2024 Georgia Balance of State Continuum of Care Review Team Scoring NEW Projects (PSH, RRH, Joint TH-RRH, Expansion, or Other) Annual Competition

Reviewer Name:	Date:
Organization Name:	
Project Name:	
HUD Project Type: 🗌 PSH; 📗 RRH; 🔲 Joint TH-RRH (is	this for an Expansion or DV Bonus?)
Requested Amount (General Information Question 6):	
Proposed Number of Individuals and/or Families to Serve (Total number of households, Question 5b, second	

Please read each application fully first before scoring. Each scoring section has the question from the application that applies specifically to that scoring criteria. As the individual point amounts may vary just slightly, please read each scoring criteria fully prior to assigning a score.

There is a "Comments/Scoring Rationale" box following the scoring chart in each section. It is important that reviewers are able to provide rationalization for each project scoring, therefore, please provide comments on scoring rationale.

Threshold Information

Threshold Statements	Yes/No	Score
1. PSH & RRH Agencies submitting new projects	All the requirements checked and/or	
had 8 requirements to meet in order to be	addressed = Yes	
considered for this funding (Joint TH-RRH must	One or more of the requirements not	
also meet HUD minimum standards**).	checked or addressed = No	

Project Threshold Criteria	Scoring	Reviewer Score
Applicant meets HUD's eligibility and threshold criteria.	Pass/Fail	
Applicant demonstrates adequate capacity to carry out grant (attachments required).*	Pass/Fail	
Project meets eligible costs or activities requirements.	Pass/Fail	
Project sufficiently demonstrates eligible populations will be served.	Pass/Fail	
Project shows required match & sufficient commitments for leveraging to implement project.	Pass/Fail	
Applicant does not have serious compliance or performance issues on current projects.	Pass/Fail	
Project demonstrates adequate impact or cost effectiveness.	Pass/Fail	
Project meets HUD Joint TH & PH-RRH Component Minimum Standards**	Pass/Fail	
Other, as identified by reviewers.	Pass/Fail	
Threshold Statements Comments		

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 1 of 13

Agency Capacity*	Possible Points	Score
Agency demonstrates	Response is clear and concise; financial statements/IRS Form 990 are	
they have the capacity	current (without concerns); board consists of volunteer/ diverse members;	
to carry out and	applicant has experience administering federal funds; and there are no	
implement the project	match/ leveraging concerns for reaching capacity = 20 Excellent*	
proposed.		
(20 possible points)	Response is adequate; financial statements/IRS Form 990 are current (any concerns addressed); board consists of volunteer/ diverse members; applicant has experience administering government funds; and there are no match/leveraging concerns for reaching capacity = 15 Good	
New project applicants must sufficiently describe experience administering federally funded grants, and submit the most recent financial audit, IRS	Response unclear and leaves unanswered questions; financial statements and/or IRS Form 990 are not current (with concerns); board consists of local volunteer/diverse members; applicant has experience administering grant funds; and/or there are match/leveraging concerns for reaching capacity = 5 Adequate	
Form 990, and list of current board members. New	Response and required documentation does not demonstrate experience or capacity to carry out project = 0 (May be rejected by the review team)	
projects should also adequately describe how project will reach	*Local government applicants (county or municipality) should receive full points for this criteria provided that match has been adequately demonstrated.	
full operational capacity. New project applications that do not demonstrate capacity to carry out	Applicants with open (unresolved) monitoring findings or concerns from HUD, DCA, or any other governmental or foundation funder, that doesn't demonstrate a satisfactory corrective plan of action may lose additional points or be determined not to meet threshold.	
project may be rejected by the review		
team.	TOTAL (20 points maximum)	
Agency Capacity Comme		
Agency Capacity Comme	:111.5	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 2 of 13

