

Roanoke City and County/Salem CoC (VA-502) 2019 Continuum of Care Rating and Review Procedure

For the FY 2019 CoC Consolidated Grant Competition, the CoC Ranking 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 in alignment with the HUD System Performance Measures, including:

- % permanent housing exit destinations
- % increasing total income
- % receiving benefits at exit
- % of households who do not return to homelessness within two years of exit
- Severity of needs and vulnerabilities experienced by program participants
- · Cost effectiveness of the project
- · Organization drawdown rates
- Frequency and/or amount of funds recaptured by HUD
- Services to specialized populations, including youth, victims of domestic violence, families with children, persons experiencing chronic homelessness, and veterans

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

- Program description and design
- · Management of program
- · Agency capacity and performance history
- · Fiscal management
- · Budget
- 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
- Services to specialized populations, including youth, victims of domestic violence, families with children, persons experiencing chronic homelessness, and veterans

FY 2019 CoC Ranking Sheet – SSO Supportive Services Only (Excludes Street Outreach)

Reviewer:	Proposal:		
Scoring Elements		Point Values	Score
 The percentage who exited to permanent housi unsubsidized) during the operating year. HUD Max points =30. Total number of individuals exiting: Total number of individuals exiting to permaner destinations: Percentage exiting to permanent housing desting (Source: ESG CAPER Report, Question 23a & b) 	standard is 80%.	Housing Results: 80-100% = 30 points 60-79% =20 points 49-69% = 10 points 0-48% = 0 points	
 The percentage of persons age 18 and older wh total income (from all sources) at program exit. Max. points =20 Total number of adults exiting during operating Total number of adults increasing income at pro Percentage of adults increasing income at progra (Source: HUD APR, Question 19a2) 	year: gram exit:	Income Results: 80-100% = 20 points 50-79% = 10 points 0-49% = 0 points	
 Percentage of adults receiving benefits at progr Standard = 56%. Max. points = 10 Total number of adults exiting: Total number of adults with benefits at exit: Percentage of adults with benefits at exit: (Source: HUD APR, Question 20b) 		Mainstream Benefits: 80-100% = 10 points 50-79% = 5 points 0-49% = 0 points	
 Cost effectiveness: average cost per household: Max. points = 15 Total project spending: Total number of households served: Average cost per household: (Source CoC project spending report and CoC APR, Que 		Cost Effectiveness (SSO): ≤\$500 = 15 points ≥\$500 = 0 points	
 Average VI-SPDAT 2.0 score of individuals and during the operating year. Max. points = 15 Total number of individuals with completed VI-S Average score of those with completed assessme (Source: HMIS custom report) 	families served SPDAT 2.0 assessment:	Vulnerability Results: ≥7 = 15 points ≤6.9 = 0 points	
6. Percentage of people that were served who were chronically homeless at intake. Max. points = 10 Total number of individuals served during prograted and number of individuals categorized as chronic (Source: CoC APR Question 26b)	am year: nically homeless:	Chronically Homeless: ≥75% = 10 points ≤74% = 0 points	
7. Percentage of households served who were cate households with children. Max. points = 10 Total number of households served during programmer of households served who were categories with children: Percentage of households served who were categories with children: (Source: Coc APR Question 8a)	ram year: ized as households	Homeless Families: ≥75% = 10 points ≤74% = 0 points	

A	-	_1		_		L 4
Att	га	cr	٦n	ne	n	ГΙ

 Project summary was clear and funding for objectives is reasonated for number of outcomes. Max. points = 10 	able Max. points = 10 points.
 Project summary included detailed budget and budget narrative Match is documented, budget narrative included, itemized budg clear. Max. points = 20 	et is All elements are included will = 20 points.
10. Monitoring Criteria: 1) Documentation of participant eligibility Data quality meets community standard 3) Drawdown dates from HUD were timely 4) Program identified frequency or amount of funds recaptured by HUD. Max. points = 20	om
Maximum points available = 160	
Total Points Received by Proposal:	
Comments:	
Reviewer Signature:	Date:

