

**Local Scoring Guidelines: Renewal PH-RRH, and PH-PSH with an APR  
FY2023 HUD CoC Competition**

Threshold Requirements:

- Match at 25% for eligible activities (all budget line items, except leasing)
- As applicable, participate in the most recent PIT, HIC, and LSA
- Participates in HMIS
- Accepts referrals through Coordinated Entry
- Meet all requirements listed in the Supplemental or Annual NOFO (part of esnaps review)

Projects which meet all the threshold requirements will be scored according to the following guidelines:

WEIGHT	CATEGORY	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<b>30%</b>	<b>Project Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program Best Practices                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Housing First</li> <li>○ Consumer input</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SLVCEH Strategic Plan                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure homelessness is rare, brief, and one-time</li> <li>○ Target Population</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Review of HUD monitoring results</li> <li>• Review of HUD inspection requirements</li> <li>• Housing Placement Process                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Process/time from prioritization to voucher</li> <li>○ Process/time from voucher to housing placement</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Operating as an integrated network in evaluation criteria                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Commitments from range of service providers; integration of education, health, etc.</li> <li>○ Commitments to provide case management coverage</li> <li>○ Utilize coordinated entry and identifying housing units to quickly move persons experiencing homelessness into stable housing</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Address racial disparities to ensure equity</li> </ul>
<b>10%</b>	<b>Budget/Application Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drawdown rate</li> <li>• Expenditure History</li> <li>• Cost per positive outcome</li> <li>• Followed instructions</li> <li>• Submitted on time, with all required attachments</li> <li>• Responses provide sufficient detail and are appropriate for the type of project and target population</li> </ul>
<b>10%</b>	<b>Data Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program level DQ review: accuracy and timeliness</li> </ul>
<b>50%</b>	<b>Need &amp; Performance</b>	<p>How well does the program demonstrate it is needed locally?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization</li> <li>• Hard to Serve Populations/Barriers to Housing                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Percentage of entries with no income</li> <li>○ % Entries disabled</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>How well does the program help the community improve system performance measures/achieve positive client outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Returns to Homelessness /negative exits</li> <li>• Exits to Permanent Housing</li> <li>• Increased income</li> </ul>

2023 NOFA Scoring Tool

Renewals with an APR

Weight	Criteria Category	Renewal Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Point Range	Total
30%	Project Effectiveness	Program Best Practices	Agency Application	Score of 1-5; Multiplied by 2	10
		SLVCEH Homeless Policy Priorities		Score of 1-5; Multiplied by 2	10
		Review of HUD monitoring results		Score of 1-5	5
		Review of HUD inspection requirements		Score of 1-5	5
		Housing Placement Process: Process/time from prioritization to voucher		Score of 1-5	5
		Housing Placement Process: Process/time from voucher to housing placement		Score of 1-5	5
		Integrated Network: Partnerships		Score of 1-5	5
		Integrated Network: Case Management Coverage		Score of 1-5	5
		Coordinated Entry/Identifying Units		Score of 1-5	5
		Integrated Network: Utilizing Coordinated Entry/Identifying Units		Score of 1-5	5
10%	Budget/Application Quality	Quarterly Drawdowns	LOCCs Report verified by Field Office/Agency Application	Score of 1-5	5
		Expenditure History	Agency Application	within (+ or -) 5%    within (+ or -) 10%    >10%	5
		Followed instructions, Timely submission, with attachments	Agency Application	Score of 1-5	5
		Responses sufficient detail and appropriate	Agency Application	Score of 1-5	5
10%	Data Quality	HUD and local Data Quality Standards	Data Quality Report, Application Narrative	Score of 1-5; Multiplied by 4	20

2023 NOFA Scoring Tool

Renewals with an APR

Weight	Criteria Category	Renewal Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Full Points	Half Points	0 Points	Total
30.0%	Need and Performance (All Projects)	Occupancy / Average Daily Unit Utilization	Unit Utilization Rate / 2018 Application Data	>90%	80-90%	<80%	10
		Percentage of entries with no income	APR Q16	>40%	19-40%	<19%	10
		Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown	APR Q23a & 23b	<10%	10-15%	≥15%	15
		Returns to homelessness	HMIS Report: Measure 2a and 2b: Persons who Exit Homelessness to PH Return to Homelessness	<15%	15%-45%	>45%	10
		Percentage of adult stayers who increased earned income	APR Q19	>10%	5-10%	<5%	3.75
		Percentage of adult stayers who increased non-employment income	APR Q19	>20%	10-20%	<10%	3.75
		Percentage of adult leavers who increased earned income	APR Q19	>10%	5-10%	<5%	3.75
		Percentage of adult leavers who increased non-employment income	APR Q19	>20%	10-20%	<10%	3.75
20.0%	Project Specific Need and Performance (PSH)	% entries disabled	APR Q13a2	>85%	65-85%	<65%	15
		Percentage of participants who remain in PSH or exited to permanent housing	The % of stayers and leavers to permanent housing during the operating year	>80%	70-80%	<70%	25
20.0%	Project Specific Need and Performance (RRH)	% entries disabled	APR Q13a2	>40%	20-40%	<20%	5
		Percentage of participants who exited to permanent housing	The % of stayers and leavers to permanent housing during the operating year	>70%	60-70%	<60%	10
		On average, participants spend XX days from project entry to residential move-in	APR Q22c	<60	61-180	>180	25