Proposed Project Information

Agency Experience	Possible Points	Score
2. PSH: Homeless and	Response is clear and concise and gives a complete picture of the relevant experience of the applicant = 20	
Permanent Supportive Housing Experience	Response gives an adequate description of related experience, but the experience is limited = 15	
RRH: Homeless and Rapid Re-housing	Response gives an adequate description of experience, but leaves a few unanswered questions = 10	
Experience	Response unclear and leaves unanswered questions about the experience = 0	
Joint TH-RRH: Unsheltered and Youth Homeless, Transitional Housing, and Rapid Re- housing Experience	Response does not describe experience working with people who are homeless and/or managing a similar program type (PSH, RRH, or TH-RRH) = 0	
(Question 1a, 1b, 1c & 1d)		
(20 possible points)		
Weighed heavily due to the importance of experience		
3. Leasing, Rental, Support Services, and HMIS	Response is clear and concise and gives a complete picture of the relevant experience of the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any), for all four aspects = 5	
Experience (Question 1e)	Response gives an adequate description of related experience, but the experience is limited for one or two aspects = 3	
(5 possible points)	Response gives an adequate description of experience, but the experience is limited for three or four aspects = 2	
	Response unclear and leaves unanswered questions about the experience = 0	
	Response does not describe experience related to leasing, rental assistance, support services and/or HMIS = 0	
	TOTAL (25 points maximum)	
Agency Experience Com		

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 3 of 13

Program Monitoring		
	(9 points maximum)	
	TOTAL	
	= -5	
	Agency has current CoC funded project on pace for 75% or less spenddown	
(5 possible points)	Agency does not have a current CoC funded project = 0	
(Question 1h)	spenddown =2	
our cire doc runding	Agency has current CoC funded project on pace for greater than 90%	
current CoC funding	, igency has carrent esertanded project on pace for 100% spenddown -5	
5. Full utilization of	that causes capacity concerns = 0 Agency has current CoC funded project on pace for 100% spenddown =5	
	findings or concerns were of a serious financial or programmatic nature	
	Agency has open findings or concerns that aren't being addressed, or	
(4 possible points)		
	a response letter has not been received by applicant = 2	
(Questions 1f & 1g)	Agency is currently working to address monitoring findings or concerns, but	
Findings or Concerns	there are no outstanding Federal debts = 4	
4. Monitoring	Agency has no open (unresolved) monitoring findings or concerns, and	

General Description	Possible Points	Score
6. Program Description	Response has a clear description of how the project meets the community need	
	for housing (or expansion if applicable) = 1	
(Question 2a and 3a)	Response has a clear description of the target population that will be served = 1	
	Response has a clear description of a plan to address the housing and support	
(8 possible points)	service needs of the participants = 1	
	Response has clear proposed outcomes, <u>and</u> the proposed outcomes seem	
(Each checked	reasonable = 1	
applicable box = 1	Response includes a description of planned and established partnerships = 1	
point)	Response is clear in describing why CoC support is necessary for the project = 1	
Proposed Project	Response clearly describes the plan to reach full project capacity in a timely	
Expansions will need to	manner = 1	
fully demonstrate need	Response clearly describes how project will target and prioritize people with	
(Question 3)	higher needs and who are most vulnerable = 1	
7. Estimated Schedule	Applicant provided a complete timeline showing when the project	
	implementation milestones will occur, and they seem reasonable = 3	
(0 0.1)	Applicant provided a timeline showing when project implementation	
(Question 2d)	milestones will occur, but is missing 1 or 2 milestones or some of the	
(2 nossible noints)	milestones seem unrealistic = 2	
(3 possible points)	Implementation timeline is unclear or project has some feasibility concerns = 0	
	Implementation timeline is unclear or project has some feasibility concerns = 0	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 4 of 13

