Kings Tulare Homeless Alliance
GENERAL MEETING AGENDA
July 28, 2016

Location: KTHA Office
525 W. Center St. Ste A, Visalia, CA

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. Welcome and Introductions

3. Stakeholder Comments

4. Consent Agenda
   a. Financial Statements
   b. Minutes

5. Discussion/Action Items
   a. Veteran Homelessness
   b. Coordinated Entry
   c. 2016 CoC Combined HUD Application: Renewals and Invite for New Applications
   d. FY 2016 HUD NOFA Project Selection & Ranking Process

6. Presentation/Discussion:
   a. 2-1-1, Fedieson Landicho

7. Announcements
   a. Next Visalia Roundtable, August 25th

8. Adjourn

Next Meeting:
August 25, 2016
9:00 AM

Location:
KTHA
Visalia

Next Meeting:
July 28, 2016
9:00 AM

Location:
KTHA
Visalia

1. Meeting Called to Order at 9:02 am by Scott Harvey

2. Welcome and Introductions

3. Stakeholders Comments

4. Consent Agenda

    a. Financial Statement
    b. Minutes

        i. Jody Ketcheside moved to accept, Nanette Villarreal seconded, motion carried

5. Discussion/Action Items

    a. Coordinated Assessment System:

        i. Veronica reviewed new updates on VI-SPDATs
        ii. Discussion on whether we should have a registry week again this year, suggestion was to take a break for a year then regroup next year

    b. Veteran Homelessness:

        i. WestCare is still enrolling, and they still have a wait list

    c. FY 2016-17 Funding Priorities:

        i. Reviewed
        ii. Fred Risard moved we accept, Kitty Palmer seconded, motion carried with 1 abstention

    d. ESG NOFA Rating & Ranking Recommendations:

        i. Committee recommendations presented
        ii. Jodie Ketcheside and Nanette Villarreal offered to help with technical assistance
        iii. Nanette Villarreal moved we accept recommendations, Jodi Ketcheside seconded, motion carried with 2 abstentions

6. Presentation/Discussion

    a. Wings Advocacy Program, Suzy Ward

        i. Looking for neutral funding agency
        ii. Needing to create partnerships with community agencies

7. Announcements

   i. Visalia Roundtable cancelled for June
   ii. Performance Measurement Planning Session meeting immediately following
   iii. SJV Veterans, WestCare, sponsoring an Assistant Training, July 21-22, 8 am to 5 pm
   iv. Ready-Set-Rent Workshop at the Alliance, July 11th at 2 pm

8. Adjourned at 10:45 am

Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness
Balance Sheet
As of June 30, 2016

		Jun 30, 16
ASSETS		
Current Assets		
Checking/Savings		
10100 · Bank of the Sierra		35,440.73
10110 · Petty Cash Fund		18.51
Total Checking/Savings		35,459.24
Accounts Receivable		
11000 · Accounts Receivable		9,440.10
11400 · Grants Receivable		
11401 · Hanford CDBG Grant	2,145.10	
11402 · Porterville CDBG Grant	2,021.49	
11403 · Tulare CDBG Grant	3,434.34	
11404 · Visalia CDBG Grant	4,855.04	
11406 · HUD Grant	1,358.80	
Total 11400 · Grants Receivable		13,814.77
Total Accounts Receivable		23,254.87
Total Current Assets		58,714.11
TOTAL ASSETS		**58,714.11**
LIABILITIES & EQUITY		
Liabilities		
Current Liabilities		
Accounts Payable		
20000 · Accounts Payable		589.66
Total Accounts Payable		589.66
Credit Cards		
23000 · Visa Bank of the Sierra		1,026.83
Total Credit Cards		1,026.83
Total Current Liabilities		1,616.49
Total Liabilities		1,616.49
Equity		
30001 · Temporary Restricted Net Assets		
30030 · Restricted - Visalia PHC	11,973.74	
30040 · Restricted - Porterville PHC	4,928.43	
30050 · Restricted - Hanford PHC	2,076.50	
30060 · Restricted - Tulare PHC	4,478.16	
Total 30001 · Temporary Restricted Net Assets		23,456.83
30005 · Net Assets		-9,953.04
32000 · Unrestricted Net Assets		63,179.58
39000 · Prior Period Adjustment		-17,914.24
Net Income		-1,671.51
Total Equity		57,097.62
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY		**58,714.11**

Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness
Profit & Loss
July 2015 through June 2016

