

Background

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) released the Continuum of Care (CoC) FY2021 CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) on August 18, 2021. The City of Oklahoma City Planning Department on behalf of the Oklahoma City CoC will submit a collaborative application to HUD for competition funds on or before November 16, 2021. One of the primary responsibilities of the CoC is to develop a new, renewal and reallocation process for selection and ranking criteria of projects for CoC Program funding.

Rating and Review Procedure for New and Renewal Project Applications

When considering new and renewal projects for award, City of Oklahoma City Planning Department staff will conduct a preliminary review of all applications to determine if the project meets the eligibility and threshold requirements as established by HUD. Planning Department staff will review project applications, documentation of 501(c)(3) status, program policies, Annual Performance Reports (APRs); monitoring reports, and A-133 audit reports as applicable. Any project not meeting the threshold requirements will not be further reviewed or considered for funding.

All projects that meet eligibility and threshold requirements will be presented to members of the CoC Governing Board. In accordance with HUD regulations, no member may participate in or influence discussions or resulting decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefit to the organizations that the member represents. The CoC Board members are knowledgeable about homelessness and housing in the area and are broadly representative of the relevant sectors and subpopulations.

The CoC will establish a time frame that allows for review and discussion about the applications, questions and clarification about applications with applicant agencies, scoring of the applications, and presenting project scoring and ranking recommendations. The CoC Board determines the rank and funding levels of all projects considering all of the information provided to them on the application, APRs, monitoring reports and through the applicant presentations. City of Oklahoma City Planning Department staff will provide technical assistance by responding to questions of the CoC Board and correcting technical inaccuracies if they arise in conversation. Each CoC Board member is responsible for calculating scores for each new and renewal project. The average score for the project is then used to determine the ranking.

Renewal projects are scored and ranked according to the Renewal Score Sheet except for HMIS and Coordinated Intake projects as well as first time renewals or projects that have not been in operation for at least one year. Renewal HMIS and Coordinated Intake projects will be ranked at the top of the project rankings. Projects that have not been in operation for at least one year will be ranked after the renewal projects and ahead of new project applications. New projects will be scored based on the New Application Score Sheet and ranked after renewal projects. The CoC uses a two-tiered ranking system. Tier 1 funding is equal to 100% of the CoC's Annual Renewal Demand and Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the maximum amount of renewal, reallocation, and CoC Bonus funds. A project may straddle the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line. The CoC Board considers adjustments for CoC and HUD priorities to best position the CoC to receive maximum overall amount of funding. Scoring results are delivered to applicants electronically with a reminder about the appeal process if a project application is rejected. Applicants not selected by the CoC to be included in the CoC submission to HUD may appeal by submitting their esnaps Solo Application directly to HUD



no later than November 16 2021, at 7:59:59pm (EST). Once the scoring is finalized funding recommendations are presented to the City Council for their approval.

Reallocation

The Oklahoma City CoC has implemented a reallocation process that uses performance data to determine how efficient and effective CoC program resources are being expended to establish if reallocation should be considered to improve system performance and end homelessness within our community. If applicable, funds reallocated, voluntary or involuntary, will be made available for reallocation to create new projects during the local application process.

As part of the local application process for inclusion in the HUD CoC Collaborative Application projects are asked whether they wish to voluntarily re-allocation some or all their funding. Projects with poor performance and/or are not serving the intended population or with significant, unresolved findings are subject to reallocation. Applicants may appeal the decision, and the appeal must be considered by the CoC Board.

Renewal Score Sheet

Project:

Score: _____

	Scoring Tool	Reviewers
		Score
#1 Coordinated Entry Participation	100% = 5 point	
	<100% = 0 points	
#2 Homeless Contribution	No participation over the last year and currently has no plan to incorporate person with lived experience: 0 Points	
	No participation over the last year but has a plan in place to incorporate	
	participation: 3 Points	
	Had participation from person with lived experience and provided	
	documentation: 5 Points	
#3 Project Performance		
Housing Stability	95%+ = 5 points	
	80% - 94% = 2 points	
	<80% = 0 points	
Total Income	65%-100%: 5 Points	
	40%-64%: 3 Points	
	Below 40%: 0 Points	



