#### Before Starting the Project Listings for the CoC Priority Listing

The FY 2018 CoC Consolidated Application requires TWO submissions. Both this Project Priority Listing AND the CoC Application MUST be submitted prior to the CoC Program Competition deadline as required by the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition NOFA.

The FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing includes the following:

Reallocation forms – must be fully completed if the CoC is reallocating eligible renewal projects to create new projects as described in the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition NOFA.
 New Project Listing – lists all new project applications created through reallocation, the bonus, and DV Bonus that have been approved and ranked or rejected by the CoC.

- Renewal Project Listing – lists all eligible renewal project applications that have been approved and ranked or rejected by the CoC.

- UFA Costs Project Listing – applicable and only visible for Collaborative Applicants that were designated as a Unified Funding Agency (UFA) during the FY 2018 CoC Program Registration process. Only 1 UFA Costs project application is permitted and can only be submitted by the Collaborative Applicant.

- CoC Planning Project Listing – Only 1 CoC planning project is permitted per CoC and can only be submitted by the Collaborative Applicant.

- HUD-2991, Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan – Collaborative Applicants must attach an accurately completed, signed, and dated HUD-2991.

Things to Remember:

- All new and renewal projects must be approved and ranked or rejected on the Project Listings. - Collaborative Applicants are responsible for ensuring all project applications are accurately appearing on the Project Listings and there are no project applications missing from one or more Project Listings.

- If a project application(s) is rejected by the CoC, the Collaborative Applicant must notify the affected project applicant(s) no later than 15 days before the CoC Program Competition application deadline outside of e-snaps and include the reason for rejection.

- For each project application rejected by the CoC the Collaborative Applicant must select the reason for the rejection from the dropdown provided.

- If the Collaborative Applicant needs to amend a project application for any reason after ranking has been completed, the ranking of other projects will not be affected: however, the Collaborative Applicant MUST ensure the amended project is returned to the applicable Project Listing AND re-rank the project application BEFORE submitting the CoC Priority Listing to HUD in e-snaps.

Additional training resources are available online on the CoC Training page of the HUD Exchange at: https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources/

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 1	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

#### 1A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Identification

#### Instructions:

The fields on this screen are read only and reference the information entered during the CoC Registration process. Updates cannot be made at this time. If the information on this screen is not correct, contact the HUD Exchange Ask A Question (AAQ) at https://www.hudexchange.info/ask-a-question/.

Collaborative Applicant Name: Michigan State Housing Development Authority

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 2	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

## 2. Reallocation

#### Instructions:

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions. Submit technical question to the e-snaps HUD Exchange Ask A Question (AAQ) at https://www.hudexchange.info/get-assistance/.

2-1. 2-1. Is the CoC reallocating funds from Yes one or more eligible renewal grant(s) that will expire in calendar year 2019 into one or more new projects?

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 3	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

## 3. Reallocation - Grant(s) Eliminated

CoCs that are reallocating eligible renewal project funds to create a new project application – as detailed in the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition NOFA – may do so by eliminating one or more expiring eligible renewal projects. CoCs that are eliminating eligible renewal projects entirely must identify those projects on this form.

Amount Available for New Proje (Sum of All Eliminated Projects)				
\$119,519				
Eliminated Project Name	Grant Number Eliminated	Component Type	Annual Renewa I Amount	Type of Reallocation
MHAAB 2017 Dedica	MI0558L5F001700	РН	\$119,51 9	Regular

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 4	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

## 3. Reallocation - Grant(s) Eliminated Details

#### Instructions:

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions. Submit technical question to the e-snaps HUD Exchange Ask A Question (AAQ) at https://www.hudexchange.info/get-assistance/.

\* 3-1. Complete each of the fields below for each eligible renewal grant that is being eliminated during the FY 2017 reallocation process. Collaborative Applicants should refer to the final HUD-approved FY 2017 Grant Inventory Worksheet to ensure all information entered on this form is accurate.

Eliminated Project Name:	MHAAB 2017 Dedicated Plus PSH Project
Grant Number of Eliminated Project:	MI0558L5F001700
Eliminated Project Component Type:	PH
Eliminated Project Annual Renewal Amount:	\$119,519

3-2. Describe how the CoC determined that this project should be eliminated and include the date the project applicant was notified. (limit 750 characters)

Project voluntarily reallocated due to capacity constraints for match and service delivery.

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 5	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

## 4. Reallocation - Grant(s) Reduced

CoCs that are reallocating eligible renewal project funds to create a new project application – as detailed in the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition NOFA – may do so by reducing one or more expiring eligible renewal projects. CoCs that are reducing eligible renewal projects entirely must identify those projects on this form.