8. Housing First Model	Description of how the project will incorporate a Housing First model	
(Question 2e)	of housing assistance that prioritizes rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing that does not have service participation	
	requirements or preconditions is thorough and leaves no unanswered	
(3 possible points)	questions, and applicant selected "Yes" = 3 points	
	Description is adequate but leaves some unanswered questions, and applicant selected "Yes" = 1 point	
	Explanation is unclear or does not align with a Housing First design or applicant selected "No" = 0 points	
9. Housing First	Agencies were required to check each criteria that there would NOT be a	
(Question 2f)	policy or practice that would prevent project entry (other than state/federal-mandated exceptions) and to provide an explanation to	
	support other requirements based on housing readiness. Projects that	
(8 possible points)	did not check one or more of the four barriers that would not prohibit	
	participants from being enrolled in the project were required to	
	provide an explanation. If explanation or other narratives indicate	
	barrier is not one mandated by an outside authority, award zero points for related criteria.	
	Award two points for each criteria that was selected for not being a barrier to	
	project entry.	
	Having to little or little income: check = 2	
	Active or history of substance abuse: check = 2	
	 Having a criminal record with exceptions for state/federal mandated restrictions: check = 2 	
	 History of victimization (e.g. domestic violence, sexual assault, childhood abuse): check = 2 	
	• None of the above: check = 0	
	Other requirements based on "housing readiness": if satisfactory explanation can award 1 point for relevant barrier if 2 points weren't awarded	
	Applicants that did not select any of the above policies/practices as not being a	
	barrier for accepting a client into the project should describe the rules that would prevent entry into a project.	
10. Housing First	Agencies were required to indicate which, if any, factors that there	
	would NOT be a policy or practice that would cause a client to be	
(Question 2g)	terminated from the project. Projects that did not check one or more	
	of the four items, that would not be a cause for termination, were	
(8 possible points)	required to provide an explanation. If explanation or other narratives do not back up answer award zero points for related criteria.	
	Award one point for each factor that was_selected and not a cause for	
	termination.	
	Failure to participate in supportive services: check = 2	
	 Failure to make progress on a service plan: check = 2 Loss of income or failure to improve income: check = 2 	
	 Loss of income or failure to improve income: check = 2 Any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found for 	
	unassisted persons in the project's geographic area: check = 2	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 5 of 13

	None of the above (see below): check = 0	
	Applicants that did NOT select any of the above policies/practices for	
	termination should describe rule violations that would cause a client to be	
	terminated from the project and any corrective measures taken prior to termination.	
11. Determinations	PSH projects:	
by Project Type PSH: Prioritization of	Response clearly describes a plan for identifying and prioritizing the people with the most severe needs, <u>and</u> clearly explains the outreach process that will be used to engage people living on the streets and in shelter = 6	
Chronically Homeless		
,	Response describes a plan for identifying and prioritizing the people with the most severe needs, and explains the outreach process that will be used to	
RRH and Joint TH-RRH: Leasing and Rental	engage people living on the streets and in shelter, but leaves some unanswered questions = 4	
Assistance Procedure	Response describes a minimal plan for identifying and prioritizing the people	
SSO CE: Prioritization and Referral Process	with the most severe needs, and may or may not include an outreach process, and leaves unanswered questions = 1	
(Question 2h)	Response unclear, incomplete, or severity of needs not considered = 0	
(Question 211)	RRH and Joint TH-RRH projects:	
	Response is clear and describes a consistent plan regarding assistance = 6	
(6 possible points)	Response gives an adequate description of the assistance plan, but leaves unanswered questions= 3	
	Response unclear or incomplete = 0	
	SSO-CE projects:	
	Response is clear and describes a consistent plan regarding prioritization = 6	
	Response gives an adequate description of the prioritization plan, but leaves unanswered questions= 3	
	Response unclear or incomplete = 0	
12. Coordinated Entry	Agencies were required to explain and discuss:	
Participation		
(Question 2i)	a) plans to assess clients using the appropriate VI-SPDAT, or participate in a local Coordinated Entry implementation (as it relates to assessment) = 3 points if fully addressed and demonstrates requirement will be met	
Assessment, Prioritization, & Eligibility Requirements	b) how the project will work to ensure they are prioritizing people with the highest needs or participate in a local Coordinated Entry implementation (as it relates to prioritization of clients and project acceptance of clients through the referral process) = 3 points if fully addressed and demonstrates requirement will be met	
(9 possible points)	c) participant eligibility requirements around homelessness and disability (as applicable for PSH) for homeless persons to access and be accepted into this program = 3 points if fully met and demonstrates requirement will be met	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 6 of 13

