### Renewal PSH, SSO

| Factor # | Factor                          | How Evaluated  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|---|
| Α        | Grant and Financial Management  |  | 20      |   |
| A1       | Audited Financial statements    | Ranking Committee will review Audited Financial Statements or YE Financials w/ letter if audit is not required   | 4       | Audit w/ no findings for a FY ending 6/30/24 or more recent or financial statements if audit not required = 4 points Findings in the past 2 years with documented resolution plan = 2 points Audit not recent or has unaddressed findings or not submitted = 0 points         |
| A2       | CoC or ESG Monitoring           | If applicable Ranking Committee will review Monitoring reports and resolution strategies   | 4       | Monitoring w/ no findings in last 3 years or monitoring not required = 4 points Findings in the past 2 years with documented resolution plan = 2 points Monitoring not within last 3 years or has unaddressed findings or not submitted = 0 points                            |
| A3       | Expenditure of Grant Funds      | Facilitator will review APR expenditure data   | 4       | Grant 95-100% expended = 4 points Grant 0-85% expended = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for unexpended funds  |
| A4       | Regular ELOCCs Draw Downs       | Facilitator will review ELOCCS draws submitted via screenshot submission   | 4       | Draws completed at least once every quarter = 4 points Draws completed at least 4 times in the grant year, but not every quarter = 2 points Draws completed fewer than 3 times in the grant year = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for draw schedule |
| A5       | Timely APR Submission           | Facilitator will review APR submission data  | 4       | On time submission = 4 points Within 30 days of due date = 2 points More than 30 days late = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for delay.  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation |  | 7       |   |
| B1       | Coordinated Entry               | Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative response describing how project works with Coordinated Entry to manage referrals quickly and safely, especially for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and human trafficking. | 3       | Strong response = 3 points Average response = 2 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| B2       | CoC Participation               | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.   | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/ workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points   |
| В3       | Point In Time Count Involvement | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).   | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points   |

## Renewal PSH, SSO

| Factor # | Factor  | How Evaluated  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---|--|---------|--|
| С        | HMIS and Comparable Database Quality                      |  | 6       |  |
| C1       | Data Quality- destination                                 | The Collaborative Applicant staff will run a project APR using calendar year 2024 as the performance period. This factor will be scored Q 6c for all projects.   | 2       | All project types: 2% or less = 2 points More than 2% = 0 points   |
| C2       | Data Quality- Income at entry                             | The Collaborative Applicant staff will run a project APR using calendar year 2024 as the performance period. This factor will be scored Q 6c for all projects.   | 2       | All project types: 2% or less = 2 points More than 2% = 0 points   |
| C3       | Data Quality- Income at exit                              | The Collaborative Applicant staff will run a project APR using calendar year 2024 as the performance period. This factor will be scored Q 6c for all projects.   | 2       | All project types: 2% or less = 2 points More than 2% = 0 points   |
| D        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities                           |  | 32      |  |
| D1       | Requiring Supportive Services that meet participant needs | Ranking Committee will review attached policies and procedures sections and score applicant narrative describing the organization's commitment to and implementation of support services                         | 8       | Strong response = 7 to 8 points Average response = 4 to 6 points Weak response = 3 points or less  |
| D2       | Prioritizing treatment and Recovery                       | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing current and/or planned efforts to identify and increase available treatment on site.   | 8       | Strong response = 7 to 8 points Average response = 4 to 6 points Weak response = 3 points or less  |
| D3       | Coordination and leveraging of resources                  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing efforts to meaningfully involve partners and description of partnerships with organizations with expertise in serving different populations.     | 8       | Strong response = 7 to 8 points Average response = 4 to 6 points Weak response = 3 points or less  |
| D4       | Improving outcomes for clients                            | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing their effectiveness in reducing homelessness and increasing self-sufficiency.  | 8       | Strong response = 7 to 8 points Average response = 4 to 6 points Weak response = 3 points or less  |
| E        | Objective Project Performance                             |  | 35      |  |
| E1       | Obtain or Maintains Permanent housing                     | The Collaborative Applicant staff will run a project APR using calendar year 2024 as the performance period. This factor will be scored from Q5 & Q23C for PSH projects and Q23C for RRH, Joint TH/RRH projects. | 10      | PSH maintains housing: 90+% = 10 points 75% to 89% = 6 points Below 65% = 0 Points SSO exiting to positive housing destinations: 60+% = 10 points 40% to 59% = 6 points Below 39% = 0 Points |
| E2       | Exits from Project Back to<br>Homelessness                | The Collaborative Applicant staff will run a project APR using calendar year 2024 as the performance period. This factor will be scored from Question 23C for all projects.                                      | 9       | PSH: 10% or below = 9 points 11% to 20% = 4 points<br>More than 20% = 0 points SSO: 35% or below = 9<br>points 45% to 34% = 4 points More than 45% = 0<br>points                             |

