

2006 CoC Exhibit 1 Application Debriefing Information

Part I: CoC Organizational Structure (Maximum Score of 8 Points)

Part I score includes 2006 Exhibit 1 Application pages 1-5.

A. Lead Organization Chart

- All organizational information must have been completely filled out.

B. Geography Chart

- Geographic Area Name(s) and 6-digit Code(s) within a CoC must have been included.
- Failure to list an individual name and code resulted in a reduced Pro Rata Need amount.

C. Groups and Meetings Chart

- One CoC Primary Decision-Making Group and the Other CoC Committees, Sub-committees, Workgroups, etc. must have been listed, including the Role and Meeting Frequency of each planning group.
- The chart also requested the Number of Organizations involved in each of these groups. This number gives HUD an indication of the size of your groups as related to the size of your CoC.

D. Planning Process Organizations Chart

- A broad and inclusive list of Public Sector Organizations and Private Sector Organizations must have been actively participating in the CoC planning process.
- If applicable, one or two subpopulation(s), whose interests the organization is specifically focused on, should be actively participating in the CoC planning process and correctly identified on this chart.
- An organization was not credited with representing a subpopulation if it identified "general" or "all" as the subpopulation.
- Insufficient information on this chart resulted in less credit.

E. Governing Process Chart

- This chart was reviewed for informational purposes only.

F. Project Review and Selection Chart

- All applicable boxes must have been checked to indicate procedures that were used in project solicitation, project performance, and the CoC decision-making process.

G. Written Complaints Chart

- CoCs must have indicated whether any written complaints had been received within the 12 months prior to the application deadline. If "Yes", adequate description of the complaint(s), and how each was resolved, must have been included.
- CoCs need to remember, complainants usually send copies of complaints to HUD, as well as to the CoC.

Part II: CoC Housing and Service Needs (Maximum Score of 12 Points)

Part II score includes 2006 Exhibit 1 Application pages 6-15.

H. Services Inventory Chart

- All service provider organization names within a CoC should have been included in this chart. The appropriate column(s) corresponding to the service(s) provided by each organization must have been checked. HUD looked for a wide variety of prevention, outreach, and supportive services available within a CoC.

I. Housing Inventory Charts

- Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, and Permanent Housing charts should have correctly listed all beds in the CoC's Current Inventory, New Inventory in Place in 2005, Inventory Under Development in 2006 and Unmet Need. All homeless beds and calculations should have been correct.
- Every CoC should have had something in Current Inventory but not all CoCs would have had New Inventory or Under Development Inventory. Neither the type of beds (family or individual) nor the actual number of beds were scored.
- Unmet need rows should have included a numeric value in subcategories (at least: units, family beds, and individual beds) for relevant unmet need columns.
- The six totals, at the bottom of the chart, must have been completed accurately.

J. Housing Inventory Sources and Methods

- A CoC must have checked all applicable box(es) and provided all information as requested.

K. Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

- Part 1 and Part 2 of the chart must have been completed using statistically reliable, unduplicated counts or estimates of homeless persons sheltered and unsheltered at a one-day point in time.
- All calculations must have been correct.
- Part 3 was reviewed for informational purposes only.

L. Population and Subpopulations Data Sources and Methods

- A CoC must have checked all applicable box(es) and provided all information as requested.

M. HMIS

- This chart should have been completed in conjunction with the lead agency responsible for the CoC's HMIS.
- A CoC must have checked all applicable box(es) and provided all information as requested.

Part III: Strategic Planning (Maximum Score of 10 Points)

Part III score includes 2006 Exhibit 1 Application pages 16-22.

