

Project	Changed Scores	New Scores	Final Score
<p><b>Alliance for Children and Families</b> <b>A-FIRST (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Adoption of Low Barriers</u>: Score lowered from 5 to 4 because policies suggest project is not low-barrier insofar as it requires commitments to becoming increasingly self-sufficient and becoming clean and sober, suggesting that tenancy is conditional on making progress on service plan and avoiding loss of income or failure to improve income</li> <li>• Page 3, <u>Length of Stay in Housing</u>: Score changed from deduction of 2 to deduction of .8 based on 6 of 79 clients leaving before 366 days</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Scored increased from 4.1 to 4.2 to achieve consistency in rounding up from 5,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 5 points for having policies but 2 points deducted for inconsistencies with system-wide policies in (1) maintaining own housing waiting list and (2) accepting referrals directly from providers</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: Policies state adherence to Housing First but only 2 of 5 points awarded because policies also imply deviation from HF policies by doing following in determining eligibility: (1) requiring that applicants provide a voucher for a substance test and make commitment to becoming clean and sober; (2) taking eviction history into account; (3) taking police/criminal record into account other than record that legally restrict housing options; and (4) requiring a security deposit and ability to pay .</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Compliance with documentation</u>: Not sure whether this is new or not, but there should be .5 deduction in this spot for HUD finding at latest monitoring</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>. No deductions</li> </ul>	<p><b>67</b>  (68.2 points out of possible 102 = 67%)</p>
<p><b>Alliance for Children and Families</b> <b>B-FIRST (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 1, <u>Serving Target Populations</u>: Score should be based on those actually served in 2015 for renewing projects. I originally gave this project a 10 based on its intent to serve 100% families and children. Technically, however, this criterion is inapplicable because, it is a renewal project, B-FIRST was not operating in 2015.</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Adoption of Low Barriers</u>: Score lowered from 5 to 3 for same reasons outline above for A-FIRST.</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Scored increased from 3.5 to 3.6 to achieve consistency in rounding up from 5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, For same reasons applied to A-FIRST, score for <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u> and <u>Housing First Implementation</u> were 3 and 2, respectively.</li> </ul>	<p><b>78</b>  (32.6 points out of a possible 42 = 78%)</p>

SCORING STATUS OF LOCAL COC APPLICATIONS – 7/19/2016

<p><b>Alliance for Children and Families</b> <b>SOHO PSH (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Adoption of Low Barriers</u>: Score lowered from 5 to 3 for same reasons outline above for A-FIRST.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, For same reasons applied to A-FIRST, score for <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u> and <u>Housing First Implementation</u> were 3 and 2, respectively.</li> </ul>	<p><b>65</b>  (27.2 out of a possible 42 points = 65%)</p>
<p><b>Alliance for Children and Families</b> <b>SOHO PSH Bonus (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Adoption of Low Barriers</u>: Score lowered from 5 to 3 for same reasons outline above for A-FIRST.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, For same reasons applied to A-FIRST, score for <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u> and <u>Housing First Implementation</u> were 3 and 2, respectively.</li> </ul>	<p><b>65</b>  (27.5 out of a possible 42 points = 65%)</p>
<p><b>CommQuest</b> <b>Supportive Services for the Homeless (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 1, <u>Vulnerability</u>: Received from HMIS precise no. of families and individuals (2:5) and redid weighted average of family and individual SPDAT scores to yield slightly higher score of 10 instead of 9.8</li> <li>Page 3, <u>Promoting Housing Stability</u>: Had mistakenly looked at only no. of leavers that went in PH as % of all leavers rather than no. of those who exited to or remained in PH as % of all clients served. When calculation was redone, it yielded 90% (141/156) increasing score from 6.2 to 9</li> <li>Page 3, <u>Increasing Employment Income</u>: Had miscalculated. Ten (10) of 105 adult clients had gained or increased employment income, which = 9.5%</li> <li>Page 3, <u>Obtaining Health Insurance</u>: Score increased from 6.2 to 6.3 to achieve consistency in rounding up</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, Project had up-to-date policies and procedures (5 points) but one point deducted for having confusing eligibility documentation rules not consistent with system rules</li> <li>Page 2, Determined that both <u>Housing First Implementation</u> and <u>Low Barriers</u> were inapplicable to project given that it doesn't make housing decisions</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: 1 point deducted due to late APR</li> </ul>	<p><b>73</b>  (63.5 points out of a possible 87)</p>
<p><b>ICAN</b> <b>Cherry Grove aka Basic Accommodations (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 3, <u>Promoting Housing Stability</u>: Had mistakenly looked at only no. of leavers that went in PH as % of all leavers rather than no. of those who exited to or remained in PH as % of all clients served. When</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 5 points for submitting policies and procedures with no apparent inconsistencies with system-wide policies</li> <li>Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: 5 points awarded for written adoption of Housing First approach with no apparent inconsistencies in policies or practices</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: 1 point deducted due to late APR</li> </ul>	<p><b>65</b>  (65.9 points out of a possible 102 = 65%)</p>