	-	
Earned Income	50%-100%: 5 points	
	10%-49%: 3 points	
	Below 10%: 0 points	
Entered From		
Exits to Homelessness	5% or less = 5 points	
	6% - 10% = 2 points	
	11% - 25% = 1 point	
	>25% = 0 points	
Non-cash benefit -Stayers	85%-100%: 5 Points	
	60-84%: 3 Points	
	Below 60%: 0 Points	
Non-cash benefit – Leavers		
Non-cash benefit – Leavers		
Utilization Rate	90%-100%: 10 Points	
	75%-89%: 5 Points	
	Below 75%: 0 Points	
# 4 Housing First/Low Barrier	1 point for every "No" response (Max 15 points)	
# 5 Project Populations		
Chronic	75%-100%: 2 Points	
	Less than 75%: 0 Points	
No Income	75%-100%: 2 Points	
	Less than 75%: 0 Points	
Multiple Conditions	75%-100%: 2 Points	
	Less than 75%: 0 Points	
#6 HMIS Data Quality		1
Identifiable Info	0% = 1 point	
	1% - 3% = .5 point	
Veteran Status	>3% = 0 points	
Project Start Date		
Froject Start Date		
Head of Household	4	



Disabling Condition		
Destination		
Income at Entry		
Income at Annual Assessment		
Income at Annual Assessment		
Income at Exit		
Chronicity		
Chromony		
#7 Financial and Monitoring	·	
Funds Expended		
	>90% = 0 points	
Timely Reimbursement Requests	Yes = 1 point	
	No = 0 points	
Findings or Concerns	5 Points will be deducted from any project score with any outstanding	
	findings.	
#8 Collaboration		1
Coalition membership	Yes = 1 point	
	No = 0 points	
CCM participation	Yes = 1 point	
#9 Other	No = 0 points	
Participant Satisfaction	Agency assess for satisfaction annually: 2 Points	
	Agency does not assess for satisfaction annually: 0 Points	
Advancing Racial Equity	Multiple different approaches: 5 points	
	Some work and approaches: 2 points	
	No work: 0 points	



COVID-19 Vaccine access and information	Explanation of how information was provided 2 points (Bonus) Explanation of how clients/staff were helped to gain access to vaccine: 2 points No information provided: 0 points	
TOTAL (Max Possible: 100 points)		

New Application Score Sheet

Project: _____

Score: _____

	Scoring Tool	Reviewers Score
# 1 Proposed Program	Clearly and in detail describes the scope of the project = 10 points Describes project, but lacks important details = 5 points Vaguely or inadequately describes project = 0 points	
# 2 CoC Need	Clearly describes the need of the CoC and how the project will help move the community to improve the system performance measures =30 points Somewhat describes the need of the CoC and how project will help community improve the system performance measures = 15 points Vaguely or inadequately describes the need of the CoC and how project will help community improve the system performance measures = 0 points	
# 3 CoC Housing and Services	Clearly and in detail describes the project planned contribution to Community Housing and Services through Coordinated Entry = 5 points Vaguely or inadequately describes contribution to Community Housing and Services through Coordinated Entry = 0 points	
# 4 Homeless Contribution	Homeless or formerly homeless Board member = 5 points	
# 5 Agency Capacity and Experience	Extensive experience with government grants with high staff experiences in project administration and compliance = 5 points Some experience with government grants = 2 point No experience = 0 points	
# 6 Housing First/Low Barrier	1 points for every "No" response (Max 15 points)	



# 7 Project Populations	> 5 populations selected = 5 points	
	2-4 populations selected = 2 point	
#8 Collaboration		
Coalition membership	Yes = 2 point	
	No = 0 points	
CCM participation	Yes = 2 point	
	No = 0 points	
HMIS participation	Yes = 2 point	
	No = 0 points	
# 9 Other		
Participant Satisfaction	Agency assess for satisfaction annually: 2 Points	
	Agency does not assess for satisfaction annually: 0 Points	
Advancing Racial Equity	Multiple different approaches: 5 points	
	Some work and approaches: 2 points	
	No work: 0 points	
COVID-19 Vaccine access and	Explanation of how information was provided 2 points	
information	(Bonus) Explanation of how clients/staff were helped to gain access to	
	vaccine: 2 points	
	No information provided: 0 points	
TOTAL (Max Points Possible: 100)		