N. 10-year Plan, Objectives, Action Steps Chart

- Objectives: Chart N identifies the national objective standards for clients remaining in permanent housing (71%), for clients moving into permanent housing (61%), and for clients who became employed (11% increase above the percentage of those employed at entry. e.g., If 10% were employed at entry, then an increase of 11% would have been 21% employed at exit).
- Local Actions Steps should have been directly linked to each objective. Credit was reduced if action steps were poorly linked, too general, not specific, or not clearly stated.
- All action steps should have been achievable within a 12-month period.
- Measurable Achievements must have had numeric values, (e.g., 100 beds, 24% employed, and 12 new agencies in HMIS). As applicable, numeric values should have shown realistic increases between 12 months, 5 years, and 10 years.
- CoCs meeting or exceeding the national objectives should continue to strive for realistic improvement and set incrementally higher goals over the next 12 months, 5 years, and 10 years.
- A single Lead Person should have been identified as accountable for accomplishing each objective/action step.
- Other CoC Objectives are an important element in local strategic planning, and are encouraged by HUD, but these objectives were reviewed for informational purposes only.

O. Discharge Planning Policy Chart

- A CoC should have completed this chart for each category of publicly funded institutions or systems of care within the CoC. Specifically, CoCs should have identified the level of development of discharge planning protocols, policies, plans, or processes.
- If “Yes” was answered on the chart for “Formal Protocol Implemented”, higher credit was given than if “Yes” was marked for “Formal Protocol Finalized” etc.
- Protocol Implemented (narrative required) should have described a protocol that is in place, agreed to and is being executed by the institution(s) and the CoC providers.
- Protocol Finalized (narrative required) should have described a protocol that has been agreed upon but not yet implemented or activated at the time of application submission.
- Credit was lowered if a weak, unacceptable, vague, or unclear narrative was given. An unacceptable protocol was one that is missing, or one that includes discharging clients into a McKinney-Vento funded CoC project(s), or it was unclear if such discharges were part of the protocol.
- Protocol Development: A “Yes” in this category indicated that the protocol is being developed. It was not finalized or implemented. No narrative was required.
- Initial Discussion: A “Yes” in this category indicated there had been no discussion to initiate the development of a protocol. No narrative was required.

P. Coordination Chart

- The CoC Coordination Chart was designed to evaluate the basics of CoC coordination with diverse stakeholders. CoCs demonstrating coordination with multiple funding sources and, as applicable, coordination with multiple existing strategic planning groups, received more credit.

Q. Project Priorities Chart

- This chart included eight major categories of CoC Name/Number, Applicants, Project Sponsors, Project Names, Priority Numbers, Project Amounts, Project Terms, Component Types and S+C Renewals. Errors found in any of these categories may have resulted in reduced credit. Common mistakes included: no CoC name or number, an “X” in component type instead of the correct code for the component, mislabeling SHP-TH as TRA, or S+C renewals listed in the wrong section.

R. Pro Rata Need Reallocation Chart

- CoCs utilizing Pro Rata Need Reallocation must have accurately completed this chart.
- The CoC’s 1-year renewal amount identified in question #2 must have equaled the amount confirmed with your local HUD field office.
- An explanation of the open decision-making process the CoC used to reduce and/or eliminate projects must have been included.

S. Project Leveraging

- Project Leveraging included cash and non-cash resources for which CoCs had written commitment(s) at the time of application submission.
- This was a computer-generated score based on the ratio of leveraged funds to the Total CoC Requested Amount in Chart Q.
- The leveraging score was based on a sliding scale. The higher the leveraging percentage, the higher the credit. If a CoC’s leveraging percentage was 200% or more of the Total CoC Requested Amount, then full credit was given. If a CoCs leveraging percentage was 100%, then half credit was given, etc.

T. Renewal Projection Chart

- HUD encourages CoCs to accurately project renewals into the future in order to facilitate better strategic planning at the local, state, and national levels.
- This chart must have been filled out with funding amounts with all future renewal project projections.
- This chart should have included information regarding renewal projections for all applicable years.

Part IV: Performance (Maximum Score of 18 Points; Includes 2 Points for Removal of Regulatory Barriers)

Part IV score includes 2006 Exhibit 1 Application pages 23-27.

U. Achievements

- CoCs should have clearly stated past goals for chronic homelessness and other specific homelessness goals. Action steps should have been distinctly related to the goals listed. There should have been measurable numeric achievements identified within the past 12 months.