### Renewal PSH, SSO

| Factor # | Factor                                       | How Evaluated   | Max Poi<br>nts | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|--|---|----------------|---|
| E3       | Maintains or Increases Employment Income     | The Collaborative Applicant staff will run a project APR using calendar year 2024 as the performance period. This factor will be scored Question 19 A1 & A2 for all projects. | 9              | ALL: 40% or above = 9 points 25% to 39% = 4 points<br>Less than 25% = 0 Points                |
| E4       | Commitment to Required Service participation | Applicants must confirm whether they align to the local supportive services agreement. Projects will upload their version of a Supportive Service Participation Agreement     | 7              | ALL: Agreement = 7 points No Agreement = 0 points   |
|          | TOTAL POINTS                                 |   | 100            |   |
| F        | Bonus Points                                 |   | 5              |   |
| F1       | Voluntary Reallocation                       | Projects that voluntarily reallocate a portion of their grant will receive bonus points.  | 5              | 15% or more of grant = 5 points 11 to 14% of grant = 4 points 10% or less of grant = 3 points |

### Renewal SSO-CE

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Critera   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|---|
| А        | Grant and Financial Management  |  | 20      |   |
| A1       | Audited Financial statements    | Ranking Committee will review Audited Financial Statements or YE Financials w/ letter if audit is not required   | 4       | Audit w/ no findings for a FY ending 6/30/24 or more recent or financial statements if audit not required = 4 points Findings in the past 2 years with documented resolution plan = 2 points Audit not recent or has unaddressed findings or not submitted = 0 points         |
| A2       | CoC or ESG Monitoring           | If applicable Ranking Committee will review Monitoring reports and resolution strategies   | 4       | Monitoring w/ no findings in last 3 years or monitoring not required = 4 points Findings in the past 2 years with documented resolution plan = 2 points Monitoring not within last 3 years or has unaddressed findings or not submitted = 0 points                            |
| A3       | Expenditure of Grant Funds      | Facilitator will review APR expenditure data   | 4       | Grant 95-100% expended = 4 points Grant 0-85% expended = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for unexpended funds  |
| A4       | Regular ELOCCs Draw Downs       | Facilitator will review ELOCCS draws submitted via screenshot submission   | 4       | Draws completed at least once every quarter = 4 points Draws completed at least 4 times in the grant year, but not every quarter = 2 points Draws completed fewer than 3 times in the grant year = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for draw schedule |
| A5       | Timely APR Submission           | Facilitator will review APR submission data  | 4       | On time submission = 4 points Within 30 days of due date = 2 points More than 30 days late = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for delay.  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation |  | 7       |   |
| B1       | Coordinated Entry               | Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative response describing how project works with Coordinated Entry to manage referrals quickly and safely, especially for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and human trafficking. | 3       | Strong response = 3 points Average response = 2 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| B2       | CoC Participation               | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.   | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/<br>workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points  |
| В3       | Point In Time Count Involvement | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).   | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points   |

### Renewal SSO-CE

| Factor # | Factor Name   | Evaluation Critera   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---|--|---------|--|
| С        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities                                   |  | 38      |  |
| C1       | Advertising strategy  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the strategy for advertising that is designed specifically to reach households experiencing homelessness with the highest needs.                           | 6       | Strong response = 5 to 6 points Average response = 4 points Weak response = 3 points or less       |
| C2       | Coordinates referrals to permanent housing                        | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing how the project ensures program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs.  | 10      | Strong response = 8 to 10 points Average response = 4 to 7 points Weak response = 3 points or less |
| C3       | Promotes recovery   | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing current and/or planned efforts to identify and increase available treatment and recovery opportunites.   | 10      | Strong response = 8 to 10 points Average response = 4 to 7 points Weak response = 3 points or less |
| C4       | Ensures Program participants are directed to appropriate services | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing how the project ensures program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs.  | 6       | Strong response = 5 to 6 points Average response = 4 points Weak response = 3 points or less       |
| C5       | Fulfills role of CES lead   | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing how the project fulfills the role of CES lead.   | 6       | Strong response = 5 to 6 points Average response = 4 points Weak response = 3 points or less       |
| D        | Objective Project Performance                                     |  | 35      |  |
| D1       | Covers 100% of geographic   | Applicants must confirm that the Coordinated Entry system is easily available and reachable for all persons, including persons with disablities, within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking homelessness assistance. | 10      | Confirm 100% = 10 points Not confirm 100% = 0 points   |
| D2       | Annually assesses CES   | Applicants must confirm that the Coordinated Entry system is annually assessed   | 7       | Confirm = 7 points Not confirm = 0 points  |
| D3       | Provides referrals to 100% of CES required projects               | Applicants must confirm that the Coordinated Entry system provided referrals to 100% of the CES required projects.   | 10      | Confirm = 10 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
| D4       | Commitment to Required Service participation                      | Applicants must confirm whether they align to the local supportive services agreement. Projects will upload their version of a Supportive Service Participation Agreement  | 8       | Agreement = 8 points No Agreement = 0 points   |

### Renewal SSO-CE

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Critera | Max Poi<br>nts | Points Breakdown |
|----------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|
|          | TOTAL POINTS |                    | 100            |                  |