		Jul '15 - Jun 16
Ordinary Income/Expense		
Income		
43300 · Direct Public Grants		
43330 · Foundation and Trust Grants	10,217.96	
43400 · Direct Public Support		
43450 · Individ, Business Contributions	2,061.95	
43452 · Auctions	2,779.14	
Total 43400 · Direct Public Support	4,841.09	
Total 43300 · Direct Public Grants		15,059.05
44500 · Grant Income		
44530 · Local & Government Grants		
44531 · Hanford CDBG Grant	8,482.96	
44532 · Porterville CDBG Grant	3,500.00	
44533 · Tulare CDBG Grant	7,670.04	
44534 · Visalia CDBG Grant	13,500.00	
44535 · HUD Grant	20,539.03	
Total 44530 · Local & Government Grants	53,692.03	
Total 44500 · Grant Income		53,692.03
47200 · Program Income		
47230 · Membership Dues	5,925.00	
47240 · Program Service Fees	60,351.93	
Total 47200 · Program Income		66,276.93
47600 · Interest and Dividends Earned		250.00
Total Income		135,278.01
Gross Profit		135,278.01
Expense		
60900 · Business Expenses		
60920 · Business Registration/License	85.01	
Total 60900 · Business Expenses		85.01
62100 · Contract Services		
62110 · Accounting Fees	5,809.39	
62150 · Outside Contract Services	13,105.00	
62170 · Program Delivery	9,100.00	
Total 62100 · Contract Services		28,014.39
65000 · Operations		
65010 · Books, Subscriptions, Reference	25.90	
65020 · Postage, Mailing Service	446.28	
65030 · Printing and Copying	129.73	
65040 · Supplies	2,213.51	
65050 · Telephone, Telecommunications	949.88	
65051 · Internet	681.15	
65060 · Equipment	733.75	
65070 · Hosting Fees	358.82	
65080 · Bank/Credit CardService Charges	77.03	
65090 · Rent	8,099.99	
65091 · Utilities	865.21	
65093 · Repairs / Maintenance	409.35	
Total 65000 · Operations		14,990.60
65100 · Other Types of Expenses		
65120 · Insurance - Liability, D and O	2,102.22	
65130 · Interest Expense - General	83.98	
65190 · Payroll Service	557.55	
Total 65100 · Other Types of Expenses		2,743.75

Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness
Profit & Loss
July 2015 through June 2016

		Jul '15 - Jun 16
65200 · Program Expenses		
65205 · Program Supplies		
65205.1 · Aprons/T-shirts	346.75	
Total 65205 · Program Supplies		346.75
65210 · Equipment/Rentals		726.79
65220 · Client Consumables		
65220.1 · Food	102.51	
65220.5 · Stipend	1,377.00	
Total 65220 · Client Consumables		1,479.51
65250 · Fundraising Expenses		119.85
Total 65200 · Program Expenses		2,672.90
66000 · Wages, Taxes, Payroll Expenses		
66001 · Payroll Expense	82,669.70	
66002 · Insurance - Workers Comp	772.90	
Total 66000 · Wages, Taxes, Payroll Expenses		83,442.60
68300 · Travel and Meetings		
68310 · Conference, Convention, Meeting	669.70	
68320 · Travel	942.62	
Total 68300 · Travel and Meetings		1,612.32
Total Expense		133,561.57
Net Ordinary Income		1,716.44
Net Income		**1,716.44**

2016 HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) Program
Project Selection and Ranking Process

I. Background

On June 28, 2016, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Year 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition. The NOFA is available at https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/4688/fy-2015-coc-program-nofa/. Although the available amount of funding is expected to be sufficient to fund anticipated eligible renewal projects in the 2016 funding process, HUD continues to require Collaborative Applicants to rank all projects in two tiers.

The Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance (Alliance), which serves as the local Continuum of Care and Collaborative Applicant, is eligible to apply for funding to support housing and services for homeless households. That funding breaks down as follows:

Tier 1:	
93% of Renewal Amount	$1,884,612
Tier 2:	
7% of Renewal Amount	$141,852
Permanent Housing Bonus Amount	$101,323
CoC Planning Grant:	$60,794

The Alliance will submit a collaborative application to HUD for competition funds by September 14, 2016. The application may include up to three types of project applications:

A. Grantees with current projects that will expire in 2017 that are seeking **renewal** of those same projects.
B. New projects by using amounts available by making funds available through reallocation. The following types of projects may only be created using funds that the Alliance has made available through reallocation. Through the reallocation process the following new projects may be created:
    1. New permanent supportive housing projects where all beds will be dedicated for use by chronically homeless individuals and families, as defined in 24 CFR 578.3.
    2. New rapid rehousing projects that will serve homeless individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, and include persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness.
    3. New Supportive Services Only project specifically for a centralized or coordinated assessment system.
    4. New dedicated Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) project for the costs at 24 CFR 578.37(a)(2) that can only be carried out by the HMIS Lead, which is the recipient or subrecipient of an HMIS grant, and that is listed on the HMIS Lead form in the CoC Applicant Profile in e-snaps.
C. New projects through the permanent housing bonus up to 5 percent of the CoC's FPRN for the following types of new projects:
    1. New permanent supportive housing projects that will serve 100 percent chronically homeless individuals and families, and

2. New rapid rehousing projects that will serve homeless individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, and include persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness.

The Alliance will assign a unique rank to each project that it intends to submit to HUD for FY 2016 funding. Each project will be comprehensively reviewed, both new and renewal projects within the geographic area, using the scoring criteria and selection priorities below, to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and contributes to improving system performance. Funds for projects that are determined to be underperforming, obsolete, or ineffective will be reallocated to new projects that meet a community priority and contribute to improving system performance.

II. Project Ranking Policy

The Alliance will use the below component prioritization after scoring all new and renewal projects within the CoC based on the Renewal Project, New Project, and HMIS Scoring Criteria. Renewal Projects that have not complete a full operating year will be scored based on an APR from a like-kind project operated by the Applicant. Renewal projects that are not yet in contract with HUD will be scored using the New Project ranking tool.