**Local Scoring Guidelines: Renewal PH-RRH, and PH-PSH without an APR  
FY2023 HUD CoC Competition**

**Renewal Housing Projects without an APR**

WEIGHT	CATEGORY	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<b>30%</b>	<b>Capacity/Application Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No/minor past audit or monitoring findings or concerns (fiscal or program) from HUD or independent auditors</li> <li>• Grant management system in place for complying with government grants</li> <li>• Involvement in the local homeless housing and services system or local low-income housing and services system.</li> <li>• Effective record of administering government funded housing programs for homeless persons or housing for low-income persons.</li> <li>• Followed instructions</li> <li>• Submitted on time, with all required attachments</li> <li>• Responses provide sufficient detail and are appropriate for the type of project and target population</li> </ul>
<b>70 %</b>	<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of activities carried out since funds awarded</li> <li>• Demonstrate need using data from Housing Inventory Chart and Point in Time Count.</li> <li>• Impact on community performance related to HUD system performance measures including promoting racial equity</li> <li>• Timeline for project implementation</li> <li>• Plan to fully expend HUD funds</li> <li>• Rapidly securing housing for clients</li> <li>• Assisting clients with employment/other income</li> <li>• Target population               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (DV) Trauma-informed and client-centered policies</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Utilization of Housing First</li> </ul>

2023 NOFA Scoring Tool

Renewals without an APR

Renewal Housing Projects without an APR

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Point Range	Total (200 points)
30%	Capacity	Audits/Monitoring Review	Local Application	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Grant management system		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Involvement in the local homeless system		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Record of administering government funded housing programs		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Followed instructions, Timely submission, with attachments		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Responses sufficient detail and appropriate		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
70%	Need	Summary of activities carried out	Local Application	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		Target population	Local and EsnapS	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		Utilization of Housing First		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 6	30
		Demonstrate need using data	Local Application	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Impact on community performance including promoting racial equity		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Timeline for project implementation		Score of 1-5	5
		Plan to fully expend HUD funds		Score of 1-5	5
		Rapidly securing housing for clients		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		Assisting clients with employment/other income		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20

**Local Scoring Guidelines: Renewal SSO-CE  
FY2023 HUD CoC Competition**

**Renewal Coordinated Entry Project**

WEIGHT	CATEGORY	EVALUATION CRITERIA
<b>30%</b>	<b>Capacity/Application Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No/minor past audit or monitoring findings or concerns (fiscal or program) from HUD or independent auditors</li> <li>• Grant management system in place for complying with government grants</li> <li>• Involvement in the local homeless housing and services system or local low-income housing and services system.</li> <li>• Effective record of administering government funded housing programs for homeless persons or housing for low-income persons.</li> <li>• Followed instructions</li> <li>• Submitted on time, with all required attachments</li> <li>• Responses provide sufficient detail and are appropriate for the type of project and target population</li> </ul>
<b>70 %</b>	<b>Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System Function               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clients are prioritized/referred as appropriate</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Inclusive coordination with stakeholders</li> <li>• System design that is accessible for all persons seeking information regarding homelessness assistance               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (DV) Trauma-informed and client-centered policies</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Advertised program to reach homeless persons with the highest barriers</li> <li>• Standardized assessment process</li> <li>• Ensuring that program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services</li> </ul>

2023 NOFA Scoring Tool

Renewal Coordinated Entry

Renewal Coordinated Entry Project

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Point Range	Total (200 points)
30%	Capacity	Audits/Monitoring Review	Local Application	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Grant management system		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Involvement in the local homeless system		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Record of administering government funded housing programs		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Followed instructions, Timely submission, with attachments		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
		Responses sufficient detail and appropriate		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 2	10
70%	Need	System Function-current implementation	Local Application	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 8	40
		Inclusive plan for coordination w/ stakeholders	E-snaps & Local Application	Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		System design that is accessible		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		Strategy for advertising		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		Standardized assessment process		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20
		Directed to appropriate housing and services		Score of 1-5, Multiplied by 4	20