5 Below 20% = 0	APR Q25a1 Q25a2	5

Attachment 1

	Standard	Scoring	Data Source	Points Possible	Points Awarded	
9.	Leavers with No Non-cash Benefits	20% or less	<=20% = 0 10-20% = 3 Below 10% = 5	APR Q26a2	5	
10.	Residence Prior to Entry	a. X% Eligible & Priority b. Y% Institution/TH c. Z% Ineligible	a. 1 per 10% Priority b. 0 per 10% Inst./TH c. -1 per 10% Ineligible	APR a. Q20a1 b. Q20a1 Q20a2 c. Q20a3	-10 to 10	
11.	Housing First	Project follows Housing First approach	+5 if yes 0 if no	App 3B - Q4d	5	
Subtotal Performance Criteria					100	
HUD COMPLIANCE CRITERIA						
12.	Annual Performance Report	APR submitted on time	1 point if yes	App 2B	1	
13.	Spending	Drawdown quarterly	1 point if yes	App 2B	1	
14.	Monitoring	No findings or findings addressed in Corrective Action Plan (CAP) submitted to HUD	1 point for no unaddressed findings	App 2B	1	
15.	Funds recapture by HUD	HUD did not recapture grant funds from the most recently expired grant term	1 point for no HUD funds recapture	App 2B	1	
Subtotal Compliance Criteria					4	
PERFORMANCE MEASURES CRITERIA						
17.	Income performance measures	Housing and Income performance measures identified	1 point if yes	App 6A	1	
18.	Housing performance measures	67% or higher	+1 if yes 0 if no	App 6A	1	
19.	Additional performance measures	Additional performance measures identified	1 point if yes	App 6A	1	
Subtotal Performance Measures Criteria					3	

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED _____

Attachment 2

Yakima County HUD CoC Review Committee New Project Evaluation Form – Non-Expansion Projects

Organization _____

Project _____ Reviewer Name _____

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: The effectiveness of each organization will be scored using information gained from the written application and Annual Performance Reports (where applicable). During the review meeting, committee members will review and score the project applications and then total their overall score at the bottom of the Evaluation Form. Scores from all committee members will be added and the resulting average score will serve as a guide for committee members in determining ranking of projects during the review meeting. All scores and comments will be made available to each applicant and the CoC, so please provide comments both positive and or negative as well as any recommendations that you would like the program to address in the future.

1) Program Description and Design – 35 points

Standard	Data Source	Points Possible	Points Awarded
a. Does the type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the program participants?	App	6	
b. Does the type and scale of the supportive services fit the needs of the program participants (this includes all supportive services, regardless of funding source)?	App	6	
c. Does the specific plan for ensuring program participants will be individually assisted to obtain the benefits of the mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible to apply meets the needs of the program participants?	App	6	
d. Are program participants assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs?	App	6	
e. Will at least 75 percent of the proposed program participants come from the street or other locations not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, safe havens, or fleeing domestic violence?	App	6	
TOTALS		30	0

2) Management of Program – 14 points

Standard	Data Source	Points Possible	Points Awarded
a. Has the applicant demonstrated that they can effectively use federal funds and perform the activities proposed in the application, given funding and time limitations?	App	7	

Attachment 2

b. Do the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) have sufficient experience in leveraging other Federal, State, local and private sector funds?	App	5	
c. Is the applicant's organization and management structure appropriate to the project being proposed?	App	5	
d. Has the applicant demonstrated that they will be able to drawdown funds at least once per quarter of the program year, after eligible activities commence?		1	
e. Has the applicant demonstrated that they will be able to distribute funds to subrecipients, in advance of expenditures by the subrecipients?		1	
f. Has the applicant demonstrated that they will be able to distribute the appropriate portion of the funds to a subrecipient no later than 45 days after receiving an approvable request for such distribution from the subrecipient?		1	
TOTALS		20	0

3) Performance Measure – 14 points

Standard	Data Source	Points Possible	Points Awarded
a. Are the required Housing and Income performance measures attainable and measurable for the applicant?	App	6	
b. Does the applicant identify any additional attainable and measurable performance measures?	App	2	
c. Are the identified additional performance measures appropriate indicators of performance for the proposed project?	App	2	
TOTALS		10	0

4) Budget – 7 points

Standard	Data Source	Points Possible	Points Awarded
a. Is the budget realistic for completion of the project?	App	5	
b. Does the budget provide for required minimum 25% match?	App	3	
c. Does the budget provide any leverage sources?	App	2	
TOTALS		10	0

TOTAL POINTS AWARDED _____