Within project component, rank will be made according to project score. Projects with equal scores and same project component type will be ranked according to cost efficiency. Projects that are deemed essential to the CoC but which would be at risk of loss of funding if placed in Tier 2, will be ranked at the bottom of Tier 1.

A. Tier 1 projects will be ranked in the following order:
    1. HMIS
    2. Permanent Supportive Housing projects (renewing, first time renewal, new reallocations, new bonus)
    3. Rapid Re-housing projects (renewing, first time renewal, new reallocations, new bonus)
    4. Coordinated Entry projects (new reallocations)

B. Tier 2 project components will be ranked in the following order:
    1. Renewal project applications ranked according to renewal project score
    2. Reallocation and bonus project applications ranked according to new project score
    3. Projects will be ranked until there are no funds remaining in Tier 2

As HMIS is a HUD mandated requirement in order to receive Continuum of Care Program and Emergency Solutions Grant funding, it is strongly recommended as one of the top priorities in Tier 1 in order to secure funding for this authorized activity. HMIS renewals will be assessed for performance and spending in alignment with HUD requirements.

In accordance with HUD guidelines, the planning project will not be ranked.

III. Project Scoring Policy

A. Threshold Review
A preliminary, quantitative review of each application submitted will be completed by the Alliance. This review will:

- Confirm that application was submitted on time
- Confirm that all required attachments were submitted
- Confirm that the application meets HUD project quality threshold

- Confirm matching requirements are met

B. Contribution to System Performance
One of the most important factors in the local scoring process will be a review of a project's contribution to the improvement of overall system performance. Annual Performance Reports, HMIS data and other measurement tools will be reviewed carefully to ensure that all projects recommended for funding contribute to the improvement of system performance.

All complete, timely, and eligible applications will be scored by the Alliance Rating and Ranking Committee, using the scoring criteria located in the Appendix. Scores will determine each project's rank in the Alliance's application to HUD in accordance with Section II of this guidance. Scores may also be used to reject applications or to reduce budgets for low-scoring projects.

Total scores for each project are determined by adding up points in each section and then adding any bonus points, if applicable. All projects are judged together, both new and renewals. The scores from each Rating and Ranking committee member is computed and averaged for each project.

Once the committee completes the rating and ranking, the committee may consider the Alliance's priorities, whether the initial scoring is likely to result in any critical service gaps, whether grantees have a history of returning unspent funds to HUD and strategy related to Tier cut offs and HUD's selection process, and may make adjustments to budgets and produce the final ranking of projects to be included in the collaborative application. The recommendation of the Rating & Ranking Committee will go to the Alliance's Board of Directors and Membership for review and final approval.

Projects submitted to HUD in Tier 1 are expected to be funded, provided that the project meets HUD eligibility and threshold requirements. Tier 2 projects will be awarded funds by HUD based on a comparative score computed using: the CoC's FY2016 application competitive score, the rank the Alliance gives to the project, and the project component.

Applicants will be notified in writing no later than August 26, 2016 of whether they will be included in the application to HUD and the amount to be allocated for each project. This information will also be posted on the Alliance website at www.kingstularecoc.org no later than 5:00 pm on August 26, 2016.

IV. Rating and Ranking Members

The Alliance recruits Rating & Ranking Committee members who are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in the area and who are broadly representative of the relevant sectors, subpopulations, and geographic areas. The Rating & Ranking Committee will be composed of representatives from a cross-section of groups which might include: Faith-based and non-profit providers of homeless services and housing; housing developers; city representatives; Kings and Tulare County employees; mental health; substance abuse; veteran's services; and consumers.

Complete guidelines regarding the policies and selection process of Rating and Ranking Members can be found in the Alliance's Policy and Procedure Manual located on the Alliance's website at www.kingstularecoc.org.

V. Reallocation Policy

The Alliance may use the reallocation process to shift funds in whole or part from existing renewal projects to new project applications without decreasing the Alliance's annual renewal demand. HUD strongly encourages CoCs to take advantage of this option. The funds may be reallocated to develop new permanent supportive housing

projects, new rapid re-housing projects, HMIS funds, or Support Services Only (SSO) for Coordinated Entry.

During comprehensive reviews of renewal projects, the Rating and Ranking Committee will use the Ranking Tool and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and addresses policy priorities (e.g. ending chronic homelessness, etc.). The Committee will reallocate funds to new projects whenever such reallocation(s) would reduce homelessness or address an underserved homeless population. In the event the Committee identifies a renewal project(s) whose funding should not be renewed (or funding should be decreased), the Committee will then determine whether any new proposed projects should be awarded and will proceed with reallocation.

VI. Appeals Process

If an applicant organization feels it has been unfairly eliminated from either the local or the federal competition, that a decision made by the Rating and Raking Committee regarding the ranking, rejection, or funding of their project was prejudicial, unsubstantiated by project performance, or in violation of the 2016 Rating & Ranking Guidelines, the applying lead agency and sponsor if any may file an appeal according to the process outlined in the Alliance's Policy and Procedure Manual, which can be found on the Alliance's website at www.kingstularecoc.org.