	calculation was redone, it yielded 92.5% (141/156) increasing score from 6.8 to 9.3		
<b>ICAN Housing First Leasing Assistance (Renewal)</b>	No changes to existing scores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 5 points awarded for submitting policies and procedures with no apparent inconsistencies with system-wide policies</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: 5 points awarded for written adoption of Housing First approach with no apparent inconsistencies in policies or practices</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: 1.5 points deducted due to underspending totaling \$3,190</li> </ul>	<b>69</b>  (70.1 points out of a possible 102 = 69%)
<b>ICAN Shelter Plus Care SRA (Renewal)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 1, <u>Vulnerability</u>: Received from HMIS precise no. of families and individuals (2:5) and redid weighted average of family and individual SPDAT scores to lesser score of 6</li> <li>• Page 1, <u>Serving Populations Target</u>: Score changed from 10 to 5. I'd misread HMIS data, which actually indicated that only 50% of new clients in 2015 were in target populations</li> <li>• Page 3, <u>Obtaining Health Insurance</u>: Score increased from 5.3 to 5.4 to achieve consistency in rounding up</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Score changed from 9.3 to 4.7. Had mistakenly awarded 1/10<sup>th</sup> rather than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a point for each 1% of budget funding housing and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 5 points awarded for submitting policies and procedures with no apparent inconsistencies with system-wide policies</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: 5 points awarded for written adoption of Housing First approach with no apparent inconsistencies in policies or practices</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: Late APR, but no deduction because ICAN got info to SMHA in time, but SMHA missed deadlines</li> </ul>	<b>61</b>  (62.6.6 out of a possible 102 = 61%)
<b>ICAN Supported Apartments (Renewal)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Score changed from 9.3 to 4.7. Had mistakenly awarded 1/10<sup>th</sup> rather than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a point for each 1% of budget funding housing and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 5 points awarded for submitting policies and procedures with no apparent inconsistencies with system-wide policies</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: 5 points awarded for written adoption of Housing First approach with no apparent inconsistencies in policies or practices</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: 7 points deducted for \$14,000+ in underspending but no late APRs</li> </ul>	<b>59</b>  (60 out of a possible 102 =59%)