Amount Available for New Project (Sum of All Reduced Projects)					
\$0					
Reduced Project NameReduced Grant NumberAnnual Renewal 					
This list contains no items					

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 6	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

## 5. Reallocation - New Project(s)

Collaborative Applicants must complete each field on this form that identifies the new project(s) the CoC created through the reallocation process.

Sum of All New Reallocated Project Requests (Must be less than or equal to total amount(s) eliminated and/or reduced)

\$119,519				
Current Priority #	New Project Name	Component Type	Transferred Amount	Reallocation Type
9	PSH Dedicate	PH	\$119,519	Regular

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 7	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

#### 5. Reallocation - New Project(s) Details

#### Instructions:

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions. Submit technical question to the e-snaps HUD Exchange Ask A Question (AAQ) at https://www.hudexchange.info/get-assistance/.

5-1. Complete each of the fields below for each new project created through reallocation in the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition. For list of all eligible types of new projects that may be created through the reallocation process, see the FY 2018 CoC Program Competition NOFA.

FY 2018 Rank (from Project Listing): 9
 Proposed New Project Name: PSH Dedicated Plus Expansion
 Component Type: PH
 Amount Requested for New Project: \$119,519

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 8	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

#### 6. Reallocation: Balance Summary

#### Instructions

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2018 CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions. Submit technical question to the e-snaps HUD Exchange Ask A Question (AAQ) at https://www.hudexchange.info/get-assistance/.

6-1 Below is a summary of the information entered on the eliminated and reduced reallocation forms. The last field on this form, "Remaining Reallocation Balance" should equal zero. If there is a positive balance remaining, this means the amount of funds being eliminated or reduced are greater than the amount of funds request for the new reallocated project(s). If there is a negative balance remaining, this means that more funds are being requested for the new reallocated project(s) than have been reduced or eliminated from other eligible renewal projects.

#### **Reallocation Chart: Reallocation Balance Summary**

Reallocated funds available for new project(s):	\$119,519
Amount requested for new project(s):	\$119,519
Remaining Reallocation Balance:	\$0

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 9	09/18/2018
------------------------------	--------	------------

## **Continuum of Care (CoC) New Project Listing**

#### Instructions:

Prior to starting the New Project Listing, Collaborative Applicants should carefully review the "CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions" and the "CoC Project Listing Instructional Guide", both of which are available at: https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources.

To upload all new project applications that have been submitted to this CoC Project Listing, click on the "Update List" button. This process may take a few minutes based upon the number of new projects submitted that need to be located in the e-snaps system. The Collaborative Applicant may update each of the Project Listings simultaneously. The Collaborative Applicant can wait for the Project Listings to be updated or can log out of e-snaps and come back later to view the updated list(s). To review a project on the New Project Listing, click on the magnifying glass next to each project to view project details. To view the actual project application, click on the orange folder. If there are errors identified by the Collaborative Applicant, the project can be amended back to the project applicant to make the necessary changes by clicking on the amend icon. The Collaborative Applicant has the sole responsibility for ensuring all amended projects are resubmitted and appear on this project listing BEFORE submitting the CoC Priority Listing in e-snaps.

EX1_Project_List_Status_field	List Updated Successfully
-------------------------------	---------------------------

Project Name	Date Submitte d	Comp Type	Applican t Name	Budget Amount	Grant Term	Rank	PH/Reall oc	PSH/RR H	Expansi on
2018 DV TH PH- RRH	2018-08- 17 15:21:	Joint TH & PH- RRH	Michigan Departme 	\$653,648	1 Year	23			
PSH Dedicate d Plu	2018-09- 14 10:22:	PH	Michigan Departme 	\$119,519	1 Year	9	Reallocati on	PSH	Yes
Coordinat ed Entry	2018-09- 14 13:08:	SSO	Michigan State Ho	\$529,931	1 Year	24	PH Bonus		

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 10	09/18/2018
------------------------------	---------	------------

## Continuum of Care (CoC) Renewal Project Listing

#### Instructions:

Prior to starting the New Project Listing, Collaborative Applicants should carefully review the "CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions" and the "CoC Project Listing Instructional Guide", both of which are available at: https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources.

