Point Scale: 150 total points	neviewen		-	
Project Name:	Max points	Points Notes		portfolio
Component Type	16		Score weight	10% Data source chart
PH w/ leasing or RA that serves exclusively chronic	16			
PH w/ leasing or RA that serves chronic and non chronic	14			
PH w/ no leasing or RA	10			
TH or SH	3			
sso	1			
		AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER		
	Component Type Score	0		
I. HUD's Strategic Objectives (From APR, Questions 27, 29a1, 29a2, 25a1,a2, 26a1)) * if no leavers, look at stayers	30		Score weight	20% Data source APR data
1. Housing Goal - Maximum 20 points	80% or above	20		
For PH - 80% of participants who remain in PH for at least 6 months	between 70% and 79%	15		
(From Question 27, 29a1, 29a2)	between 60% and 69%	10		
	between 50% and 59%	5		
	between 40% and 49%	2		
	39% or below	0		
	65% or above	20		
For TH - 65% of participants exiting TH placed in PH	between 55% and 64%	15		
(From Question 27, 29a1, 29a2)	between 45% and 54%	10		
	between 30% and 44%	5		
	29% or below	0		
	56% or above	20		
For SSO - 56% of participants exiting SSO placed in PH	between 45% and 55%	15		
(From Question 27, 29a1, 29a2)	between 35% and 44%	10		
	between 30% and 34%	5		
	29% or below	0		
	Housing Goal Score	0		
	20% or above	5		
2. Employment Goal - Maximum 5 points	between 15% and 19%	3		
20% of participants exiting the program should have employment	between 10% and 14%	1		
(From Question 25a1,a2 Q36 as check)	9% or below	0,		
	Employment Goal Score	<u> </u>		
	20% or above	5		
3. Mainstream Benefits - Maximum 5 points	between 15% and 19%	3		
20% of participants exiting the program should have obtained MSB	between 10% and 14%	1		
(From Question a1)	9% or below	0		
	MS Benefits Goal Score	<u> </u>		
	Total HUD Strategic Objective	<u>ves Score</u> 0		

Reviewer:

Score

0

2015 Boston CoC Score Sheet / Renewal Applications

II. Consistency with HUD's Homeless Policies and Program Priorities Score maximum points for each yes answer	30		Score weight	20% data source applic	cation
Strategic Resource Allocation - Does the project address the goals articulated in the					
Federal Strategic Plan / Opening Doors re: maximizing use of mainstream resources in the	(maximize use of mainstream resources, as				
program?	6 evidenced by match / leverage)				
Does or will the project utilize the Housing First or a low barrier to entry model?	12				
3. Is the project a Rapid Re-housing model?	4				
4. Does / will the provider participate in a Coordinated Access System?	6				
5. Does the project exceed the required 25% cash match?	2				
3. Does the project exceed the required 25% cash match:	2				
	Total Consistency Score	0			
				proje	
III. Priority Populations & Chronic 1. Does the project prioritize those households most in need as defined by HUD & the CoC?	20 (dedicated to population 3 pts, accepts		Score weight	13% data source appli	catio
Does the project work to:	population 2 pt, not serving 0)				
Reduce the number of vulnerable individuals on the street	3				
	3				
House extended shelter stayers (LOS > 30 days, < 365)	3				
House homeless veterans House victims of DV	2				
	2				
House youth	2				
House families	_				
2. December assistation of the observation of the observations of	5 pts if exclusive, 3 points if serve any, 0 5 points for none				
2. Does the project currently serve the chronically homeless?	5 points for none				
	Total Prioritization Score	0			
		(refer to renewal			
3. Chronic Homelessness Prioritization	10	application)	Score weight	7%	
% of beds available to the CH at turnover	10 100% available to CH				
% of beds in 2013 application	5 Increased percentage from prior level				
% of beds in 2014 application	3 No increase in % dedicated to CH				
	0 No CH beds				
	Total Chronic Score	0			
				roll u lever	
W Leverage	10		Score weight	7% data source char	_
iV. Leverage Percentage of project application amount toward leveraging	0 Less than 100%		Score weight	770 GOLD SOUTCE CHAIL	•
resentable of higher application misorit commit interesting	2 100%				
	4 125%				
	8 150%				
	10 above 150%				
	Total Leveraging Score	ol			
	Total Leveraging Score				