### **Renewal HMIS**

| Factor # | Factor Name                        | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|------------------------------------|--|---------|---|
| A1       | Grant and Financial<br>Management  |  | 20      |   |
| A2       | Audited Financial statements       | Ranking Committee will review Audited Financial Statements or YE Financials w/ letter if audit is not required   | 4       | Audit w/ no findings for a FY ending 6/30/24 or more recent or financial statements if audit not required = 4 points Findings in the past 2 years with documented resolution plan = 2 points Audit not recent or has unaddressed findings or not submitted = 0 points         |
| А3       | CoC or ESG Monitorin g             | If applicable Ranking Committee will review Monitoring reports and resolution strategies   | 4       | Monitoring w/ no findings in last 3 years or monitoring not required = 4 points Findings in the past 2 years with documented resolution plan = 2 points Monitoring not within last 3 years or has unaddressed findings or not submitted = 0 points                            |
| A4       | Expenditure of Grant Funds         | Facilitator will review APR expenditure data   | 4       | Grant 95-100% expended = 4 points Grant 0-85% expended = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for unexpended funds  |
| A5       | Regular ELOCCs<br>Draw Downs       | Facilitator will review ELOCCS draws submitted via screenshot submission   | 4       | Draws completed at least once every quarter = 4 points Draws completed at least 4 times in the grant year, but not every quarter = 2 points Draws completed fewer than 3 times in the grant year = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for draw schedule |
| A6       | Timely APR Submissio n             | Facilitator will review APR submission data  | 4       | On time submission = 4 points Within 30 days of due date = 2 points More than 30 days late = 0 points Up to 2 points back with reasonable explanation for delay.  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation    |  | 7       |   |
| B1       | Coordinated Entry                  | Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative response describing how project works with Coordinated Entry to manage referrals quickly and safely, especially for victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and human trafficking. | 3       | Strong response = 3 points Average response = 2 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| B2       | CoC Participation                  | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.   | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points  |
| В3       | Point In Time Count<br>Involvement | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).   | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points   |

### **Renewal HMIS**

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| С        | Timely Submission of reports    |  | 35      |  |
| C1       | Timely Submission of reports    | Applicants must document the timely submission of reports including, Housing Inventory (HIC), Point-in-Time (PIT), Longitudinal System Analysis (LSA), and FY24 System Performance Measures.   | 35      | Submitted 4= 35 points Submitted 3 = 20 points Submitted 2 = 15 points Submitted 1 = 5 points 0 = 0 points |
| D1       | HUD + Local Priorities          |  | 32      |  |
| D2       | Promote recovery                | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing current and/or planned efforts to identify and increase available treatment and recovery opportunites.   | 16      | Strong response = 13 to 16 points Average response = 9-12 points Weak response = 0-8 points or less        |
| D3       | Fulfilling HMIS lead            | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing how the project fulfills the role of HMIS lead.  | 16      | Strong response = 13 to 16 points Average response = 9-12 points Weak response = 0-8 points or less        |
| E1       | Objective HMIS<br>Functionality |  | 6       |  |
| E1       | Collects all required elements  | Applicants must confirm that the HMIS collects all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the HMIS Data Standards.  | 2       | Confirm = 2 points Not confirm = 0 points  |
| E2       | Un-duplicate client records     | Applicants must confirm that the ability of the HMIS to unduplicate client records.  | 2       | Confirm = 2 points Not confirm = 0 points  |
| E3       | Produces all required reports   | Applicants must confirm that the HMIS produces all HUD required reports and provides data as needed for HUD reporting (e.g., APR, quarterly reports, data for CAPER/ ESG. reporting) and other reports required by other federal partners. | 2       | Confirm = 2 points Not confirm = 0 points  |
|          | TOTAL POINTS                    |  | 100     |  |
| F        | Bonus Points                    |  | 5       |  |
| F1       | Voluntary Reallocation          | Projects that voluntarily reallocate a portion of their grant will receive bonus points.   | 5       | 15% or more of grant = 5 points 11 to 14% of grant = 4 points 10% or less of grant = 3 points              |

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|--|---|---------|--|
| А        | Application Capacity   |   | 20      |  |
| A1       | Experience Serving Target Population   | The applicant must confirm the organization's experience working with the proposed target population for the proposed project, including any relevant expertise with the specific subpopulation to be served.   | 4       | Has experience = 4 points Has no experience = 1 point or less                                |
| A2       | Experience Operating a Comparable Program                                    | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing agency (and subrecipient if applicable) experience with comparable projects, including experience with program operations and service delivery.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A3       | Experience providing service/housing as part of a coordinated system of care | Applicant must confirm agency (and subrecipient if applicable) has experience delivering programs within a CoC or comparable system.  | 4       | Experience with CoC or comparable system: 4 points No experience: 0 point                    |
| A4       | Experience Managing Federal or Other<br>Complex Funding                      | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the agency's experience and capacity in leveraging and managing Federal funding or other sources.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A5       | Financial Management Capacity  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the organization's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) financial management structure. Score will also factor in financial audit, with a clean audit (and/or fully resolved findings) part of a high score. | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation (Objective)                                  |   | 4       |  |
| B2       | CoC Participation  | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.  | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points |
| В3       | Point In Time Count Involvement  | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).  | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points            |
| С        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities  |   | 32      |  |