To upload all renewal project applications that have been submitted to this Renewal Project Listing, click on the "Update List" button. This process may take a few minutes based upon the number of renewal projects that need to be located in the e-snaps system. The Collaborative Applicant may update each of the Project Listings simultaneously. The Collaborative Applicant can wait for the Project Listings to be updated or can log out of e-snaps and come back later to view the updated list(s). To review a project on the Renewal Project Listing, click on the magnifying glass next to each project to view project details. To view the actual project application, click on the orange folder. If there are errors identified by the Collaborative Applicant, the project can be amended back to the project applicant to make the necessary changes by clicking on the amend icon. The Collaborative Applicant has the sole responsibility for ensuring all amended projects are resubmitted and appear on this project listing BEFORE submitting the CoC Priority Listing in e-snaps.

The Collaborative Applicant certifies that there is a demonstrated need for all renewal permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing projects listed on the Renewal Project Listing.

The Collaborative Applicant does not have any renewal permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing renewal projects.

**EX1\_Project\_List\_Status\_field** List Updated Successfully

Project Name	Date Submitted	Grant Term	Applicant Name	Budget Amount	Rank	PSH/RRH	Comp Type	Consolida tion Type
Homeless Re- Housi	2018-07- 26 13:59:	1 Year	Human Developm ent	\$317,300	C14	RRH	PH	Fully Consolidat ed
HMIS Ren 18	2018-08- 08 12:55:	1 Year	Michigan State Ho	\$136,764	3		HMIS	
ACCMHS - PSH/Dedi ·	2018-07- 27 09:20:	1 Year	Allegan County Co	\$138,015	6	PSH	PH	

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 11	09/18/2018
------------------------------	---------	------------

Homeless Re- Housi	2018-07- 26 11:23:	1 Year	Human Developm ent	\$68,503	16	RRH	PH	Individual
Michigan Statewid	2018-08- 08 14:08:	1 Year	Michigan State Ho	\$652,700	1		HMIS	
ACCMHS - RRH FY 1	2018-07- 27 09:19:	1 Year	Allegan County Co	\$100,762	22	RRH	PH	
Ending Family Hom	2018-07- 27 15:33:	1 Year	Capital Area Comm	\$100,348	4	RRH	PH	
Housing Services	2018-07- 25 11:13:	1 Year	Housing Services	\$99,030	7	PSH	PH	
2018 MDHHS MHAAB RRH	2018-07- 27 15:22:	1 Year	Michigan Departme	\$2,189,46 4	20	RRH	PH	Individual
Hillsdale County	2018-07- 27 12:42:	1 Year	Communit y Action	\$133,172	5	PSH	PH	
Homeless Re- Housi	2018-07- 26 13:58:	1 Year	Human Developm ent	\$248,797	15	RRH	PH	Individual
Rapid Re- Housing	2018-07- 27 15:12:	1 Year	Michigan Departme	\$1,251,54 8	21	RRH	PH	Individual
ACCMHS - MI500 Co	2018-07- 27 09:20:	1 Year	Allegan County Co	\$26,188	11	PSH	PH	
Rapid Rehousing S	2018-08- 14 11:40:	1 Year	EightCAP, Inc.	\$61,516	18	RRH	PH	
Alger- Marquette C	2018-08- 15 10:47:	1 Year	Alger Marquette C	\$217,103	17		Joint TH & PH-RRH	
Stability and Bey	2018-08- 16 14:56:	1 Year	Channel Housing M	\$65,448	13	RRH	PH	
West Bridge Perma	2018-08- 22 10:56:	1 Year	Eastern Upper Pen	\$123,196	12	PSH	PH	
2018 MDHHS MHAAB	2018-08- 21 13:51:	1 Year	Michigan Departme	\$2,347,93 8	10	PSH	PH	
PSH 2004 Statewid	2018-08- 31 11:59:	1 Year	Michigan Departme	\$398,987	8	PSH	PH	
2018 Consolidat ed	2018-08- 31 14:27:	1 Year	Michigan Departme	\$3,441,01 2	C19	RRH	PH	Fully Consolidat ed

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 12	09/18/2018
------------------------------	---------	------------

MSHDA FY18	2018-09- 14	1 Year	Michigan State Ho	\$341,000	2	SSO	
Coordi	12:45:						

Project Priority List FY2018 Page 13 09/18/2018	
---	--

## Continuum of Care (CoC) Planning Project Listing

#### Instructions:

Prior to starting the CoC Planning Project Listing, Collaborative Applicants should carefully review the "CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions" and the "CoC Project Listing Instructional Guide," both of which are available at: https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources.

To upload the CoC planning project application that has been submitted to this CoC Planning Project Listing, click on the "Update List" button. This process may take a few minutes as the project will need to be located in the e-snaps system. The Collaborative Applicant may update each of the Project Listings simultaneously. The Collaborative Applicant can wait for the Project Listings to be updated or can log out of e-snaps and come back later to view the updated list(s). To review the CoC Planning Project Listing, click on the magnifying glass next to view the project details. To view the actual project application, click on the orange folder. If there are errors identified by the Collaborative Applicant, the project can be amended back to the project applicant to make the necessary changes by clicking on the amend icon.