VII. Assurances

Project applicants will be required to sign an agreement to the following:

- Applicant will complete the Project Application with the same information as contained in this application unless there were adjustments made during the rating/ranking process. Those adjustments will be included in your project ranking letter and supersede the original application submitted.
- Applicant agrees to participate fully in KTHMIS, the local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
- Applicant agrees to fully participate in the Every Door Open, Coordinated Assessment Strategy for Kings/Tulare Counties.
- Applicant understands that HUD funded homeless assistance projects are monitored by the Alliance and may include an annual site monitoring visit, as well as the submission of the program's most recent Annual Performance Report sent to HUD and their most recent audited financial statement and any management letters if applicable when submitting their application.
- Applicant understands that if funding is awarded they are responsible to inform the Alliance when:
    - Changes to an existing project or change in sub-population served that is significantly different than what the funds were originally approved for, including any budget amendments submitted to HUD
    - Increase/decrease of other funding to the project that could affect projected numbers of participants served, program staffing, performance, etc.
    - Delays in the start-up of a new project
    - Program is having difficulty in meeting projected numbers served or performance outcomes.
- Applicant agrees to execute the following documents and submit as a part of their application to the Rating & Ranking Committee:
    - Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance Applicant "Hold Harmless" Agreement; and
    - Memorandum of Understanding for HUD Funded Programs.

VIII.Timeline

This list highlights the steps your agency will take to participate in the local NOFA competition. Please take special note of these dates.

July 14, 2016 3:00 – 5:00 pm Alliance Office 525 W. Center, Suite A Visalia, CA	**CoC APPLICANT WORKSHOP** This workshop is designed to give participants a basic understanding of the CoC application process, grant funds available, requirements, and key strategies for a successful application in the Rating & Ranking and to HUD. **This is a mandatory workshop for all HUD applicants.**
July 20, 2016	**DRAFT 2016 COC PROJECT SELECTION & RANKING PROCESS** Sent to the Alliance Membership listserv for comment.
July 28, 2016	**2016 COC PROJECT SELECTION & RANKING PROCESS FINALIZED** Comments incorporated into draft document and presented to Alliance Membership at July 28, 2016 membership meeting. Finalized document posted publicly.
August 4-10, 2016	**APPLICANT PRE-SUBMITTAL MEETINGS** Applicants will attend a mandatory meeting with the Alliance for an application review prior to submitting for rating & ranking. This process is intended to alleviate common mistakes and other findings discovered through rating & ranking.
August 11, 2016 3:00 pm Alliance Office 525 W. Center, Suite A Visalia, CA	**DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTAL OF COMPLETE APPLICATION FOR RATING & RANKING** Complete applications include: ☐ **PDF** of the application submitted through eSnaps. Send via email to msmith@kingstularcoc.org by the submittal deadline. **Do not include any of the attachments below in the email.** ☐ **Four (4) hardcopies** of the following items delivered to the Alliance office by the submittal deadline: ☐ Project Application as submitted through eSnaps; ☐ Most recent APR[1] ☐ LOCCS[2] report showing draws for most recent operating year – or – operating year to date if program is in first year ☐ Most recent Audit ☐ Match Letters ☐ Renewal Housing Projects: • Narrative for Item #2 on Scoring Tool: Project Serves Eligible Households Only ☐ HUD Forms 2880 and 50070 (dated between 5/1/16 and 9/14/16) ☐ The following agency policies, if not on file with the Alliance: • Drug-Free Workplace; Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing; Reasonable Accommodation and Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities; Nondiscrimination and Equal Employment; Code of Conduct ☐ 501c3, if not on file with the Alliance ☐ Project Related MOUs, if not on file with the Alliance: • Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance Applicant "Hold Harmless" Agreement • Memorandum of Understanding for HUD Funded Programs ☐ HUD Monitoring Letter and/or correspondence with HUD (if applicable)

[1] If project has not begun operations, is in its first year of operations or is a new project, submit performance data for another homeless housing project.

[2] If project has not begun operations or is a new project, submit the most recent LOCCS report for a like-kind project. If none are available, submit proof of consistent draws with other HUD/Public Contracts.

August 22 & 23, 2016	**RATING & RANKING** Applicants will meet with the Rating and Ranking Committee. Appointments will be issued the week of August 15, 2016.
August 26, 2016	**NOTIFICATION OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS POSTED ON WEBSITE AND SENT TO APPLICANTS IN WRITING**
September 1, 2016 5:00 pm	**DEADLINE FOR APPEALS**
September 8, 2016 5:00 pm	**DEADLINE FOR FINAL PROJECT APPLICATION** Project applications must be uploaded to eSnaps and a PDF of the application must be e-mailed to msmith@kingstularecoc.org with confirmation that the application has been submitted in e-snaps.
September 14, 2016	**ENTIRE CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO HUD (BY ALLIANCE)**