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| C1       | HUD Priority Alignment          | Ranking Committee will review the extent to which the project will support the FY2025 HUD Policy Priorities. 1. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessnes 2. Prioritizing Treatment and Recovery 3. Advancing Public Safety 4. Promoting Self Sufficiency 5. Improving Outcomes 6. Minimizing Trauma                          | 12      | For each prority: 2 points= in alignment 0 points = not in alignment                             |
| C2       | Subpopulation Preference        | Ranking Committee will confirm if project prioritizes one or more the following sub populations: Aging & Older Adults (62+), families with minor children, Persons with disabilities, and youth & young adults (18-24).  | 4       | For each subpopulation: Prioritizes subpopulation= 1 points Doesn't prioritize = 0               |
| C3       | Workforce Development Needs     | Ranking Committee will review applicant description of plan for assessing workforce development needs regularly and/or connecting clients to specific workforce development resources such as training, assistance in job search.  | 6       | Strong response = 5 points Average response = 3 to 4 points Weak response = 2 points or less     |
| C4       | Dedicated Recovery Beds         | Project demonstrated dedicated beds (included in the project or supported by project activities) for the purpose of providing substance use treatment, requiring participation in treatment as a condition of continued participation in the program (as demonstrated by occupancy/service participation agreements) | 10      | 250+ Beds = 10 Points 150-249= 8 Points<br>50-149= 5 Points 0-49 Beds = 3 Points                 |
| D        | Project Performance Objective   |  | 18      |  |
| D1       | Plan for Project Implementation | Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing or deployment of services for the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.                             | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |
| D2       | Appropriate Budget              | Ranking will review and score budget provided by applicant. The Committee will assess whether the budget is adequate and cost effective (i.e., not too high, or too low), and includes an appropriate staffing structure. Budget should identify services to be provided and by whom.                                | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |

| Factor # | Factor Name   | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---|---|---------|---|
| D3       | Design of Housing & Supportive Services                   | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing: 1) demonstrating understanding of the needs of the clients to be served; 2) demonstrating that type, scale, and location of the housing or services fit the needs of the clients to be served; 3) demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining mainstream benefits and increasing employment income; and 4) establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD or CoC benchmarks. | 8       | Strong response = 7-8 points Average response = 4-6 points Weak response = 0-3 points |
| E        | Project-Specific Criteria: Transitional<br>Housing        |   | 26      |   |
| E1       | Obtaining/Maintaining Housing                             | Demonstrate that the project will provide and/or partner with other organizations to provide eligible supportive services that are necessary to assist program participants to obtain/ maintain housing and achieve self-sufficiency.   | 5       | Strong response = 4-5 points Average response = 1-3 points Weak response = 0 points   |
| E2       | Exiting within 24 months                                  | The applicant has prior experience operating transitional housing or other projects that have successfully helped homeless individuals and families exit homelessness within 24 months.   | 1       | Prior experience = 1 point no prior experience = 0 points                             |
| E3       | Exiting to permanent housing/increasing employment income | The applicant has previously operated or currently operates transitional housing or another homelessness project, or has a plan in place to ensure, that at least 50 percent of participants exit to permanent housing within 24 months and at least 50 percent of participants exit with employment income as reflected in HMIS or another data system used by the applicant.  | 1       | Prior experience = 1 point no prior experience = 0 points                             |
| E4       | Accessing mainstream resources                            | The project will be supplemented with resources from other public or private sources, that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, and SNAP.  | 1       | Supplemented = 1 point Not supplemented = 0 points                                    |

| Factor # | Factor Name                                      | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|--|---|---------|---|
| E5       | Required services participation                  | Demonstrate that the proposed project will require program participants to take part in supportive services (e.g. case management, employment training, substance use treatment, etc) in line with 24 CFR 578.75(h) by attaching a supportive service agreement (contract, occupancy agreement, lease, or equivalent).  | 5       | Agreement = 5 points No Agreement = 0 points  |
| E6       | customized supportive services                   | Demonstrate that the proposed project will provide 40 hours per week of customized services for each participant (e.g. case management, employment training, substance use treatment, etc.). The 40 hours per week may be reduced proportionately for participants who are employed. The 40 hours per week does not apply to participants over age 62 or who have a physical disability/impairment or a developmental disability (24 CFR 582.5) not including substance use disorder. | 5       | Strong response = 4-5 points Average response = 1-3 points Weak response = 0 points                           |
| E7       | Housing/Healthcare Leverage                      | Ranking Committee will assess whether applicant has documented (via a letter or MOU) leverage of non-CoC/ESG funded housing or healthcare resources in the amount required for HUD bonus points (25% of units, OR 25% of the value of the project for healthcare/substance use treatment).  | 5       | Documented leverage meeting HUD criteria = 5 points No Documented leverage or not meeting criteria = 0 points |
| E8       | Substance Use Disorder Treatment<br>Availability | Ranking Committee will assess whether the project will provide on-site substance use treatment (this includes an on-site clinician providing substance abuse treatment services).   | 3       | On-site services: 3 points no on-site services = 0 points   |
|          | TOTAL POINTS                                     |   | 100     |   |
| F        | Bonus Points                                     |   | 5       |   |
| F1       | HUD Opportunity Zones                            | Projects that can demonstrate more than 50% of the project will operate in a HUD-opportunity zone   | 5       |   |