	Agencies <i>not</i> providing a complete response may not receive full points (A-C).	
	Projects determined <i>not</i> willing to participate in the CoC's Coordinated Entry	
	System or <i>not</i> targeted for eligible populations may not meet threshold.	
	Award three points for each criteria that fully addresses and clearly	
	demonstrates each requirement will be met. (9 possible total points)	
TOTAL		
(45 points maximum)		
General Description Comments		

Supportive Services	Possible Points	Score
13. Educational Liaison	Response identifies a job position that serves as the educational liaison,	
(job title, responsibilities, and	describes the roles of the position, and has a plan to ensure that children are enrolled in school, McKinney-Vento services, and other related programs = 5	
services)	Response answers some of the above, but leaves unanswered questions = 3	
(Question 4a) (5 possible points)	Response is unclear or incomplete = 0	
14. Permanent	Response is clear and concise, gives a complete picture of the plan to assist	
Housing Stability	participants in remaining housed, and includes addressing the needs of the target population, through both case management and accessing outside services. Response should also clearly demonstrate proposed housing type	
(Question 4b)	meets the needs of participants, how project will work with landlords, assistance, and support to be provided to participants, and how project will	
(5 possible points)	work to help participants set goals. = 5	
	Response is clear and concise, gives an adequate picture of the plan to assist participants in remaining housed, and includes addressing the needs of the target population, through both case management and accessing outside services. Response adequately demonstrates proposed housing type meets the needs of participants, how project will work with landlords, assistance and support to be provided to participants, and how project will work to help participants set goals = 4	
	Response gives an adequate description of proposed plan, but does not address all points above = 3	
	Response gives an adequate description, but leaves unanswered questions = 2	
	Response unclear or incomplete = 0	
	Projects proposed to exclusively serve victims of domestic violence should also describe safety planning to address the needs of participants.	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page **7** of **13**

15. Increase in Income Response is clear and concise, gives a complete picture of the specific plan to assist participants in increasing their employment and/or income, and includes addressing the needs of the target population, through both case management (Question 4c and 4cand coordination with mainstream service programs to ensure participates are 1) assisted in accessing mainstream services. Response also addresses how the service delivery will result in increased employment and/or mainstream (10 possible benefits, leading participants towards increased financial independence. = 10 points) Response is clear and concise, gives an adequate picture of the specific plan to assist participants in increasing their employment and/or income, and includes addressing the needs of the target population, through both case management and coordination with mainstream service programs to ensure participates are assisted in accessing mainstream services. Response also addresses how the service delivery will result in increased employment and/or mainstream benefits, leading participants towards increased financial independence. = 7 Response unclear or incomplete = 0 Responses that do not include a specific plan to coordinate and integrate with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs and ensure participants are assisted to obtain benefits from mainstream programs for which they may be eligible will not meet HUD threshold requirements. 16. Supportive Response indicates that at least 11 of 16 services will be offered/provided for the participants in order to implement a comprehensive program, and Services description of services is clear, frequency is often, and leaves no unanswered questions = 5(Question 4d and 4e) Response indicates that at least 11 of 16 services will be offered/provided for the participants, but description of services is not clear, frequency is (5 possible points) acceptable, or leaves some unanswered questions = 4 Response indicates that 7-10 services will be offered/provided for the participants, and description of services is clear, frequency is acceptable, and leaves no unanswered questions = 3 Response indicates that 7-10 services will be offered/provided for the participants, but description of services is not clear, frequency is questionable, or leaves some unanswered questions = 1 Response indicates that less than 7 services will be offered/provided to the participants = 0 **TOTAL** (25 points maximum) **Supportive Services Comments**