project

ranking 7% data source folder-HMIS Score weight

project 10 V. HMIS 7 Data Quality Score refer to charts provided by HMIS staff 1. Data Quality 3 90% - 100% or 101% - 115% utilization There are 13 data elements. For each data element, where there is missing 2 data of 10% or higher, 0.54 will be deducted from the total score. 3 80% - 89% or 116% - 120% utilization 70% - 79% or 121% - 150% utilization 1 2. Bed Utilization Rate 0 Bed utilization rate will be calculated based on the PIT capacity (from 0 - 69% or 150%+ utilization 0 **Bed Utilization Score** question 5 on the project application) and the PIT count of persons/households served (from questions 8 and 9 from the APR) Total HMIS Score recapture 13% data source tracking 20 Score weight VI. Financial Management and Performance 10 3 year average less than 3% 10 utilize spendsheet to calculate this information 8 3 year average less than 5% 7 1. Unexpended Balances (based on a 3 year average excluding year 1) 3 year average less than 8% 3 year average less than 10% 6 (For recent projects, average unexpended balances may be calculated on 4 3 year average less than 12% one or two years and may include spending projections for the current 3 year average less than 15% 2 year based on spending to date) 0 3 year average over 15 % Unexpended balance score 0 Payments are always on time, complete 4 2. Payment Request are submitted 4 and without errors Payments are usually on time, are mostly complete with few errors 3 Payments are seldom on time, incomplete 1 and contain errors Payments are never on time, incomplete and contain many errors 0 0 Payment Request Score audit 2 data source tracking 3. Audits are submitted on time and findings are resolved satisfactorily 2 yes 0 no 0 **Audit Score** 4. During most recent monitoring visit were there any concerns or findings pertaining to data source DO 4 in compliance 4 participant eligibility? 2 concern noted 0 finding noted 0 **Monitoring Score**

VII. CoC Participation

(full 4 pts for participation in 4 or more, 3 pts for 3, 2 pts for 2, 1 pt for 1, 0 pts for 4 none)

Total Financial Management Score

CoC participation 3% data source chart

Score weight

Does the agency participate in the following CoC activities: 2015 PIT Count including the youth count

Attended Con Plan meetings
Attende Coc Membership Meetings or Leadership Council Meetings
Participated in the 25 Cities Initiative / Vets Initiatives
Participated in Coc Subcommittee, workgroup or task force,
Action plan working group, safety net, eviction prevention

CoC Participation Score	nanually enter score
Total Score	0

Collected for informational purposes:

length of stay (from APR Q 27 length of participation)

Cost per client (taken from City section of renewal application):

Cost Per Household	İ		Column1 Co	lumn2	Column3 Column4 C	olumn5 Column6 Column7 Column8
CoC Costs	<u> </u>	(only McKinney Funded Sou	rces)			
Number of Househ	olds Served		Services Cost	Per Household	Rental Assistance/Lea F	rogram Total Cost Per Household
Example: 25			\$2,654.00		\$15,061.00	20,609
						7
					Sub-Total	\$0
·.			The state of the s		and the same of th	
		11				
Other Program Sou	rces					
		<u> </u>				Service Constitution
Number of Households Served Services Cost Per Household		Per Household	Rental Assistance/Lea Program Total Cost Per Household			
Example: 25			\$2,654.00		\$15,061.00	20,609
		2 3 3 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5			Sub-Total	\$0
· · ·		7.24				
Total Costs		(All Funded Sources)				
Number of Households Served Services Cost Per Household		Per Household	Rental Assistance/Lea Program Total Cost Per Household			
Example: 25			\$5,308.00		\$30,122.00	41,218
		185 (A. 7) 185 Abrilland	\$0.00		\$6.00	\$0
					Total	\$0