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|--|---|---------|--|
| А        | Application Capacity   |   | 20      |  |
| A1       | Experience Serving Target Population   | The applicant must confirm the organization's experience working with the proposed target population for the proposed project, including any relevant expertise with the specific subpopulation to be served.   | 4       | Has experience = 4 points Has no experience = 1 point or less                                |
| A2       | Experience Operating a Comparable Program                                    | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing agency (and subrecipient if applicable) experience with comparable projects, including experience with program operations and service delivery.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A3       | Experience providing service/housing as part of a coordinated system of care | Applicant must confirm agency (and subrecipient if applicable) has experience delivering programs within a CoC or comparable system.  | 4       | Experience with CoC or comparable system: 4 points No experience: 0 point                    |
| A4       | Experience Managing Federal or Other Complex Funding                         | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the agency's experience and capacity in leveraging and managing Federal funding or other sources.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A5       | Financial Management Capacity  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the organization's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) financial management structure. Score will also factor in financial audit, with a clean audit (and/or fully resolved findings) part of a high score. | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation  |   | 4       |  |
| B2       | CoC Participation  | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.  | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points |
| В3       | Point In Time Count Involvement  | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).  | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points            |
| С        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities  |   | 32      |  |

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| C1       | HUD Priority Alignment          | Ranking Committee will review the extent to which the project will support the FY2025 HUD Policy Priorities. 1. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessnes 2. Prioritizing Treatment and Recovery 3. Advancing Public Safety 4. Promoting Self Sufficiency 5. Improving Outcomes 6. Minimizing Trauma                          | 12      | For each prority: 2 points= in alignment 0 points = not in alignment                             |
| C2       | Subpopulation Preference        | Ranking Committee will confirm if project prioritizes one or more the following sub populations: Aging & Older Adults (62+), families with minor children, Persons with disabilities, and youth & young adults (18-24).  | 4       | For each subpopulation: Prioritizes subpopulation= 1 points Doesn't prioritize = 0               |
| C3       | Workforce Development Needs     | Ranking Committee will review applicant description of plan for assessing workforce development needs regularly and/or connecting clients to specific workforce development resources such as training, assistance in job search.  | 6       | Strong response = 5 points Average response = 3 to 4 points Weak response = 2 points or less     |
| C4       | Dedicated Recovery Beds         | Project demonstrated dedicated beds (included in the project or supported by project activities) for the purpose of providing substance use treatment, requiring participation in treatment as a condition of continued participation in the program (as demonstrated by occupancy/service participation agreements) | 10      | 250+ Beds = 10 Points 150-249= 8 Points 50-149= 5 Points 0-49 Beds = 3 Points                    |
| D        | Project Performance Objective   |  | 18      |  |
| D1       | Plan for Project Implementation | Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing or deployment of services for the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.                             | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |
| D2       | Appropriate Budget              | Ranking will review and score budget provided by applicant. The Committee will assess whether the budget is adequate and cost effective (i.e., not too high, or too low), and includes an appropriate staffing structure. Budget should identify services to be provided and by whom.                                | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |

| Factor # | Factor Name                               | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---|---|---------|---|
| D3       | Design of Housing & Supportive Services   | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing: 1) demonstrating understanding of the needs of the clients to be served; 2) demonstrating that type, scale, and location of the housing or services fit the needs of the clients to be served; 3) demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining mainstream benefits and increasing employment income; and 4) establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD or CoC benchmarks. | 8       | Strong response = 7-8 points Average response = 4-6 points Weak response = 0-3 points                         |
| Е        | Project-Specific Criteria: SSO Standalone |   | 26      |   |
| E1       | Required services participation           | Demonstrate that the proposed project will require program participants to take part in supportive services (e.g. case management, employment training, substance use treatment, etc) in line with 24 CFR 578.75(h) by attaching a supportive service agreement (contract, occupancy agreement, lease, or equivalent).  | 5       | Agreement = 5 points No Agreement = 0 points  |
| E2       | Increasing Selfe-sufficiency              | Demonstrate that the Supportive Services project is necessary to assist people in exiting homelessness and increasing self-sufficiency and the Recipient will conduct an annual assessment of the service needs of the program participants.  | 6       | Strong response = 4-6 points Average response = 1-3 points Weak response = 0 points                           |
| E3       | Engagement Strategy                       | Demonstrate that the proposed project has a strategy for providing supportive services to eligible program participants including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services.  | 6       | Strong response = 4-6 points Average response = 1-3 points Weak response = 0 points                           |
| E4       | Accessing mainstream resources            | The project will be supplemented with resources from other public or private sources, that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, and SNAP.  | 5       | Documented leverage meeting HUD criteria = 5 points No Documented leverage or not meeting criteria = 0 points |

| Factor # | Factor Name                                      | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi<br>nts | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|--|---|----------------|---|
| E5       | Substance Use Disorder Treatment<br>Availability | Ranking Committee will assess whether the project will provide on-site substance use treatment (this includes an on-site clinician providing substance abuse treatment services). | 4              | On-site services: 4 points no on-site services = 0 points |
|          | TOTAL POINTS                                     |   | 100            |   |
| F        | Bonus Points                                     |   | 5              |   |
| F1       | HUD Opportunity Zones                            | Projects that can demonstrate more than 50% of the project will operate in a HUD-opportunity zone   | 5              |   |