Appendix A: 2016 RENEWAL PROJECT Scoring Criteria

2016 CoC RENEWAL HOUSING PROJECT Scoring Criteria
Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points
40%	Contribution to System Performance	1.	Occupancy/Average Daily Unit Utilization	APR, Q9	(Average number of households served at all four PIT dates)/ (number of units in project)	>=80%	79% – 70%	<70%	5
		2.	Project serves eligible households only.	APR, Q20a1, Q20a2, Q20a3[1]	N/A	100%	N/A	<100%	5
		3.	Percentage of participants who gained or increased earned income from entry to exit	APR, Q24b2 1st Row	%	>=24%	23% – 18%	<18%	10
		4.	Percentage of participants who gained or increased other (non-employment) income from entry to exit	APR, Q24b2 3rd Row	%	>=56%	55% – 42%	<42%	10
		5.	Percentage of all participants with earned income	APR, Q24b3 1st Row	%	>=24%	23% – 18%	<18%	10
		6.	Percentage of all participants with cash income other than employment	APR, Q24b3 3rd Row	%	>=56%	55% – 42%	<42%	10
		7.	PSH/RRH Programs: Connecting clients to mainstream resources	APR, Q7, Q26a2 & Q26b2	Total number of adults with at least one non-cash benefit for stayers & leavers)/(Total number of adults)	>=56%	55% – 42%	<42%	5

[1] Applicant must provide a narrative to explain how program eligibility is determined. Discuss where people came from and any data that might be confusing to the Rating and Ranking Committee.

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points
40% (con't)	Contribution to System Performance (con't)	8a.	PSH Programs: Percentage of participants who remain in PSH or exited to permanent housing	APR, Q29a1	(Subtotal of Permanent Destinations)/ (Total Number of Leavers – Deceased)	>=80%	79% – 70%	<70%	10
		8b.	RRH Programs: Exit to permanent housing	APR, Q29a2	(Subtotal of Permanent Destinations)/ (Total Number of Leavers – Deceased)	>=80%	79% – 70%	<70%	
		9.	Leavers who exit to shelter, streets or unknown	APR, Q29	(Subtotal of Temporary Destinations)/ (Total Number of Leavers – Deceased)	<10%	11-15%	>15%	10
		10.	Timely submission of APR to HUD[2]	APR	N/A	APR submitted on time to HUD[2]	-	APR submitted late	5
								Subtotal	**80**
20%	Financials	11.	Audit Review	Audit Submitted by Agency	N/A	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee AND no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee OR agency has no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a high risk auditee AND audit findings	20
		12.	LOCCS	APR, Q31a4	Q31a4 Expended Subtotal / Q31a4 Applicable Total Expenses plus Admin	Less than 10% or $10,000 (whichever is less)	Less than 15% or $15,000 (whichever is less)	Greater than 15% or $15,000	10
		13.	LOCCS	LOCCS Report/ Print Out	Regular and timely draws from LOCCS	Draws on a monthly or bi-monthly basis	Draws on a quarterly basis	Draws less than quarterly	10
								Subtotal	**40**

[2] If project is a FY2014 grant that cannot be submitted to HUD because of the current esnaps issue, then the full APR template will be used in its place. The template can be found on the HUD website at https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/1852/coc-apr-questions-template/

Weight	Criteria Category		Evaluation Criteria	Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points
15%	Coordinated Entry System	14.	Referrals are kept up to date in HMIS	HMIS Referral Report[3]	Accuracy of referral data in HMIS as reported in Monthly Referral Report	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	15
		15.	Participation in monthly Case Management Roundtable Meetings	Roundtable Sign-in Sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	15
								Subtotal	**30**
10%	HMIS & Data Quality	16.	HMIS Data Quality Standards	HMIS Data Quality Report AHAR 11	Number of missing, don't know, & refused responses/ total number of applicable records	<5% missing, don't know, or refused	6%-10% missing, don't know, or refused	>10% missing, don't know, or refused	10
		17.	HMIS Compliance	Annual Site Visit Compliance Checklist	Number of Acceptable ("A") ratings/ total number of rated items	>=90%	90% - 80%	<80%	10
								Subtotal	**20**
10%	Alliance Participation	18.	Participation in monthly Membership Meetings	Meeting sign-in sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	10
		19.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee	Meeting sign-in sheets	N/A	Serves on two or more committees	Serves on one committee	Does not serve on an Alliance committee	10
								Subtotal	**20**
5%	Local Funding Priority	20.	Project is in alignment with local FY2016-2017 funding priorities	Alliance HUD CoC Program Funding Priorities	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	10
								Subtotal	**10**
								Total	**200**

Bonus Points	Length of time from referral to enrollment	HMIS	Date of enrollment – Date of referral	<=90 days	91 – 120 days	>120 days	**10**

[3] Report period of 1/1/16 – 6/30/16

Total Score: _____/___200_____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name of Rating & Ranking
Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B: 2016 NEW PROJECT Scoring Criteria