Only one CoC Planning project application can be submitted by a Collaborative Applicant and must match the Collaborative Applicant information on the CoC Applicant Profile. Any additional CoC Planning project applications must be rejected.

#### EX1\_Project\_List\_Status\_field

Project Name	Date Submitted	Grant Term	Applicant Name	Budget Amount	Comp Type
MI-500 CoC Planni	2018-09-12 10:12:	1 Year	Michigan State Ho	\$264,976	CoC Planning Proj

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 14	09/18/2018
------------------------------	---------	------------

## **Funding Summary**

#### Instructions

For additional information, carefully review the "CoC Priority Listing Detailed Instructions" and the "CoC Priority Listing Instructional Guide", both of which are available at: https://www.hudexchange.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources.

This page contains the total budget summaries for each of the project listings for which the Collaborative Applicant approved and ranked or rejected project applications. The Collaborative Applicant must review this page to ensure the totals for each of the categories is accurate. The "Total CoC Request" indicates the total funding request amount the Collaborative Applicant will submit to HUD for funding consideration. As stated previously, only 1 UFA Cost project application (for UFA designated Collaborative Applicants only) and only 1 CoC Planning project application can be submitted and only the Collaborative Applicant designated by the CoC is eligible to request these funds.

Title	Total Amount
Renewal Amount	\$8,700,479
Consolidated Amount	\$3,758,312
New Amount	\$1,303,098
CoC Planning Amount	\$264,976
Rejected Amount	\$0
TOTAL CoC REQUEST	\$10,268,553

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 15	09/18/2018

## Attachments

Document Type	Required?	Document Description	Date Attached
Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan	Yes	MI-500 Certificat	09/17/2018
FY 2017 Rank (from Project Listing)	No	MI-500 Ranking To	09/17/2018
Other	No		
Other	No		

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 16	09/18/2018
------------------------------	---------	------------

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** MI-500 Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** MI-500 Ranking Tool Objective Score Cards

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** 

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** 

Project Priority List FY2018	Page 17	09/18/2018
------------------------------	---------	------------

#### **Submission Summary**

WARNING: The FY2017 CoC Consolidated Application requires 2 submissions. Both this Project Priority Listing AND the CoC Consolidated Application MUST be submitted.

WARNING: The FY2017 CoC Consolidated Application requires 2 submissions. Both this Project Priority Listing AND the CoC Consolidated Application MUST be submitted.

Page	Last Updated
Before Starting	No Input Required
1A. Identification	09/13/2018
2. Reallocation	09/13/2018
3. Grant(s) Eliminated	09/13/2018
4. Grant(s) Reduced	No Input Required
5. New Project(s)	09/13/2018
6. Balance Summary	No Input Required
7A. CoC New Project Listing	09/14/2018
7B. CoC Renewal Project Listing	09/14/2018

7D. CoC Planning Project Listing
Funding Summary
Attachments
Submission Summary

09/13/2018 No Input Required 09/17/2018 No Input Required

Project Priority List FY2018 Page 19 09/18/2018
---

## Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan

I certify that the proposed activities/projects in the application are consistent with the jurisdiction's current, approved Consolidated Plan. (Type or clearly print the following information:)

Applicant Name:	Michigan Balance of State Continuum of Care
Project Name:	See Attached
Location of the Project:	State of Michigan - Balance of State (See Attached)
Name of the Federal Program to which the applicant is applying:	HUD Continuum of Care
Name of Certifying Jurisdiction:	State of Michigan
Certifying Official of the Jurisdiction Name:	Kelly Rose
Title:	Chief Housing Solutions Officer, Michigan State Housing Dev Auth
Signature:	Kuga Rose
Date:	09/13/2018