SCORING STATUS OF LOCAL COC APPLICATIONS – 7/19/2016

<p><b>ICAN</b> <b>West Park Apartments (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 1, <u>Vulnerability</u>: Based on a single SPDAT score that was 4 points below average. Rounded from 2.65 to 2.7</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Score changed from 9.3 to 4.7. Had mistakenly awarded 1/10<sup>th</sup> rather than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a point for each 1% of budget funding housing and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 5 points awarded for submitting policies and procedures with no apparent inconsistencies with system-wide policies</li> <li>Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: 5 points awarded for written adoption of Housing First approach with no apparent inconsistencies in policies or practices</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: No deductions</li> </ul>	<p><b>75</b>  (76 out of a possible 102 points = 75%)</p>
<p><b>YWCA</b> <b>NBH Supportive Housing (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Adoption of Low Barriers</u>: Score reduced from 5 to 4 based on policy that suggests eviction can be based on “disrespect toward others or staff.”</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Score changed from 4.7 to 2.6. Had mistakenly awarded 1/10<sup>th</sup> rather than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a point for each 1% of budget funding housing and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: 4 points awarded for submitting policies and procedures, but 1 point deducted from possible total of 5 because policies suggest Y is accepting referrals from various sources for PSH and maintaining a separate waiting list. No mention of cooperation with Central Intake &amp; Assessment.</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: Policies include pledge to Housing First, but this seems to be contradicted in part by eligibility criteria that include (1) a commitment to self-sufficiency and (2) a promise not to bring alcohol on the premises</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: No deductions</li> </ul>	<p><b>71</b>  (72.1 out of a possible 102 points = 71%)</p>
<p><b>YWCA</b> <b>STARR (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 1, <u>Vulnerability</u>: Recalculated weighted average of family and individual SPDAT scores based on new info that avg. project SPDATs were based on 16 families and 59 individuals. Reduced score to 2.1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: No points awarded because Y has not completed a rewrite of policies and procedures that is underway. Only provided a draft.</li> <li>Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: No points awarded because no evidence of written HF policy.</li> <li>Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: No points deducted for underspending or late APRs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>54</b>  (55.4 out of a possible 102 points = 54%)</p>
<p><b>YWCA</b> <b>STARR II (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Change to 2.8 from 2.76 for consistency’s sake.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: No points awarded because Y has not completed a rewrite of policies and procedures that is underway. Only provided a draft.</li> <li>Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: No points awarded because no evidence of written HF policy.</li> </ul>	<p><b>67</b>  (41.8 points out of a possible 62 points = 67%)</p>

SCORING STATUS OF LOCAL COC APPLICATIONS – 7/19/2016

<p><b>SMHA</b></p> <p><b>PRA</b></p> <p><b>Samaritan/Gateway House II Shelter Plus Care Phase II Bonus (Renewal)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 3, <u>Promoting Housing Stability</u>: Score reduced from 9.7 based on recalculation of no. of clients that met this criterion (30/33)</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Score changed from 9.3 to 4.6. Had mistakenly awarded 1/10<sup>th</sup> rather than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a point for each 1% of budget funding housing and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: No points awarded because SMHA was unable to produce any policies or procedures.</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: No points awarded because SMHA was unable to produce any written commitment to Housing First</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: 2 points deducted for 2 late APRs and half a point deducted for underspending of \$1,147</li> </ul>	<p><b>63</b></p> <p>(64 points out of a possible 102 points = 63%)</p>
<p><b>SMHA</b></p> <p><b>Shelter Plus Care TRA</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 1, <u>Vulnerability</u>: Recalculated weighted average of family and individual SPDAT scores based on new info that avg. project SPDATs were based on 1 family and 1 individual. Reduced score to 8.7 from 10.</li> <li>• Page 3, <u>Promoting Housing Stability</u>: Correction of rounding error reduced score from 9.4 to 9.3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: No points awarded because SMHA was unable to produce any policies or procedures.</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: No points awarded because SMHA was unable to produce any written commitment to Housing First</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: Because of underspending by \$85,908 on FY 2012 grant and \$87,913 on FY 2013 grant, 86.5 points were deducted. (1/2 point for every \$1,000 of underspending). An additional 2 points were deducted by 2 late APRs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>-0-</b></p> <p>(score wiped out by deductions for underspending)</p>
<p><b>SMHA</b></p> <p><b>Shelter Plus Care TRA MHR SB</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 6, <u>Budget Emphasis on Housing</u>: Score changed from 9.3 to 4.6. Had mistakenly awarded 1/10<sup>th</sup> rather than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of a point for each 1% of budget funding housing and operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 2, <u>Up-to-Date Policies and Procedures</u>: No points awarded because SMHA was unable to produce any policies or procedures.</li> <li>• Page 2, <u>Housing First Implementation</u>: No points awarded because SMHA was unable to produce any written commitment to Housing First</li> <li>• Page 6, <u>Management of Grant Funds</u>: Apparently, this was 5-year grant of \$178,920. SMHA doesn't know what the annual grant amount was, but for purposes of underspending, I assumed it was 20% of the total or \$35,784. Using that figure, I calculated that underspending in FYs 2012 and 2013 were \$4,266 and \$4,294, respectively, which yielded a total of \$8,659. Accordingly, I deducted 4 points for underspending. In addition, I deducted 2 points for 2 late APRs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>50</b></p> <p>(40.9 out of a possible 82 points = 50%)</p>