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 8 of 13

Housing Type and Location and Project Participants	Possible Points	Score
17. Prioritization	Response fully demonstrates need and will dedicate units/beds for serving people who are veterans or unaccompanied youth at 100% = 5	
(Question 5b-5c) (5 points possible)	Response fully demonstrates need and will dedicate units/beds for serving people who are veterans, or unaccompanied youth at 70-99% = 4	
New projects should	Response adequately demonstrates need and will dedicate units/beds for serving people who are veterans, or unaccompanied youth at 50-69% = 3	
sufficiently demonstrate need, targeting, and related partnerships (in	Response adequately demonstrates need and will dedicate units/beds for serving people who are veterans, or unaccompanied youth at 30-49% = 2	
the size and scope proposed).	Response indicates no dedicated units/beds for prioritization and a low or no percentage of subpopulations, or response is unclear or incomplete = 0	
18. Racial & Ethnic Equity (Identification of barriers to participation)	Response is clear and concise, gives a complete picture of the specific plan to identify barriers to participation in this project and steps that will be taken to eliminate identified barriers = 10	
(Question 5d) (10 possible points)	Response is clear and concise and adequately describes specific plan to identify barriers to participation in this project and steps that will be taken to eliminate identified barriers = 7	
	Response includes a plan to identify barriers to participation and steps to eliminate barriers, but leaves unanswered questions = 3 Response is unclear or incomplete = 0	
19. Experience working with BIPOC, LGBTQ populations, people living with	Response is clear and concise and gives a complete picture of the relevant experience of the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any), for all three populations = 10 Response gives an adequate description of related experience, but the	
disabilities	experience is limited for two populations = 7	
(Question 5e)	Response gives an adequate description of experience, but the experience is limited to 1 population group = 5	
(10 possible points)	Response is clear and strategies are viable but experience with the populations Is limited or not present = 3	
	Response does not describe experience nor strategy to working with any of these populations= 0	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page **9** of **13**

20. Partnering with	Response is clear and concise and gives a complete picture of how the		
people with lived	project will partner with people with lived experience/expertise in the		
Experience/expertise	design, implementation, and evaluation of the project = 10		
(Question 5f)	Response gives an adequate description how the project will partner with		
(10 possible points)	people with lived experience/expertise in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the project = 7		
	Response gives an adequate description how the project will partner with people with lived experience/expertise in 2 of the 3 phases, the design,		
	implementation, and evaluation of the project = 5		
	Response gives an incomplete description how the project will partner		
	with people with lived experience/expertise in the design,		
	implementation, and evaluation of the project = 2		
	Response does not describe how the project will partner with people with		
	lived experience/expertise in the design, implementation, and evaluation		
	of the project = 0		
TOTAL			
(35 points maximum)			
Housing Type and Location and Project Participants Comments			

Proposed Performance	Possible Points	Score
Measures		
21. Housing Stability	Response indicates that the project has a plan that is thorough and realistic	
(Question 6a)	that will help at least 85% of participants reach housing stability = 4	
(Question ba)	Response indicates that the project has a less thorough or realistic plan to	
(4 possible points)	help 85% of participants reach housing stability = 2	
Standard Baseline = 85%	Response does address or adequately describe how project will help	
of households	participants reach housing stability, or narrative notes an anticipated rate	
	less than 85% of households = 0	
22. Income	Response indicates that the project has a plan that is thorough and realistic	
(4 possible points)	that will help at least 54% of participant households increase income = 4	
(+ possible points)	Response indicates that the project has a less thorough or realistic plan to	
Increase in Total Income	help at least 54% of participant households increase income = 2	
(Question 6b)	Response does not address or adequately describe how project will help	
C.	participant households increase income = 0	
Standard Baseline = 54% of households		
of flousefloids		
	TOTAL	
	(8 points maximum)	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 10 of 13

Proposed Performance Measures Comments		

Budget	Possible Points	Score
23. Budget	The budgets and rationale for the requested amounts are complete, accurate,	
	and realistic, and leave no questions = 10	
(Question 8)	The budgets and rationale for the requested amounts complete, accurate,	
(40	and realistic, but leave unanswered questions = 7	
(10 possible points)	· ·	
	The budgets and rationale for the requested amounts are acceptable, but leave unanswered questions = 5	
	· ·	
	The budgets and rationale for the requested amounts are not clear, complete,	
	accurate, or realistic, and/or leave too many unanswered questions = 0	
TOTAL		
	(10 points maximum)	