# MI-500 Michigan Balance of State Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan 9/13/2018

	Τ.								1			Т		ł		T					Ţ				Γ			Т		Т	_		
19 A		M	17 H	A	16 H		15 E	14 B	1 <u>3</u> H	_	11 0 0			2		<u>9</u>	N	8 Н	Z	7 H	6 H	A	s	4	ω A	7	2 A	2	1 A	2	×	-	
19 Authority	18 Human Services	Michigan Department of Health and	17 Health Services	Allegan County Community Mental	Human Services	Michigan Department of Health and	EightCAP, Inc.	Alger Marquette Community Action Board	13 Human Development Commission		Crannel Housing Ministries, Inc./doa OCEANA'S HOME Partnership		castern opper retuisure veteration Foundation	Figerian James Destantia Vistorant	Allegan County Community Mental	Human Services	Michigan Department of Health and	Human Services	Michigan Department of Health and	7 Housing Services Mid Michigan	Health Services	Allegan County Community Mental	Community Action Agency	4 Capital Area Community Services	Authority	Michigan State Housing Development	Authority	Michigan State Housing Development	Authority	Michigan State Housing Development	Authority	Michigan State Housing Development	Applicant Name
Janet Irrer	Paula Kaiser VanDam		Nikki McLaughlin		Paula Kaiser VanDam		Christa Jerome	Rod Desjardins	Lori Offenbecher		Kittie Tuinstra		Linda LaFord	THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE	Nikki Mclauchlin	Paula Kaiser VanDam		Paula Kaiser VanDam		Denise Duna	Nikki McLaughlin		Laura Reaume	Pamela Elise	Rose Meyer		Janet Irrer		Rose Meyer		Janet Irrer		Contact Name
irreri@michigan.gov	kaiserp@michigan.gov		nmclaughlin@accmhs.org	8	kaiserp@michigan.gov		christai@8cap.org	rdesjardins@amcab.org	orio@hdc-caro.org		ohp kittie@oceana.net		laford@dmcaa.com		nmrlaushlin@accmhs.org	kaiserp@michigan.gov		kaiserp@michigan.gov		ddunn@hs-mm.org	nmclaughlin@accmhs.org		Ireaume@caaih.org	pelise@cacs-inc.org	meyerr3@michigan.gov		irrerj@michigan.gov		meyerr3@michigan.gov		irreri@michigan.gov		Contact Email
(517) 335-3038	(51/) 241-0638		(269) 673-3384		(517) 241-0638		(616) 754-9315	(906) 288-6522	(989) 673-4121		(231) 873-2222		(906) 632-3363		(769) 672-2384	(517) 241-0638		(517) 241-0683		(517) 541-1180	(269) 673-3384		(517) 784-4800	(517) 393-1722	(517) 241-1291		(517) 335-3038		(517) 241-1291		(517) 335-3038		<b>Contact Phone</b>
Balance of State	balance of state		Allegan County		Balance of State		Ionia/Montcalm Counties	Region 1 - Balance of State	Counties	Huron/Lapeer/Sanilac/Tuscola	Counties	Into Mason Nousian Oceans	Chippewa County	0	Allegan County	Balance of State		Balance of State		Clinton County	Allegan County	1	Hillsdale County	Clinton/Shiawassee Counties	Statewide		Balance of State		Statewide		Balance of State		Location
Coordinated Entry Outreach	2018 UV IN PH-RRH		ACCMHS - RRH FY 18 Renewal ES18		2018 Consolidated Rapid Re-Housing		Rapid Rehousing SH ionia/Montcalm FY2018	Renewal	Consolidated FY2018	Homeless Rehousing Program	Stability and Beyond Program		Housing	West Bridge Dermanent Sunnortive	ACCMHS - MISOU COC FT 18 RENEWAI	Plus	2018 MDHHS MHAAB PSH Dedicated	PSH Statewide Leasing		Clinton PSH	ES18	PSH/DedicatedPlus FY18 Renewal	Hillsdale County Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Scattered	Ending Family Homelessness through Rapid Re-Housing - Clinton and	HMIS Ren 18		Coordinated Entry		Michigan Statewide HMIS		CoC Planning Grant		Project Name
\$ 529	S OS		\$ 100		\$ 3,441		\$ 61	\$ 217	\$ 317		\$ 65		<b> \$</b> 123		\$ 26	\$ 2,46		\$ 41		ې 8	5 13		\$ 13	\$ 10	\$ 13		\$ 34		\$ 65		\$ 26		Fur
529,931.00 N/A	003,046.00		100,762.00		\$ 3,441,012.00		61,516.00	217,103.00	317,300.00		65,448.00		123,196.00		26.188.00	2,467,457.00		411,519.00		99,030.00	138,015.00		133,172.00	100,348.00	136,764.00		341,000.00		652,700.00		264,976.00 N/A		Funding
N/A	N/A			MINS64I SE001700	MI0566LSF001700		MI0435L5F001703	MI0560L5F001700		MI0516L5F001701	MI0462L5F001702		MI0026L5F001710		MI0463L5F001702		MI0565L5F001700	OT / TONIC / TONIM	MIN0171 SE001710	MI0561L5F001700		MI0563L5F001700	MI0562L5F001700	MI0434LSF001703		MI0007LSF001710					N/A		Grant Number



#### FY2018 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION RENEWAL PROJECT SCORECARD HOUSING PROJECTS

Applicant and Project Name: Click here to enter text.