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|--|---|---------|--|
| А        | Application Capacity   |   | 20      |  |
| A1       | Experience Serving Target Population   | The applicant must confirm the organization's experience working with the proposed target population for the proposed project, including any relevant expertise with the specific subpopulation to be served.   | 4       | Has experience = 4 points Has no experience = 1 point or less                                |
| A2       | Experience Operating a Comparable Program                                    | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing agency (and subrecipient if applicable) experience with comparable projects, including experience with program operations and service delivery.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A3       | Experience providing service/housing as part of a coordinated system of care | Applicant must confirm agency (and subrecipient if applicable) has experience delivering programs within a CoC or comparable system.  | 4       | Experience with CoC or comparable system: 4 points No experience: 0 point                    |
| A4       | Experience Managing Federal or Other<br>Complex Funding                      | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the agency's experience and capacity in leveraging and managing Federal funding or other sources.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A5       | Financial Management Capacity  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the organization's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) financial management structure. Score will also factor in financial audit, with a clean audit (and/or fully resolved findings) part of a high score. | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation  |   | 4       |  |
| B2       | CoC Participation  | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.  | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points |
| B3       | Point In Time Count Involvement  | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).  | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points            |
| С        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities  |   | 32      |  |

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| C1       | HUD Priority Alignment          | Ranking Committee will review the extent to which the project will support the FY2025 HUD Policy Priorities. 1. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessnes 2. Prioritizing Treatment and Recovery 3. Advancing Public Safety 4. Promoting Self Sufficiency 5. Improving Outcomes 6. Minimizing Trauma                          | 12      | For each prority: 2 points= in alignment 0 points = not in alignment                             |
| C2       | Subpopulation Preference        | Ranking Committee will confirm if project prioritizes one or more the following sub populations: Aging & Older Adults (62+), families with minor children, Persons with disabilities, and youth & young adults (18-24).  | 4       | For each subpopulation: Prioritizes subpopulation= 1 points Doesn't prioritize = 0               |
| C3       | Workforce Development Needs     | Ranking Committee will review applicant description of plan for assessing workforce development needs regularly and/or connecting clients to specific workforce development resources such as training, assistance in job search.  | 6       | Strong response = 5 points Average response = 3 to 4 points Weak response = 2 points or less     |
| C4       | Dedicated Recovery Beds         | Project demonstrated dedicated beds (included in the project or supported by project activities) for the purpose of providing substance use treatment, requiring participation in treatment as a condition of continued participation in the program (as demonstrated by occupancy/service participation agreements) | 10      | 250+ Beds = 10 Points 150-249= 8 Points<br>50-149= 5 Points 0-49 Beds = 3 Points                 |
| D        | Project Performance Objective   |  | 18      |  |
| D1       | Plan for Project Implementation | Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing or deployment of services for the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.                             | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |
| D2       | Appropriate Budget              | Ranking will review and score budget provided by applicant. The Committee will assess whether the budget is adequate and cost effective (i.e., not too high, or too low), and includes an appropriate staffing structure. Budget should identify services to be provided and by whom.                                | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |

| Factor # | Factor Name                                       | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---|---|---------|---|
| D3       | Design of Housing & Supportive Services           | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing: 1) demonstrating understanding of the needs of the clients to be served; 2) demonstrating that type, scale, and location of the housing or services fit the needs of the clients to be served; 4) demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining mainstream benefits and increasing employment income; and 5) establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD or CoC benchmarks. | 8       | Strong response = 7-8 points Average response = 4-6 points Weak response = 0-3 points |
| E        | Project-Specific Criteria: SSO Street<br>Outreach |   | 26      |   |
| E1       | Required services participation                   | Demonstrate that the proposed project will require program participants to take part in supportive services (e.g. case management, employment training, substance use treatment, etc) in line with 24 CFR 578.75(h) by attaching a supportive service agreement (contract, occupancy agreement, lease, or equivalent).  | 5       | Agreement = 5 points No Agreement = 0 points  |
| E2       | Outreach Experience                               | The applicant has experience providing outreach services consistent with the activity description at 24 CFR 578.53(e)(13) and has demonstrated effectiveness at helping people successfully exit from places not meant for human habitation to emergency shelter, treatment programs, transitional housing or permanent housing programs.   | 6       | Strong response = 4-6 points Average response = 1-3 points Weak response = 0 points   |
| E3       | Engagement Strategy                               | Demonstrate that the proposed project has a strategy for providing supportive services to eligible program participants including those with histories of unsheltered homelessness and those who do not traditionally engage with supportive services.  | 6       | Strong response = 4-6 points Average response = 1-3 points Weak response = 0 points   |
| E4       | Accessing mainstream resources                    | The project will be supplemented with resources from other public or private sources, that may include mainstream health, social, and employment programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, and SNAP.  | 5       | Supplemented = 5 point Not supplemented = 0 points                                    |

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi<br>nts | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|--|---|----------------|--|
| E5       | Partnering with First-Responders & Law Enforcement | Applicant must confirm a history of partnering with first responders and law enforcement to engage people living in places not meant for human habitation to access emergency shelter, treatment programs, reunification with family, transitional housing or independent living. The applicant must cooperate, assist, and not interfere or impede with law enforcement to enforce local laws such as public camping and public drug use laws. | 5              | Confirm history = 5 points No confirmed history = 0 points |
|          | TOTAL POINTS                                       |   | 100            |  |
| F        | Bonus Points                                       |   | 5              |  |
| F1       | HUD Opportunity Zones                              | Projects that can demonstrate more than 50% of the project will operate in a HUD-opportunity zone   | 5              |  |