2016 CoC NEW HOUSING PROJECT Scoring Criteria
Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Weight	Scoring Factor		Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
15%	Applicant Experience	1.	Applicant and subrecipient's prior experience in serving homeless people and in providing housing similar to that proposed in the application.	15	
		2.	Satisfactory experience with prior HUD grants and other public contracts, including satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients (if applicable), regular drawdowns, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of APRs on existing grants.	15	
			Subtotal	**30**	
30%	Contribution to System Performance	3.	Extent to which the applicant: a. Demonstrates an understanding of the needs of the people to be served b. Proposes an appropriate mix of people to be served through the program c. Shows a clear relationship between the type of housing provided and needs of the population to be served d. Shows a clear relationship between the type of supportive services provided and the needs of the population to be served e. Supports Housing First where the client is housed regardless of their involvement in services they do not believe will help them achieve their stated goals f. Gains access to mainstream (non-CoC) resources g. Establishes performance measures for housing and income that are measurable, objective and meet or exceed HUD and CoC benchmarks h. Commitment to quickly place households in permanent housing	35	
		4.	Extent to which the applicant provides a sound plan to ensure that homeless people will be assisted to both OBTAIN and REMAIN in permanent housing and only terminate clients based on lease violations	15	
		5.	Extent to which there is a sound plan to ensure that participants will be assisted to both increase their INCOMES and to maximize their ability to LIVE INDEPENDENTLY	15	
		6.	Project is in alignment with local FY2016-2017 funding priorities	5	
			Subtotal	**60**	
20%	Project & Client Accessibility	7.	Extent to which the applicant conducts outreach in all areas of the community such as emergency shelters, places not meant for human habitation, etc. to locate potentially eligible homeless people	15	
		8.	Agreement to the Coordinated Entry System through an executed MOU with the Alliance. All referrals must come through Coordinated Entry.	10	
		9.	Project does not present barriers to entry (e.g. sobriety, income, criminal background, number of children, LGBTQ status, etc.)	15	
			Subtotal	**40**	

Weight	Scoring Factor		Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
20%	Project Feasibility	10.	Applicant clearly describes a viable plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant within 6 months of the award. For full points, project must have: a. Solid plan for site control through existing relationships. b. Description of the steps it will take to complete the C1.9a (technical submission) in an expedited manner.	25	
		11.	Project is cost-effective and is similar in cost to like-kind projects.	10	
		12.	Sufficient match documentation. Match is appropriate for project type and supports eligible activities.	5	
			Subtotal	**40**	
15%	Alliance Participation	13.	Participation in monthly membership meetings 15 points: >=90% attendance 7 points: 89% – 75% attendance 0 points : < 75% attendance	15	
		14.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee 15 points: Serves on two or more committees 7 points: Serves on one committee 0 points: Does not serve on a committee	15	
			Subtotal	**30**	
			Total	**200**	

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C: 2016 HMIS PROJECT Scoring Criteria

2016 CoC HMIS PROJECT Scoring Criteria
Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points
40%	Contribution to System Performance	1.	Bed Coverage: Emergency Shelters	APR, H10a	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		2.	Bed Coverage: Transitional Housing	APR, H10b	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		3.	Bed Coverage: Rapid Re-housing	APR, H10c	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		4.	Bed Coverage: Permanent Supportive Housing	APR, H10d	Average % of all bed types (without children, with children, and with only children)	>=86%	85% - 75%	<75%	15
		10.	Timely submission of APR to HUD[1]	APR	N/A	APR submitted on time to HUD[2]	-	APR submitted late	20
								Subtotal	**80**

[1] If project is a FY2014 grant that cannot be submitted to HUD because of the current esnaps issue, then the full APR template will be used in its place. The template can be found on the HUD website at https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/1852/coc-apr-questions-template/

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points
20%	Financials	11.	Audit Review	Audit Submitted by Agency	N/A	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee AND no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a low risk auditee OR agency has no audit findings	Audit shows agency as a high risk auditee AND audit findings	20
		12.	LOCCS	APR, H12 & H13	H13 Total Expenditures / H12 CoC Program Grant	Less than 10% or $10,000 (whichever is less)	Less than 15% or $15,000 (whichever is less)	Greater than 15% or $15,000	10
		13.	LOCCS	LOCCS Report/ Print Out	Regular and timely draws from LOCCS	Draws on a monthly or bi-monthly basis	Draws on a quarterly basis	Draws less than quarterly	10
								Subtotal	**40**
15%	Coordinated Entry System	14.	Monthly referral reports are issued to CES participating agencies	HMIS Referral Report[2]	Number of reports /number of months in reporting period	=100%	99% - 90%	<90%	15
		15.	Participation in monthly Case Management Roundtable Meetings	Roundtable Sign-in Sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	15
								Subtotal	**30**
10%	HMIS & Data Quality	16.	HMIS Data Quality, Residential Projects	APR, 11a	Average of missing, don't know, refused values	<5% missing, don't know, or refused	6%-10% missing, don't know, or refused	>10% missing, don't know, or refused	10
		17.	HMIS Data Quality, Street Outreach/SSO Projects	APR, 11b	Average of missing, don't know, refused values	<5% missing, don't know, refused	6%-10% missing, don't know, refused	>10% missing, don't know, or refused	10
								Subtotal	**20**

[2] Report period of 1/1/16 – 6/30/16

Weight	Criteria Category	Evaluation Criteria		Source of Criteria	Calculation	Full Points	50% of Points	0 Points	Max Points
10%	Alliance Participation	18.	Participation in monthly Membership Meetings	Meeting sign-in sheets	Number of times agency representative attended/ total number of meetings	>=90%	89% - 75%	<75%	10
		19.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee	Meeting sign-in sheets	N/A	Serves on two or more committees	Serves on one committee	Does not serve on an Alliance committee	10
								Subtotal	**20**
5%	Local Funding Priority	20.	Project is in alignment with local FY2016-2017 funding priorities	Alliance HUD CoC Program Funding Priorities	N/A	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	10
								Subtotal	**10**
								Total	**200**