FY 2019 CoC Ranking Sheet – SSO

Supportive Services Only (Street Outreach)

vie	ewer:	Proposal:		
	Scoring Elements		Point Values	Score
1.	The percentage persons placed into housing (En Shelter, TH or PH) as a result of the street outre during the operating year. Max points =50. Total number of persons exiting during the oper Total number of persons placed into housing duryear: Percentage of persons placed into housing durin year: (Source: HUD APR, Question 23 a&b)	ach program ating year: ring the operating	Housing Results: 75-100% = 50 points 60-74% = 40 points 46-59% = 30 points 31-45% = 20 points 0-30% = 0 points	
2.	The percentage of households who do NOT retuor, having exited shelter, return to homelessness shelter) within two years of exiting the program 95% Max. points =15 Total number of persons who exited to permane destination two years prior: Number of returns in two years: Percentage of returns to homelessness: (Source: System Performance Measure 2, ART Report	ss (street or n. HUD Standard nt housing	Returns to Homelessness: 0-5% = 15 points 6-20% = 10 points 21-30% = 5 points 31-100%=0 points	
3.	Percentage of people that were served who were chronically homeless at intake. Max. points = 10 Total number of clients served during operating Total number of chronically homeless clients served operating year: Percentage of people served who were categorize homeless: (Source: Coc APR Question 26b)	year: rved during	Chronically Homeless: ≥75% = 10 points ≤74% = 0 points	
	Percentage of people entered with service connot whom that connection is recorded. Max. points = 15 Total number of clients served during operating Total number of clients with service connection that connection is recorded: Percentage of clients with service connection ne connection is recorded: (Source: HUD APR, Question 7)	year: need for whom ed for whom that	Service Connections: ≥75% = 15 points ≤74% = 0 points	
	Cost effectiveness: average cost per household Max. points = 15 Total project spending: Total number of households served: Average cost per household: (Source: CoC project spending report and CoC APR, Qu	uestion 8a)	Cost Effectiveness (SO): ≤\$500 = 15 points ≥\$500 = 0 points	
6.	Average VI-SPDAT 2.0 score of individuals and during the operating year. Max. points = 15 Total number of individuals with completed VI-Sassessment: Average score of those with completed assessment (Source: HMIS custom report)	families served SPDAT 2.0	Vulnerability Results: ≥ 7 = 15 points ≤ 6.9 = 0 points	

Attachment 1

7.	Project summary was clear and funding for objectives is reasonable for number of outcomes. Max. points = 10	Max. points = 10 points.	
8.	Project summary included detailed budget and budget narra Match is documented, budget narrative included, itemized budget is clear. Max. points = 20	All elements are included will = 20 points.	
9.	Monitoring Criteria: 1) Documentation of participant eligibi 2) Data quality meets community standard 3) Drawdown da from HUD were timely 4) Program identified frequency or amount of funds recaptured by HUD. Max. points = 20		
	Maximum points available = 170		
Total F	Points Received by Proposal:		
Comm	ents:		
			ž
Revie	wer Signature:	Date:	

FY 2019 CoC Ranking Sheet – PSH

Permanent Supportive Housing (Including Legacy + Shelter Plus Care)