Rater Name: Click here to enter text.

Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

Project Quality Requirements		a characteristic and the second
Renewal projects must ensure they continue to meet HUD thresholds for funding.	Maximum Score Possible	PSH 125 RRH - 95
	Total Project Score	
	Minimum Threshold Score	PSH – 87 RRH – 66.5

Please note at the numbered questions on the application correspond with the numbered scoring areas below.

Section I: Project Effectiveness	Possible Points: <b>PSH – 70</b> <b>RRH – 40</b> Possible Deductions: -5	Section Score:	
3. How many beds are dedicated/prioritized for priority population(s)?			
Veterans			
Chronic			
Domestic Violence	Prioritized by	Ranking Tool	
Youth			
Families			
4. Does the project qualify as low barrier?			
Yes	4	-	
No	0		
5. Does the project meet all Housing First criteria?	-		
Yes	6	-	
No	0		
6. Did the project take 100% of all referrals from Coordinated Entry in the past			
Yes	5	-	
7. Prioritization and Referral Process No	0		
Proof of Prioritization and Referral Process No Information Provided	5	-	
Efficient Use of Funding:	U U		
8. What is the project's utilization rate?			
95% or higher	5	r	
80%-94%	0	╄────	
79% or lower	-5		
9. Percent of funding recaptured in last completed grant year			
a. Amount authorized in most recent completed HUD grant year			
b. Remaining balance in eLOCCS		14	
7% or less	5	0.000	
8% or more	0	4	

Yes	5	
No	0	1
HMIS Participation		
11. Percentage of APR Data Quality Elements (6a6d.) with 5% or less null or r	nissing values	
85% or greater	5	
Less than 84%	0	
HUD Monitoring Findings		
12. Does the recipient have any HUD monitoring findings in any of the agency's projects? If yes, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of the Funding Review Panel for the application to meet standards.	Standard Met: Yes/No	
Impact on Homelessness		
13. Is this project the only CoC funded project with dedicated beds to a partic	ular target populat	ion? (Answered
by Project Evaluation based on all applications submitted for this NOFA.)		
Yes		Not Scored Taken into consideration
No		in a tie score situation
14. Would additional funds be accepted?		1
Yes	0	Not Scored
No		
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY		the second se
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a	s having zero incor	ne at
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a	10	me at
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79%	10 8	ne at
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69%	10 8 5	ne at
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50%	10 8 5 0	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2)	10 8 5 0 aving two or more	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50%	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49%	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49% 10%-29%	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8 5	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49% Less than 10%	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8 5 0	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49% 10%-29% Less than 10% 17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? (APR 13.A.2)	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8 5 0 APR Q26a.)	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49% 10%-29% Less than 10% 17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? ( 80% or more	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8 5 0 APR Q26a.) 10	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49% 10%-29% Less than 10% 17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? ( 80% or more 70-%79%	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8 5 0 APR Q26a.) 10 8	-
Serving High Need Populations – PSH ONLY 15. What percentage of the households met "hard to serve" criteria defined a Start/entry? (APR 23) 80% or more 70-%79% 50%-69% Less than 50% 16. What percentage of participants met "hard to serve" criteria defined as ha mental health conditions known at Start/entry? (APR 13.A.2) More than 50% 30%-49% 10%-29% Less than 10% 17. What percentage of the households served were chronically homeless? ( 80% or more	10 8 5 0 aving two or more 10 8 5 0 APR Q26a.) 10 8 5 5 10 5 5 10 8 5 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	-

Section II: Project Performance	Possible Points: 55	Section Score:
Performance Data		
18. Length of Stay		_
	ADD 33- 41	
PSH—Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days (	APK 223.1)	
PSH—Percentage of leavers that remained in project more than 180 days ( 95% and more		1