V. Chronic Homeless (CH) Progress Chart

- **Column 1 and Question 5** indicated any changes in chronic homelessness. The 2006 chronically homeless number should have matched the chronically homeless number in Chart K, Part 2: Homeless Subpopulations. CoCs that showed a reduction in the chronically homeless between 2005 and 2006 received additional credit. The reason(s) for any changes in the total number of the chronically homeless between 2005 and 2006 must have been stated.
- **Columns 2, 3, and 4** indicated changes in the number of permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless. An increase in new permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless would have resulted in additional credit.

W. Housing Performance Chart

- Chart W assessed Annual Progress Report (APR) housing data for clients remaining in permanent housing and clients moving into permanent housing.
- The sliding scale used for scoring compared the CoC's percentages with the **national objective standards**. HUD used the national objective standards for clients remaining in permanent housing (71%) and for clients moving into permanent housing (61%), as identified in Chart N. The higher the percentage, the higher the credit.

X. Mainstream Programs and Employment Performance Chart

- Chart X assessed Annual Progress Report (APR) data for clients who gained access to mainstream services and who gained employment.
- The mainstream programs in Chart X identified the income secured for program participants at exit. Credit was given based on a sliding scale depending on how a CoC's percentages compared to the **national averages**. With the exception of (n.) No Financial Resources, the higher the percentage, the higher the credit.

Categories	Averages
a. SSI	11.4%
b. SSDI	4.4%
c. Social Security	1.7%
d. General Public Assistance	6.2%
e. TANF	7.7%
f. SCHIP	1.1%
g. Veterans Benefits	1.4%

Categories	Averages
h. Employment Benefits	20.9%
i. Unemployment Benefits	1.1%
j. Veterans Health Care	1.1%
k. Medicaid	13.3%
l. Food Stamps	20.2%
m. Other (please specify)	4.2%
n. No Financial Resources	30.5%

Y. Mainstream Programs Chart

- This chart identified activities implemented by the CoC for improving client access to mainstream programs. The variety of ways that homeless persons are able to access mainstream programs within the CoC increased a CoC's credit in this area.
- It is expected that as a CoC successfully follows through with most or all of these tasks, an increase in the percentages in Chart X will be evidenced.

Z. Unexecuted Grants

- CoCs with grants awarded prior to the 2005 competition (2004 and before), that remained unexecuted as of the 2006 competition submission deadline, received less credit.

AA. Energy Star Chart

- A CoC must have indicated if projects were informed about the Energy Star initiative and the percentage of projects using Energy Star appliances.

AB. Section 3 Employment Policy Chart

- Regulations require HUD to highlight the importance of employing low income persons. According to the instructions, the appropriate boxes must have been checked.
- CoCs requesting nothing or under \$200,000 for rehabilitation or new construction received full credit since Section 3 was not applicable.

AC. Removal of Regulatory Barriers (Maximum Score 2 Points)

- CoCs must have submitted questionnaire form HUD 23700.
- Either Part A or Part B should have been submitted, not both. Part A was for cities or counties that have regulatory authority. Part B was for state agencies, small towns, or other incorporated areas with no regulatory authority.
- Communities that addressed more elements of HUD's initiative on removal of regulatory barriers would have received more credit than communities that addressed fewer elements.

Part V: Housing Emphasis (Maximum Score of 12 Points)

- This was a computer-generated score that compares the ratio of housing dollars to services dollars. Housing dollars (i.e., acquisition, new construction, rehabilitation, rental assistance, leasing, and operations) were compared to service dollars for all projects on the priority chart that received 40 points for need.
- SSO projects counted completely as service activities even when leasing funds for office space were requested.
- Scoring was based on a sliding scale. The higher the housing percentage, the higher the credit. General score breakdowns were as follows:
 - If a CoC's housing percentage was over 85%, then full credit was given.
 - If a CoC's housing percentage was 50%, then half credit was given.
 - If a CoC's housing percentage was 16% or lower, then no credit was given.
- Score improvement can only be achieved through an increase in the percentage of funds requested for housing activities and a decrease in the percentage of funds requested for service activities.
- HMIS and Administration dollars were excluded from this calculation.
- Beginning with the 2006 competition, all funds requested for Shelter Plus Care renewals were included as housing activity dollars.
- The national average for housing activities (versus services activities) in the 2006 competition was approximately 60%.