

HUD 2018 NOFA (NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY)
ERIE COUNTY CoC RATING CRITERIA FOR NEW PROJECTS
Finalized August 7, 2018

Under the 2018 HUD Continuum of Care process, the Erie County Continuum of Care is required to rate and rank all new project applications. The HUD CoC Program Rating and Ranking tool that was released from HUD, was modified to meet local priorities and performance outcomes, and is being utilized for the 2018 rating and ranking process. In order to rate all new project applications in a fair and impartial manner, the rating tool consists of a 125-point evaluation system based on experience, design of housing and supportive services, timeliness of implementation of project, financial including any recent audit findings, whether the project intends on serving HUD priority groups, and application timeliness/accuracy. The benchmarks were developed from the information on individual 2018 project applications, HUD standards as evidenced in the 2018 HUD Notice of Funding Availability, and The Federal Register (24 CFR Part 578), most recent audit reports, and an average of project cost per program participant, that was developed by comparing all local applications. The benchmarks that were established for the evaluation include the following:

- The Provider Has Documented Extensive Experience Working with The Proposed Population and Providing Similar Housing Services
- The Provider Documented that the Program Utilizes a Housing First/Low Barrier Model
- The Provider Has Previous Experience Effectively Utilizing Federal Funds
- The Provider Has a Documented Understanding of the Design of Housing & Supportive Services
- The Provider has a Documented Detailed and Efficient Description of the Plan to Assist Clients to Rapidly Secure and Maintain Permanent Housing
- The Provider Describes a Detailed Method that Clients will be Assisted to Increased Employment/Income and Ability to Live Independently
- The Provider Plans to Implement the Program within 30 Days or Less of the Program Start Date
- The Project is Cost- Effective: The Project Budget Details that the Cost per Program Participant is > 20% Below Average within the Project Type
- Audit Findings: The Provider's Most Recent Audit Report Indicate that the Agency is Identified as Low Risk and Indicates No Findings.
- The Budgeted Costs are Detailed, Reasonable and Allowable as per the 2018 Notice of Funding Availability and The Federal Register (24 CFR, Part 278), and Allocable (per the 2018 Estimated Annual Renewal Demand Report).
- Project will Serve HUD Priority Groups- Maximum Points for Serving all 4 HUD Priority Groups.
- The application was received on or before the local due date of July 27, 2018
- The application contained all required information and was accurate

The criteria for scoring each question are as follows:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Experience: Working with Proposed Population and Providing Housing Similar to that Proposed in the Application | |
| Evidence of Extensive Previous Experience | 10 points |
| Evidence of Some Previous Experience | 5 points |
| No Evidence of Prior Experience | 0 points |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2. Experience: Utilizing a Housing First Approach | |
| Yes | 10 |
| No | 0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. Experience: Experience in Effectively Utilizing Federal Funds | |
| Yes | 5 |
| No | 0 |

4. Extent to Which the Applicant:

- A.) Demonstrate the Understanding of the needs of the clients to be served (2 points)**
- B.) Demonstrate type, scale, and location of the housing and how it will fit the needs of the Clients to be served (2 points)**
- C.) Demonstrate type and scale of all of the supportive services, regardless of funding source Meet the needs of the clients to be served (2 points)**
- D.) Demonstrate how clients will be assisted in obtaining and coordinating the provision of Mainstream benefits (2 points)**
- E.) Establish performance measures for housing and income that are objective, measurable, Trackable, and meet or exceed any established HUD, HEARTH, or CoC Benchmarks (2 points)**

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Evidence of Understanding of all 5 Criteria | 10 points |
| Evidence of Understanding of 4 of 5 Criteria | 8 points |
| Evidence of Understanding of 3 of 5 Criteria | 6 points |
| Evidence of Understanding of 2 of 5 Criteria | 4 points |
| Evidence of Understanding of 1 of 5 Criteria | 2 points |
| No Evidence of Understanding of any of Criteria | 0 points |

5. Design of Housing & Supportive Services: Description of Plan to Assist Clients to Rapidly Secure and Maintain PH

| | |
|-----|----------|
| Yes | 5 points |
| No | 0 points |

6. Design of Housing & Supportive Services: Description of how Clients will be Assisted to Increase Employment and/or Income and to Maximize their Ability to Live Independently

| | |
|-----|----------|
| Yes | 5 points |
| No | 0 points |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 7. Timeliness: Plan for Rapid Implementation of Program | |
| 30 Days or Less | 10 points |
| 30 Days to 60 Days | 5 points |
| Beyond 60 Days | 0 points |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 8. Financial: Project is Cost-Effective- Comparing Projected Cost per Person Served to CoC Average Within Project Type: | |
| Cost is > 20% Below Average | 10 points |
| Cost is 20% Below to 20% Above Average | 5 points |
| Cost is > 20% Above Average | 0 points |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 9. Financial: Most Recent Audit Identified Agency as “Low Risk” | |
| Yes | 5 points |
| No | 0 points |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 10. Financial: Most Recent Audit Indicates No Findings | |
| No Findings Found | 5 points |
| One or More Findings Found | 0 points |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 11. Financial: Budgeted Costs are Reasonable, Allocable, and Allowable | |
| No Evidence of Budget Errors | 10 points |
| Evidence of Some Budget Errors | 5 points |
| Evidence of Multiple Budget Errors | 0 Points |

12. Other Local Criteria: Provider is Serving a HUD Priority Group (Chronic Homeless, Homeless Families, Homeless Youth ages 18-24, or Homeless Veterans)

| | |
|--------------|-----------|
| All 4 groups | 10 points |
| 3 groups | 8 points |
| 2 groups | 6 points |
| 1 groups | 4 points |
| No groups | 0 points |

13. Other Local Criteria: Application Timeliness

Application was received on or before due date

| | |
|-----|-----------|
| Yes | 10 points |
| No | 0 points |

14. Other Local Criteria: Application Completeness/Accuracy

All required information was included and was accurate

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Yes | 10 points |
| Some minor errors or missing information | 5 points |
| Multiple errors or missing information | 0 points |

15. Other Local Criteria: Overall Impression of Application

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Based on Overall Impression | 0-10 points |
|-----------------------------|-------------|