75%-84%	10	
65%-74%	5	
55%-64%	0	1
RRH—Percentage of participants that took 30 days or less from project entry to	lease up (CAPE	R 22C)
80%-100%	20	
60%-79%	15	1
40%-59%	10	1
20%-39%	5	1
0%-19%	0	
19. Exits to Permanent Housing		
PSH - Percent who remain in or move to PH		
95% or higher	25	
90%-94%	20	1
85%-89%	15	1
80%-84%	10	1
75%-79%	5	1
Less than 75%	0	
RRH - Percent who exit to PH		
95% or higher	25	
90%-94%	20	1
85%-89%	15	1
80%-84%	10	1
75%-79%	5	1
Less than 75%	0	1
20. New or Increased Income and Earned Income		
a. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.1)		
8% and higher	2.5	
5%-7%	1.5	1
Less than 5%	0	1
b. PSH Project Stayers: New or increased other (non-employment) income (APR :	19a.1)	
50% and higher	2.5	1
25%-49%	1.5	1
Less than 25%	0	1
c. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)	-	-
8% and higher	2.5	
5%-7%	1.5	1
Less than 5%	0	1
c. RRH Project Leavers: New or increased earned income (APR 19a.2)		
	5	
30% and higher		
30% and higher 20%-29%	2.5	
20%-29%	2.5	1
20%-29% Less than 20%	2.5	1
20%-29% Less than 20% d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)	0	<u> </u>
20%-29% Less than 20% d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 50% and higher	0 2.5	1
20%-29% Less than 20% d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 50% and higher 25%-49%	0 2.5 1.5	1
20%-29% Less than 20% d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 50% and higher 25%-49% Less than 25%	0 2.5	
20%-29% Less than 20% d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 50% and higher 25%-49% Less than 25% d. RRH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)	0 2.5 1.5 0	
20%-29% Less than 20% d. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 50% and higher 25%-49% Less than 25% d. RRH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 10% and higher	0 2.5 1.5 0 5	
20%-29% Less than 20% J. PSH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2) 50% and higher 25%-49% Less than 25% J. RRH Project Leavers: New or increased non-employment income (APR 19a.2)	0 2.5 1.5 0	

Section III: Completion of Application		Possible Points: 0 Deductions: -10 Minimum: -5	Section Score:
21. Is the application complete and accurate?			•
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	1
22. Are all required attachments provided?			
	Yes	0	
	No	-5	1
	No	-5	]



#### FY18 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION NEW, RENEWAL, or BONUS PROJECT SCORECARD INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Applicant and Project Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Rater Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

Project Quality Requirements				
requirements before being considered for funding on the P	Aaximum Score ossible			125
merit of the project. Threshold requirements are pass/fail	otal Brainst Sco			
	Total Project Score			
	/linimum Thresh core	old		87.5
Section I: Project Overview		Possible 1	ONCE INTERCONTRACTOR ADDR	Section Score:
1.a. Description of Renewal project: Is performance meeting ex	pectations?			
Score given according to how well the project design of	lemonstrates:			
Understanding of the purpose of infrastructure projects (i.e	Entry and HMIS)			
En			.	
Type, scale, and target geographic area f		15		
Understanding of HUD expectations for either Coordinated	· · ·			
Performance measures that meet or exceed HUD or Co	C benchmarks			
1.b. Description of New or Bonus projects: Does the project pro	posed meet the	infrastru	icture nee	eds of the Co
Score given according to how well the project design of		15		
Outline of project start-up (i.e. needs, poten				
Understanding of the purpose of infrastructure projects (i.e				
	itry and HMIS)			
Type, scale, and target geographic area f		1		
Understanding of HUD expectations for either Coordinated				
Similar performance in other projects that meet or excee				
	benchmarks	Description		C
Section II: Performance and Improvement		Possible 5	0	Section Score:
3. List the outcomes reported to HUD for this project and descr outcomes.	ibe the project's	s progres:	s in reach	ing those
Score given according to selected outcomes' alignment	nt with either:			
System Performance Measure		1	0	
Coordinated Entry Self-Assessment Tool, as pro				
4. Does the project have a continual quality improvement plan				
Score given according to detail provided in			10	
Score given according to detail provided in References to data collection	on and review	1	0	
Score given according to detail provided in References to data collection Incorporation of qualitative observations into	on and review plan/process	1	0	
Score given according to detail provided in References to data collecti Incorporation of qualitative observations into Gathered findings from plan/process incorporated into LPB de	on and review plan/process ecision-making			
Score given according to detail provided in References to data collection Incorporation of qualitative observations into Gathered findings from plan/process incorporated into LPB de 5. How does the project ensure alignment in practices with bot	on and review plan/process ecision-making h HUD and CoC			
Score given according to detail provided in References to data collection Incorporation of qualitative observations into Gathered findings from plan/process incorporated into LPB de 5. How does the project ensure alignment in practices with bot Must include references to HUD and BoS CoC langu	on and review plan/process ecision-making h HUD and CoC	priorities		

Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate the impact of quality infrastructure on outcomes for permanent housing throughout the CoC.	10	
7c. Expenditure of Funds		
100%	10	
95-99%	5	
Less than 95%	0	
8. Does the recipient have any HUD monitoring findings in any of the agency's projects? If yes, findings must be resolved or explained to the satisfaction of the Funding Review Panel for the application to meet standards.	Standard Met: Yes/No	