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D: 2016 NEW SSO PROJECT Scoring Criteria

2016 CoC NEW COORDINATED ENTRY (SSO) PROJECT Scoring Criteria
Total Maximum Score = 200 points

Name of Program: _____

Name of Agency: _____

Weight	Scoring Factor		Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
15%	Applicant Experience	1.	Applicant and subrecipient's prior experience in serving homeless people and in providing services similar to that proposed in the application.	15	
		2.	Satisfactory experience with prior HUD grants and other public contracts, including satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing grants as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients (if applicable), regular drawdowns, timely resolution of monitoring findings, and timely submission of APRs on existing grants.	15	
			Subtotal	**30**	
50%	Project Quality & Client Accessibility	3.	Extent to which the applicant: a. Demonstrates an understanding of the needs of the people to be served b. Proposes an appropriate mix of people to be served through the program c. Shows a clear relationship between the type of supportive services provided and the needs of the population to be served d. Ensures that project participants are directed to appropriate housing and services that fit their needs e. Establishes performance measures that are measurable, objective and meet or exceed HUD and CoC benchmarks f. Commitment to quickly place households in permanent housing	40	
		4.	Extent to which the applicant conducts outreach in all areas of the community such as emergency shelters, places not meant for human habitation, etc. to locate potentially eligible homeless people	20	
		5.	Whether there is a strategy for advertising the project that is designed specifically to reach homeless with the highest barriers within Kings and Tulare Counties.	20	
		6.	Project does not present barriers to entry (e.g. sobriety, income, criminal background, number of children, LGBTQ status, etc.)	15	
		7.	Project is in alignment with local FY2016-2017 funding priorities	5	
			Subtotal	**100**	
20%	Project Feasibility	8.	Applicant clearly describes a viable plan for rapid implementation of the program, documenting how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant within 6 months of the award. For full points, project must have: a. Solid plan for site control through existing relationships. b. Description of the steps it will take to complete the C1.9a (technical submission) in an expedited manner.	25	
		9.	Project is cost-effective and is similar in cost to like-kind projects.	10	
		10.	Sufficient match documentation. Match is appropriate for project type and supports eligible activities.	5	
			Subtotal	**40**	

Weight	Scoring Factor		Scoring Criteria	Max	Actual
15%	Alliance Participation	11.	Participation in monthly membership meetings 15 points: >=90% attendance 7 points: 89% – 75% attendance 0 points : < 75% attendance	15	
		12.	Representative serves on an Alliance Committee 15 points: Serves on two or more committees 7 points: Serves on one committee 0 points: Does not serve on a committee	15	
			Subtotal	**30**	
			Total	**200**	

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name of Rating & Ranking Committee Member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E: Alliance HUD Program Competition Funding Priorities

Kings and Tulare Counties
Continuum of Care (HUD) Program Competition
FUNDING PRIORITIES
FY2016-2017

The Kings/Tulare Homeless Alliance has established the following local housing priorities for the FY2016HUD Continuum of Care Program Competition[1]. In addition to meeting one of the identified housing priorities in the table below, all projects[2] seeking funding must:

1) Maximize the use of mainstream benefits, including:
   a. Coordinate with existing mainstream resources to enroll participants in eligible programs and connect them to community based services; and
   b. Actively enroll participants in healthcare and/or assist participants in understanding and accessing expanded services available through the Affordable Care Act changes; and
   c. Secure funding for services through mainstream resource programs and other partnerships.

2) Work to remove barriers to local resources by:
   a. Prioritizing those most in need of services through the use of the VI-SPDAT and Housing Priority List;
   b. Actively participating in Every Door Open, the Kings/Tulare coordinated entry & assessment process; and
   c. Work to reduce the number of people exiting for unknown or negative reasons.

Priority	Focus Area	County
High	PSH for 100% chronically homeless households without children utilizing the Housing First model, including: a) Projects adding new Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds dedicated to chronically homeless; b) Projects targeting existing PSH beds for chronically homeless; c) Projects dedicating 100% of existing PSH beds to the chronically homeless at bed turnover.	Kings, Tulare
High	Renewal projects that 1) meet or exceed 75% of the CoC Performance Measurements, and 2) have no significant programmatic or audit findings.	Kings, Tulare

[1] In addition to meeting a local housing priority, all projects will go through the Alliance's Rating & Ranking process.
[2] HMIS and CoC Planning grants excluded.