### **New SSO-CE**

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|--|---|---------|--|
| А        | Application Capacity   |   | 20      |  |
| A1       | Experience Serving Target Population   | The applicant must confirm the organization's experience working with the proposed target population for the proposed project, including any relevant expertise with the specific subpopulation to be served.   | 4       | Has experience = 4 points Has no experience = 1 point or less                                |
| A2       | Experience Operating a Comparable Program                                    | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing agency (and subrecipient if applicable) experience with comparable projects, including experience with program operations and service delivery.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A3       | Experience providing service/housing as part of a coordinated system of care | Applicant must confirm agency (and subrecipient if applicable) has experience delivering programs within a CoC or comparable system.  | 4       | Experience with CoC or comparable system: 4 points No experience: 0 point                    |
| A4       | Experience Managing Federal or Other Complex Funding                         | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the agency's experience and capacity in leveraging and managing Federal funding or other sources.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A5       | Financial Management Capacity  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the organization's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) financial management structure. Score will also factor in financial audit, with a clean audit (and/or fully resolved findings) part of a high score. | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation  |   | 4       |  |
| B2       | CoC Participation  | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.  | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points |
| В3       | Point In Time Count Involvement  | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).  | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points            |
| С        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities  |   | 32      |  |

### **New SSO-CE**

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| C1       | HUD Priority Alignment          | Ranking Committee will review the extent to which the project will support the FY2025 HUD Policy Priorities. 1. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessnes 2. Prioritizing Treatment and Recovery 3. Advancing Public Safety 4. Promoting Self Sufficiency 5. Improving Outcomes 6. Minimizing Trauma                          | 12      | For each prority: 2 points= in alignment 0 points = not in alignment                             |
| C2       | Subpopulation Preference        | Ranking Committee will confirm if project prioritizes one or more the following sub populations: Aging & Older Adults (62+), families with minor children, Persons with disabilities, and youth & young adults (18-24).  | 4       | For each subpopulation: Prioritizes subpopulation= 1 points Doesn't prioritize = 0               |
| C3       | Workforce Development Needs     | Ranking Committee will review applicant description of plan for assessing workforce development needs regularly and/or connecting clients to specific workforce development resources such as training, assistance in job search.  | 6       | Strong response = 5 points Average response = 3 to 4 points Weak response = 2 points or less     |
| C4       | Dedicated Recovery Beds         | Project demonstrated dedicated beds (included in the project or supported by project activities) for the purpose of providing substance use treatment, requiring participation in treatment as a condition of continued participation in the program (as demonstrated by occupancy/service participation agreements) | 10      | 250+ Beds = 10 Points 150-249= 8 Points<br>50-149= 5 Points 0-49 Beds = 3 Points                 |
| D        | Project Performance Objective   |  | 18      |  |
| D1       | Plan for Project Implementation | Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing or deployment of services for the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.                             | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |
| D2       | Appropriate Budget              | Ranking will review and score budget provided by applicant. The Committee will assess whether the budget is adequate and cost effective (i.e., not too high, or too low), and includes an appropriate staffing structure. Budget should identify services to be provided and by whom.                                | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |

### **New SSO-CE**

| Factor # | Factor Name   | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---|---|---------|---|
| D3       | Design of Housing & Supportive Services                           | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing: 1) demonstrating understanding of the needs of the clients to be served; 2) demonstrating that type, scale, and location of the housing or services fit the needs of the clients to be served; 4) demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining mainstream benefits and increasing employment income; and 5) establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD or CoC benchmarks. | 8       | Strong response = 7-8 points Average response = 4-6 points Weak response = 0-3 points |
| E        | Project-Specific Criteria: SSO Coordinated Entry                  |   | 26      |   |
| E1       | Covers 100% of geographic   | Applicants must confirm that the Coordinated Entry system is easily available and reachable for all persons, including persons with disablities, within the CoC's geographic area who are seeking homelessness assistance.  | 7       | Confirm 100% = 7 points Not confirm 100% = 0 points                                   |
| E2       | Advertising strategy  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant confirmation of strategy for advertising that is designed specifically to reach households experiencing homelessness with the highest needs.   | 5       | Confirm = 5 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
| E3       | Standardized assessment   | Applicants must confirm that the there is a standardized assessment process.  | 7       | Confirm = 7 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
| E4       | Ensures Program participants are directed to appropriate services | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing how the project ensures program participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs.   | 7       | Confirm = 7 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
|          | TOTAL POINTS  |   | 100     |   |
| F        | Bonus Points  |   | 5       |   |
| F1       | HUD Opportunity Zones   | Projects that can demonstrate more than 50% of the project will operate in a HUD-opportunity zone   | 5       |   |