Section IV: Organizational Capacity	Possible Points: 20	Section Score:
Describe agency key staff positions and qualifications of individuals who will carry out the project	10	
10. Describe the agency's financial management system, including financial reporting, record keeping, accounting systems, payment procedures, procurement processes, and audit requirements.	10	

Section V: Financial Information	Possible Points: 40	Section Score:
11. Do project costs appear reasonable when compared to project costs of similar project types?	5	
12. Audit		
a. Most recent audit found no exceptions to standard practices	3	245
b. Most recent audit identified agency as "low risk"	3	
c. Most recent audit indicates no findings	4	
13. Documented match amount	5	
14. Budgeted costs are reasonable, allocable, and allowable	20	

Completion of Application	Possible Points: 0 Deductions: -10	Section Score:
Are all required attachments provided?		
Yes	0	
No	-5	
Is the application complete and accurate?		
Yes	0	
No	-5	



#### FY18 HUD COC PROGRAM COMPETITION NEW/BONUS PROJECT SCORECARD HOUSING PROJECTS

Applicant and Project Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Rater Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

#### Date Reviewed: Click or tap to enter a date.

Project Quality Requirements			S. Deserver S.	and the second sec
All new and bonus projects must pass threshold requirements before being considered for funding on the merit of the project. Threshold requirements are pass/fail	Maximum Score Possible			150
rather than scored.	Total Project Sco	re	ĉ	
20	Minimum Threst Score	nold		105
Section I: Design of Housing and Supportive S	iervices		e Points: 25	Section Score:
1.a. Description of project: Does it meet the needs of the con	mmunity and perso	ons expe	riencing ho	omelessness
Score given according to how well the project desig Understanding of the needs of the target popula Type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of th Type and scale of supportive services, regardless o How assistance in obtaining mainstream be Performance measures that meet or exceed HU	ition to be served hose to be served of funding source nefits is provided		15	
1.b. Description of the plan to assist in participants securing PH that is safe, affordable, accessible and acceptab			5	
1.c. Description of how participants will be assisted to employment and/or income to maximize their ability to live	· ·		5	
Section II: Experience			le Points: 40	Section Score:
2. Experience of the applicant (and any sub-recipients) in we proposed population and in providing housing similar to tha the application.			15	
3. Description of experience with utilizing a Housing First ap	proach			
Include eligibility criteria, process for accepting new par and criteria for exiting participants. Must demonstrate preconditions to entry (substance use, income, crimina status, familial status, actual or perceived sexual or identity). Must show able to address situations that may je or project assistance to ensure that project participation is	that there are no al records, marital rientation, gender copardize housing		10	
in m	a al a			
4. Description of applicant experience in utilizing federal fur				
4. Description of applicant experience in utilizing federal fur Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate			5	
4. Description of applicant experience in utilizing federal fur Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate	e past proficiency ting federal funds. ration of rental ass	istance		ants.

Section III: Project Effectiveness	Possible Points: 25	Section Score:
6. Does the project commit to taking all referrals through the Local Planning Body's Coordinated Entry process? (Pass/Fail)	5/0	
7. What would be the prioritization process for households referred to this p who is most vulnerable and the best fit for any referrals to this project? Provi by the Local Planning Body.		
Score according to how well the applicant can demonstrate understanding of prioritization and pairing households based on project eligibility.		
8. Will all participating households served in this project be recorded in HMIS or an equivalent database for Domestic Violence, in accordance with the Balance of State CoC's Data Quality Standards? (Pass/Fail)	5/0	
9. Description of a plan for rapid implementation of the project, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days and 180 days after grant award.	10	

Section IV: Organizational Capacity	Possible Points: 20	Section Score:
10. Describe agency key staff positions and qualifications of individuals who will carry out the project	10	
11. Describe the agency's financial management system, including financial reporting, record keeping, accounting systems, payment procedures, procurement processes, and audit requirements.	10	

Section V: Financial Information	Possible Points: 40	Section Score:
12. Do project costs appear reasonable when compared to project costs of similar project types?	5	
13. Audit		
a. Most recent audit found no exceptions to standard practices	3	
b. Most recent audit identified agency as "low risk"	3	
c. Most recent audit indicates no findings	4	
14. Documented match amount (Pass/Fail)	5/0	
15. Budgeted costs are reasonable, allocable, and allowable	20	

Completion of Application	Possible Points: 0 Deductions: -10	Section Score:
Are all required attachments provided?		
Ye	; 0	
No	-5	1
Is the application complete and accurate?		
Ye	0	
No	-5	1