Priority	Focus Area	County
High	Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) Applications.	Kings, Tulare
High	Existing RRH, utilizing the Housing First model.	Kings, Tulare
Medium	PSH for 100% chronically homeless households with children utilizing the Housing First model including: a) Projects adding new PSH beds dedicated to chronically homeless; b) Projects targeting existing PSH beds for chronically homeless; c) Projects dedicating 100% of existing PSH beds to the chronically homeless at bed turnover. d) PSH for chronically homeless families (Kings County only).	Kings, Tulare
Medium	New RRH, utilizing the Housing First model.	Kings, Tulare
Medium	Renewal projects that 1) meet 50% to 75% of the Alliance Performance Measurements, and/or 2) have minor programmatic or audit findings.	Kings, Tulare
Medium	Supportive Service Only (SSO) projects for coordinated entry and assessment.	Kings, Tulare
Low	All other projects.	Kings, Tulare

Appendix F: Alliance Standard Performance Measures

Goal	Purpose	Systems	Program Outcome Targets	Outcomes Calculation
Housing Stability	Indicates program/system level success in ending homelessness as measured by those who retain permanent housing or attain other permanent housing.	▪ Permanent Supportive Housing ▪ Rapid Re-Housing	80% of persons will remain in the permanent housing program as of the end of the operating year or exit to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized).	The number of Stayers in the program PLUS the number of Leavers who exited to a permanent housing destination ÷ by the total number of Stayers and Leavers.
		▪ Transitional Housing	70% of persons will exit to permanent housing (subsidized or unsubsidized) during the operating year.	Permanent housing placement is calculated by determining the number of Leavers who exited to a permanent housing destination ÷ the total # of Leavers.
		▪ Street Outreach	30% of persons will exit to safe housing (subsidized or unsubsidized) during the operating year.	Safe housing placement is calculated by determining the number of Leavers who exited to a safe housing destination (as defined by HUD) ÷ the total # of Leavers.
Increased Income	Indicates that program is assisting households to obtain sufficient income to attain housing. A higher rate is considered positive.	▪ Permanent Supportive Housing	56% of persons age 18 and older will maintain or increase their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit.	The # of adults whose amount of cash income from any source remained the same or increased based on the persons income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of adult Leavers PLUS adult Stayers.
		▪ Rapid Re-housing ▪ Transitional Housing	56% of persons age 18 and older will increase their total income (from all sources) as of the end of the operating year or program exit.	The # of adults whose amount of cash income from any source increased based on the persons income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of adult Leavers PLUS adult Stayers.

Goal	Purpose	Systems	Program Outcome Targets	Outcomes Calculation
Earned Income	Indicates that program is assisting households to stabilize housing by becoming employed or maintaining employment. A higher rate is considered positive.	▪ Permanent Supportive Housing ▪ HPRP	24% of persons age 18 through 61 will maintain or increase their earned income as of the end of the operating year or at program exit.	The number of persons (ages 18-61 whose amount of earned income remained the same or increased based on the persons earned income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of Leavers PLUS Stayers (ages 18-61).
		▪ Rapid Re-housing ▪ Transitional Housing	24% of persons age 18 through 61 will increase their earned income as of the end of the operating year or at program exit.	The number of persons (ages 18-61 whose amount of earned income increased based on the persons earned income at intake and then at exit, or if they remained housed, at their most recent assessment ÷ by the total # of Leavers PLUS Stayers (ages 18-61).
Bed Utilization	Indicates efficient use of community resources. High occupancy rate indicates system efficiency at turning over units and providing programs that are well-designed.	▪ Emergency Shelter ▪ Transitional Housing ▪ Rapid Re-Housing/ ▪ Permanent Supportive Housing	▪ 60% min. bed utilization for ES ▪ 80% min. bed utilization for TH ▪ 80% min. bed utilization for RRH ▪ 80% min. bed utilization for PSH	Total number of bed nights ÷ total number of nights in the month.
Average Length of Stay	A reasonably short length of stay indicates efficiency related to turnover of beds which is essential to meet system demand for emergency shelter.	▪ Emergency Shelter	Currently tracked but not monitored.	Exit Date (or report end date) - Entry Date ÷ number of clients served during the report period.

Goal	Purpose	Systems	Program Outcome Targets	Outcomes Calculation
Average Length of Participation	Indicates that system is assisting households to achieve independence without long term reliance on the system.	▪ Rapid Re-Housing ▪ Homeless Prevention	Currently tracked but not monitored.	Exit Date (or report end date) - Entry Date ÷ number of clients served during the report period.
Households Served	Indicates volume of households served by the system and provides a better understanding of household size as it relates to unit occupancy.	▪ Emergency Shelter ▪ Transitional Housing ▪ Permanent Supportive Housing	Currently tracked but not monitored.	The number of households served by the program (or system) during the report period.
Newly Homeless	Indicates the volume of newly homeless persons served by emergency shelters.	▪ Emergency Shelter	Currently tracked but not monitored.	The number of newly homeless[1] clients ÷ total number of clients served during the report period.
Recidivism	Indicates system's success in ending homelessness as measured by number of households who attain housing and do not return or enter shelter subsequent to successful housing outcome.	▪ Emergency Shelter ▪ Transitional Housing ▪ Rapid Re-Housing ▪ Homeless Prevention	Currently tracked but not monitored.	The total number of recidivist clients[2] ÷ the total number of clients served during the report period.

[1] *Newly Homeless is defined as the number of persons that entered the emergency shelter during the report period that have not been served by other programs in the HMIS within the past two years.*

[2] *A recidivist client is defined as one that exits a system with a successful outcome (specific to that system) and re-enters the system within one year after exit from the system.*