### **New HMIS**

| Factor # | Factor Name  | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|--|---|---------|--|
| А        | Application Capacity   |   | 20      |  |
| A1       | Experience Serving Target Population   | The applicant must confirm the organization's experience working with the proposed target population for the proposed project, including any relevant expertise with the specific subpopulation to be served.   | 4       | Has experience = 4 points Has no experience = 1 point or less                                |
| A2       | Experience Operating a Comparable Program                                    | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing agency (and subrecipient if applicable) experience with comparable projects, including experience with program operations and service delivery.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A3       | Experience providing service/housing as part of a coordinated system of care | Applicant must confirm agency (and subrecipient if applicable) has experience delivering programs within a CoC or comparable system.  | 4       | Experience with CoC or comparable system: 4 points No experience: 0 point                    |
| A4       | Experience Managing Federal or Other Complex Funding                         | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the agency's experience and capacity in leveraging and managing Federal funding or other sources.   | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| A5       | Financial Management Capacity  | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing the organization's (and subrecipient(s) if applicable) financial management structure. Score will also factor in financial audit, with a clean audit (and/or fully resolved findings) part of a high score. | 4       | Strong response = 4 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less  |
| В        | Collaboration and Participation  |   | 4       |  |
| B2       | CoC Participation  | The Collaborative Applicant will confirm GRCoC participation in general meetings, committees, and or workgroups.  | 2       | Staff participates in 1 or more committees/workgroups = 2 points No participation = 0 points |
| В3       | Point In Time Count Involvement  | The Collaborative Applicant will review PIT Participation records from 2025 Winter and Summer PIT Counts and/or Housing Inventory Count (HIC).  | 2       | Winter and Summer = 2 points Winter or Summer = 1 point No involvement = 0 points            |
| С        | HUD and Local Policy Priorities  |   | 32      |  |

### **New HMIS**

| Factor # | Factor Name                     | Evaluation Criteria  | Max Poi | Points Breakdown   |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|
| C1       | HUD Priority Alignment          | Ranking Committee will review the extent to which the project will support the FY2025 HUD Policy Priorities. 1. Reducing Unsheltered Homelessness 2. Prioritizing Treatment and Recovery 3. Advancing Public Safety 4. Promoting Self Sufficiency 5. Improving Outcomes 6. Minimizing Trauma                         | 12      | For each prority: 2 points= in alignment 0 points = not in alignment                             |
| C2       | Subpopulation Preference        | Ranking Committee will confirm if project prioritizes one or more the following sub populations: Aging & Older Adults (62+), families with minor children, Persons with disabilities, and youth & young adults (18-24).  | 4       | For each subpopulation: Prioritizes subpopulation= 1 points Doesn't prioritize = 0               |
| С3       | Workforce Development Needs     | Ranking Committee will review applicant description of plan for assessing workforce development needs regularly and/or connecting clients to specific workforce development resources such as training, assistance in job search.  | 6       | Strong response = 5 points Average response = 3 to 4 points Weak response = 2 points or less     |
| C4       | Dedicated Recovery Beds         | Project demonstrated dedicated beds (included in the project or supported by project activities) for the purpose of providing substance use treatment, requiring participation in treatment as a condition of continued participation in the program (as demonstrated by occupancy/service participation agreements) | 10      | 250+ Beds = 10 Points 150-249= 8 Points<br>50-149= 5 Points 0-49 Beds = 3 Points                 |
| D        | Project Performance Objective   |  | 18      |  |
| D1       | Plan for Project Implementation | Describe plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing or deployment of services for the first program participant. Provide a detailed schedule of proposed activities for 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days after grant award.                             | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |
| D2       | Appropriate Budget              | Ranking will review and score budget provided by applicant. The Committee will assess whether the budget is adequate and cost effective (i.e., not too high, or too low), and includes an appropriate staffing structure. Budget should identify services to be provided and by whom.                                | 5       | Strong response = 4 to 5 points Average response = 2 to 3 points Weak response = 1 point or less |

### **New HMIS**

| Factor # | Factor Name                             | Evaluation Criteria   | Max Poi | Points Breakdown  |
|----------|---|---|---------|---|
| D3       | Design of Housing & Supportive Services | The Ranking Committee will score applicant narrative describing: 1) demonstrating understanding of the needs of the clients to be served; 2) demonstrating that type, scale, and location of the housing or services fit the needs of the clients to be served; 4) demonstrates how clients will be assisted in obtaining mainstream benefits and increasing employment income; and 5) establishes performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD or CoC benchmarks. | 8       | Strong response = 7-8 points Average response = 4-6 points Weak response = 0-3 points |
| Е        | Project-Specific Criteria: HMIS         |   | 26      |   |
| E1       | HMIS implementation                     | Applicants must confirm that the HMIS funds will be expended in a way that furthers the CoC's HMIS implementation and ability to use HMIS as a proactive case management tool to promote treatment and recovery.  | 5       | Confirm = 5 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
| E2       | Collects all required elements          | Applicants must confirm that the HMIS collects all Universal Data Elements as set forth in the HMIS Data Standards.   | 7       | Confirm = 7 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
| E3       | Un-duplicate client records             | Applicants must confirm that the ability of the HMIS to unduplicate client records.   | 7       | Confirm = 7 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
| E4       | Produces all required reports           | Applicants must confirm that the HMIS produces all HUD required reports and provides data as needed for HUD reporting (e.g., APR, quarterly reports, data for CAPER/ ESG. reporting) and other reports required by other federal partners.  | 7       | Confirm = 7 points Not confirm = 0 points   |
|          | TOTAL POINTS                            |   | 100     |   |
| F        | Bonus Points                            |   | 5       |   |
| F1       | HUD Opportunity Zones                   | Projects that can demonstrate more than 50% of the project will operate in a HUD-opportunity zone   | 5       |   |