**FL-515 Panama City/Bay, Jackson County Continuum of Care**

**FY2024 CoC Competition**

**Project Application Scoresheet**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agency |  | | |
| Project Name |  | New / Renewal | |
| Reviewer |  | Date |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS**  Projects are reviewed by the Collaborative Applicant to determine whether they meet eligibility threshold requirements. Applications may be rejected and disqualified from the review process for failing to meet any of the requirements listed in this section. **This section will be completed by Collaborative Applicant staff based on application data. HUD requires the Collaborative Applicant to conduct this review.** | | |
| **Application Requirements** | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| Program participants are eligible for the program component type selected. |  |  |
| The proposed activities are eligible and consistent with 24 CFR part 578. |  |  |
| The project narrative is fully responsive to the question being asked and meets the criteria for that question as required by the NOFO and included in the detailed instructions provided by HUD. |  |  |
| The data provided in all parts of the project application are consistent. |  |  |
| All required attachments correspond to the attachments list in e-snaps, contain accurate and complete  information, and are dated between May 1, 2024 and September 28, 2024. |  |  |
| Application materials were submitted by the Lead Agency deadline. |  |  |
| Applicant has no outstanding HUD or Lead Agency monitoring findings. Response to any past findings was not overdue or unsatisfactory. |  |  |
| No Federal or State agency has taken adverse action against the provider. |  |  |
| Project complies with the requirements of the CoC interim rule (24 CFR part 578), *including requirements to accept referrals from the Coordinated Entry System for the project and to participate in HMIS.* |  |  |

**SCORING SUMMARY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Maximum Points**  (New / Renewal) | **Project Score** |
| Section 1: Key Project Elements | 40 |  |
| Section 2: Project Performance (renewals only) | 50 |  |
| Section 3: CoC Participation | 20 |  |
| Section 4: Agency Capacity | 20 |  |
| Section 5: Proposal Quality | 30 |  |
| **TOTAL POINTS** | **110/160** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 1: KEY PROJECT ELEMENTS** | | | |
| **This section will be scored by the Collaborative Applicant based on data in the project application.** | | **Max Points** | **Project Score** |
| Cost Effectiveness | Cost per client served compared to other project applications.  *Assign maximum points to lowest cost per client, then decrease points proportionally down to highest cost per client.* | **10** |  |
| Housing First | Project follows the Housing First model.  *Yes: 10 points*  *No: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| Addresses Severe Barriers | Project will provide services to populations with specific severe barriers to housing, including low/no income, substance abuse, and chronic homelessness.  *Yes: 10 points*  *No: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| Addresses Racial/Ethnic Barriers | Project has identified racial/ethnic barriers to participation AND has described steps taken/will take to eliminate those barriers.  *Yes: 10 points*  *No: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| **SECTION 1 TOTAL POINTS** | | **40** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 2: PROJECT PERFORMANCE (renewal projects only)** | | | |
| **This section will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant staff based on data in Annual Performance Reports and HMIS. Data from comparable databases will be used for projects submitted by victim service providers.** | | **Max Points** | **Project Score** |
| System Performance: Successful Exits | % leavers exiting to PH or retaining housing  *Exits to PH >= 90% or no exits: 10 points*  *Exits to PH = 75% - 89%: 5 points*  *Exits to PH < 75%: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| System Performance: Returns to Homelessness | % leavers accessing CE or ES within 2 years of exit  *Based on all applications received.*  *Lowest % (or no exits) receives full points, highest % receives no points.*  *Calculation: 10 - ( \* 10)* | **10** |  |
| System Performance: Employment/Income Growth | % clients with increased total income  *Based on improvement over FY2022 CoC average (stayers + leavers) of 25.5%.*  *Highest % receives full points. Project averages below 25.5% receive no points.*  *Calculation: \* 10* | **10** |  |
| Utilization Rate  (renewal projects only) | % of units actually occupied  *Units occupied >= 100% of total units: 10 points*  *Units occupied >= 80% of total units: 5 points*  *Units occupied < 80% of total units: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| System Performance: Length of Time Homeless | Average Length of Time Homeless is shorter in comparison to other renewal projects.  *Based improvement over CoC median 118 days.*  *LOT Homeless < 80 days: 10 pts*  *LOT Homeless = 80 - 118 days: 5 pts*  *LOT Homeless >= 118 days: 0 pts* | **10** |  |
| **SECTION 2 TOTAL POINTS** | | **50** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 3: CoC PARTICIPATION** | | | |
| **This section will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant staff based on HMIS data, meeting minutes and attendance sheets.** | | **Max Points** | **Project Score** |
| Coordinated Entry | Agency participates fully in Coordinated Entry including no side doors.  *Yes, and Lead Agency confirms no side doors: 10 points*  *Yes, and Lead agency does not confirm no side doors: 5 points*  *No: 0 points* | **5** |  |
| Meetings | Agency regularly attends and participates in membership meetings.  *Agency staff attend 80% or more membership meetings: 10 points*  *Agency staff attend less than 80% but at least 50% of membership meetings: 5 pts*  *Agency staff attend less than 50% but at least 30% of membership meetings: 2 pts*  *Agency staff attend less than 30% of membership meetings: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| Committees/Workgroups | Agency is represented on committees and workgroups.  *Agency staff regularly serve on more than one CoC committee or workgroup: 5 pts*  *Agency staff regularly serve on one CoC committee or workgroup: 3 points*  *Agency staff do not serve on CoC committees and workgroups: 0 points* | **5** |  |
| **SECTION 3 TOTAL POINTS** | | **20** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 4: AGENCY CAPACITY** | | | |
| **This section will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant staff based on data in the project application.** | | **Max Points** | **Project Score** |
| Target Population | Experience of the applicant in working with the target population.  *10 or more years of experience: 5 points*  *Less than 10 but more than 4 years of experience: 3 points*  *Less than 4 years of experience: 0 points* | **5** |  |
| Similar Housing | Experience of the applicant in providing housing similar to the type  proposed in the application.  *10 or more years of experience: 5 points*  *Less than 10 but more than 4 years of experience: 3 points*  *Less than 4 years of experience: 0 points* | **5** |  |
| Years in Operation | Length of time organization has been in operation.  *10 or more years: 5 points*  *Less than 10 but more than 4 years: 3 points*  *Less than 4 years: 0 points* | **5** |  |
| Leverage of other Funding | Applicant’s experience in leveraging other Federal, State, local, and  private sector funds.  *10 or more years: 5 points*  *Less than 10 but more than 4 years: 3 points*  *Less than 4 years: 0 points* | **5** |  |
| **SECTION 4 TOTAL POINTS** | | **20** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION 5: PROPOSAL QUALITY** | | | |
| **This section will be scored by Project Selection Committee based on the entire project application.** | | **Max Points** | **Project Score** |
| Quality of application (detailed narratives, responses address questions adequately, etc.) | *Outstanding: 5 points*  *Above Average: 4 points*  *Average: 3 points*  *Below Average: 2 points*  *Barely Acceptable: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| Project addresses a significant need in the CoC | *Strongly Agree: 10 points*  *Agree: 8 points*  *Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5 points*  *Disagree: 2 points*  *Strongly Disagree: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| Project is the best use of this funding compared to other project proposals | *Strongly Agree: 10 points*  *Agree: 8 points*  *Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5 points*  *Disagree: 2 points*  *Strongly Disagree: 0 points* | **10** |  |
| **SECTION 5 TOTAL POINTS** | | **30** |  |