kevie	ewer:	Proposal:		
	Scoring Elements		Point Values	Score
1.	The percentage of persons who remained in perm program as of the end of the operating year or ex housing (subsidized or unsubsidized). HUD stand Max points =30. Total number of individuals served: Number of individuals who accomplished this mean Percentage achieving measure: (Source: System Performance Measure 7, ART Report 70)	ited to permanent dard is 80%.	Housing Results: 90-100% = 30 points 80-89% =20 points 70-79% = 10 points 0-69% = 0 points	
2.	The percentage of persons age 18 and older who total income (from all sources) at program exit. Max. points =20 Total number of adults leavers: Number of adults who accomplished this measure: Percentage achieving measure: (Source: HUD APR, Question 19a2)	increased their	Income Results: 80-100% = 20 points 50-79% = 10 points 0-49% = 0 points	
	Percentage of adults receiving benefits at program Standard = 56%. Max. points = 10 Total number of adults exiting: Total number of adults exiting with benefits: Percentage of adults exiting with benefits: (Source: HUD APR, Question 20b)		Mainstream Benefits: 80-100% = 10 points 50-79% = 5 points 0-49% = 0 points	
	Percentage of households who do NOT return to get a new homeless certification) within two y program. HUD Standard 95%. Max. points = 20 Total number of persons who exited to p destination (2 years prior): Number of returns in 2 years: Percentage of returns in 2 years: (Source: Report 701 - Exits to Permanent Househomelessness)	vears of exiting the permanent housing sing with Return to	Return to Homelessness: 0-5% = 20 points 6-49% = 10 points 49-100% = 0 points	
	Cost effectiveness: average cost per household se Max. points = 15 Total project spending: Total number of households served: Average cost per household: (Source: CoC project spending report and CoC APR, Questions)	ition 8a)	Cost Effectiveness (PSH): ≤\$9,000 = 15 points ≥\$9,000 = 0 points	
6.	Average VI-SPDAT 2.0 score of individuals and far during the operating year. Max. points = 15 Total number of individuals with completed VI-SPI Average score of those with completed assessment (Source: HMIS custom report)	DAT 2.0 assessment:	Vulnerability Results: ≥ 7 = 15 points ≤ 6.9 = 0 points	
7.	Percentage of people that were served who were chronically homeless at intake. Max. points = 5 Total number of individuals served: Total number of individuals who were categorized homeless: Percentage of individuals categorized as chronical (Source: CoC APR Question 26b)	as chronically	Chronically Homeless: ≥75% = 5 points ≤74% = 0 points	

Attachment 1

8. Percentage of households served who were categorized as households with children. Max. points = 5 Total number of households served: Number of households with children: Percentage of households with children: (Source: CoC APR Question 8a)	Homeless Families: ≥75% = 5 points ≤74% = 0 points		
 Project summary was clear and funding for objectives is reason for number of outcomes. Max. points = 10 	nable Max. points = 10 points.		
10. Project summary included detailed budget and budget narrative Match is documented, budget narrative included, itemized budclear. Max. points = 20	1		
11. Monitoring Criteria: 1) Documentation of participant eligibility Data quality meets community standard 3) Drawdown dates for HUD were timely 4) Program identified frequency or amount of funds recaptured by HUD 5) Participation in Coordinated Entry Max. points = 20	om of Max. Points = 20		
Maximum points available = 170			
Total Points Received by Proposal:			
Comments:			
Reviewer Signature:	Date:		

Blue Ridge Continuum of Care FY 2019 New and Renewal Projects Executive Summary for Ranking Committee

1.	Provide a description that addresses the entire scope of the proposed project.
2.	Please explain your agency's experience managing federal grants and in implementing services similar to the proposed project. If the proposed project includes a sub recipient(s), please also describe the sub recipient(s) capacity and experience in managing federal grants and in implementing similar projects.
3.	Did your agency receive any findings from HUD or through local monitoring in the past year? If so, please provide the committee with your corrective action plans, if applicable.
4.	If submitting an application for housing and/or supportive services, please describe your organization's ability to implement this project in alignment with the Housing First model.
	return this form to Carla Wallace – City of Roanoke, 215 Church Avenue, SW, Room 305, Roanoke 116 or email to <u>Carla.Wallace@roanokeva.gov</u> no later than August 8, 2018.

5.	Please describe your organization's ability to meet the match requirement outlined in section 578.73 of the CoC Program Interim Rule.
6.	If requesting renewal funding, did your agency request a project extension for the most recently completed grant year? If yes, please explain.
7.	Please identify the frequency of your drawdown rates from eLOCCS.
8.	Please attach a copy of your Summary Budget from ESNAPS, Tab 6E.

Please return this form to Carla Wallace – City of Roanoke, 215 Church Avenue, SW, Room 305, Roanoke, VA 24016 or email to Carla.Wallace@roanokeva.gov no later than August 8, 2018.