Budget Comments

Project Match and Leveraging	Possible Points	Score
24. Match (Cash or In-Kind Resources)*	Match:	
New projects must demonstrate required match resources equal to at		
least 25% of the total requested HUD funding, including project and	Well defined = 5	
administrative costs.	Acceptable = 3	
*New project applicants must attach agency commitments for match	Unacceptable = 0	
(specifically dedicated to this project).	(commitments required)	
25. Leveraging (Cash or In-Kind Resources)*	Leveraging (outside of match):	
The CoC goal for all leveraged resources 75% of the grant amount		
(above and beyond the match amount). For this section, agencies	75% or more = 9	
should have reported leveraged resources outside of the match	50-74% = 6	
resources listed above to insure no duplication.	40-49% = 3	
*New project applicants must attach agency commitments for	Less than 40% = 0	
leverage (specifically dedicated to this project).	(commitments required)	
TOTAL		
(14 points maximum)		

Match and Leveraging Comments

	TOTAL APPLICATION POINTS	(191 maximum	points	:
--	--------------------------	--------------	--------	---

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 11 of 13

Bonus Points	Possible Points	Score
Veteran Prioritization - Bonus points	Yes = 5	
available to project applications that		
exclusively dedicate beds for Veterans.	No = 0	
(5 possible points)		
	** Application**	
Youth Prioritization - Bonus points	Yes = 5	
available to project applications that		
exclusively dedicate beds for youth-	No = 0	
headed households (aged 18-24 yrs.	** * ! **	
old).	** Application**	
(5 possible points)		
Leveraging Housing Resources: PSH or		
RRH project will utilize housing subsidies	Applicant demonstrates partnerships	
or subsidized housing units not funded	exist at or above 25% = 7	
through ESG or CoC.		
	Applicant demonstrates partnerships	
For PSH at least 25% of the units	exist, but 25% not demonstrated = 3	
included in project are subsidized by	No partnerships exist = 0	
Non-CoC, Non-ESG source.	No partnerships exist = 0	
For RRH at least 25% of program	(commitments required)	
participants are served by Non-CoC,	(communicities required)	
Non-ESG source.		
(5 51)		
(Question 2b)		
(7 possible bonus points)		
*New project applicants must attach commitments for leverage (specifically		
dedicated to this project).		
Leveraging Healthcare Resources: PSH	Applicant demonstrates partnerships	
or RRH project that will utilize	exist at or above 25% = 7	
healthcare resources to help		
participants. Value of Healthcare	Applicant demonstrates partnerships	
services provided is equal to at least	exist, but 25% not demonstrated = 3	
25% of proposed funding requested.		
(Question 2c)	No partnerships exist = 0	
(7 possible bonus points)	(commitments required)	
*New project applicants must attach		
commitments for leverage (specifically		
dedicated to this project).	V 10	
Point in Time Coordinator – Bonus	Yes = 10	
points available to project applications	No = 0	
submitted by an agency that served as a homeless count coordinator for the	NO = U	
Annual Point in Time Count conducted		
in January 2024.		
misandary 2027.		

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 12 of 13

Coordinated Entry Implementation –	Yes = 20	
Project proposed is critical and proposed by applicant currently managing the	No = 0	
assessment, prioritization, and referral	140 - 0	
process for a Coordinated Entry		
implementation area.		
(20 possible bonus points)		
то	OTAL POSSIBLE BONUS POINTS (50 maximur	n points):
то	TAL APPLICATION POINTS (191 maxii	mum)
		+
	TOTAL BONUS POINTS (54 maxim	ium)
		=
		_
	TOTAL POINTS (245) maximum)	
Overall Com	ments, Concerns or Recommendations	

Approved August 28, 2024 Page 13 of 13