

Approved By: OAEH Executive Board
Effective Date: August 13th, 2025
Prepared By: OAEH Rank & Review Committee

- Policy:** This policy is adopted under the authority of the local Continuum of Care (CoC) for Springfield/Greene, Christian, and Webster Counties, commonly referred to as the Ozarks Alliance to End Homelessness (OAEH).
- Purpose:** Design, operate, and follow a collaborative and public process for the solicitation, development, and approval of CoC Program applications for submission in response to the CoC Program NOFO (Notice of Funding Opportunity) published by the U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
- Standard:** The OAEH is responsible for promoting the community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness through strategic planning, system change, program development, and performance-based prioritization of funds.
- Scope:** Homeless Provider Agencies, Community Stakeholders, Recipient(s) and Subrecipient(s) of CoC Program funds, the HMIS Lead, and the CoC Collaborative Applicant.
- Authority For Code:** Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act CoC Program regulatory statutes 24 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 578.9, 578.11, 578.13, 578.15, 578.17, 578.19, 578.21 and other such parts as applicable.

Responsibilities:

1. HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES NETWORK (OAEH) – THE COC

As outlined in the CoC Governance Charter, the OAEH is to provide a coordinated and comprehensive community planning process to implement a Continuum of Care (CoC) for individuals and families who are at-risk or experiencing homelessness and to prevent returns to homelessness.

A role administered by the OAEH is preparation of the CoC Program grant application on behalf of MO-600 CoC Springfield/Greene, Christian, Webster Counties, Missouri. This policy outlines the process and criteria in ranking and rating renewal and new project applications requesting funds under the CoC Program 24 CFR Part 578.

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

2. PREPARING THE COC PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATION

OAEH (the CoC)

The OAEH is charged with designing, operating, and following a collaborative process for the development of applications, and approving the submission of applications in response to a NOFO published by HUD under part 578.19.

OAEH will establish priorities for funding projects in the geographic area of MO-600 CoC.

On behalf of the City of Springfield, the CoC Collaborative Applicant will collect, combine, and submit the required application information from all applicants and for all projects within the CoC's geographic area that the CoC has selected for funding. The CoC Collaborative Applicant will also apply for CoC Planning funds.

To be eligible, all agencies applying for CoC funding need to have an active SAM registration, UEI, and no current debarments and/or suspensions.

3. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AND RECORDKEEPING

CoC Collaborative Applicant

The CoC Collaborative Applicant will prepare and publish a Request for Letters of Intent (LOI) to Submit; LOI Request will include timeline for required trainings (as needed), due date of applications, date of ranking/rating, and scoring criteria for projects. The LOI Request will be a public announcement using email and posted on the CoC Collaborative Applicant website.

The CoC Collaborative Applicant will convene the CoC Executive Board-designated NOFO Committee to complete the rating and ranking of all applications submitted and approve the final Project Priority List in the CoC Consolidated Application. The NOFO Committee will review all new and renewal applications to validate the summary of scores prior to developing the Project Priority List. The CoC Collaborative Applicant will follow all HUD guidelines for public posting and notification.

Records supporting the grant application process will be retained for five (5) years following the HUD grant award announcement and will include the actual project application, the Project Rating Tool results, a summary of all project application scores, ranking/rating results, and letters or other communication regarding acceptance or rejection of project applications.

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

4. CODE OF CONDUCT AND RECUSAL PROCESS

The implementation of a Code of Conduct for the OAEH, inclusive of the Chair, Co-Chair, Workgroup, and associated Subcommittees, is an essential element that supports the inclusive, collaborative, and objective goals of the OAEH. *[CoC Program 24 CFR 578.95]* See Appendix A for OAEH Code of Conduct, as referenced in the OAEH Governance Charter.

5. RENEWAL/EXPANSION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

OAEH NOFO Committee

The Committee is responsible for:

- a) Review Annual Performance Report (APR) outcomes for all CoC Program projects.
- b) Establish priorities for funding projects in alignment with the OAEH review of latest PIT/HIC reporting on homeless demographics and housing gaps analysis. The CoC will determine priority of projects per application year.
- c) Review projects with non-compliance and/or outstanding on-site monitoring issues and consider reallocation of project funds in accordance with OAEH Reallocation Policy.
- d) Review renewal project applications to ensure threshold requirements have been met. The CoC Collaborative Applicant will provide data and reporting to complete the Renewal/Expansion Project Rating Tool.
- e) Review expansion project applications that seek to expand existing projects to ensure threshold requirements have been met.
- f) Project applications meeting threshold requirements will be rated on performance criteria that establish benchmark outcomes to drive system-level performance outcomes. The scoring points are full points for meeting threshold review and/or achieving the performance measurement outcome, with partial or zero points for some measurements where the project may not have the ability to fully drive the outcome.
- g) Rank projects in order of priority for funding, with the highest priority project being #1 and the lowest priority project for funding being the last number in the CoC Program Project Priority List.
- h) Approve the final project applications for submittal in the CoC Consolidated Plan.
- i) Authorize the CoC Collaborative Applicant to notify in writing Applicants/Subrecipient Agencies on decision to “accept” or “reject” project applications.

For template of the scoring tool, see Appendix B, Renewal/Expansion Project Rating Tool.

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

6. FIRST YEAR RENEWAL RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

OAEH NOFO Committee

The Committee is responsible for:

- a) Reviewing all First Year Renewal Programs, to be placed in Tier 1 if benchmarks are reached as noted in the First Year Renewal Project Rating Tool.
- b) Establish priorities for funding projects in alignment with the OAEH review of latest PIT/HIC reporting on homeless demographics and housing gaps analysis. The CoC will determine priority of projects per application year.
- c) Review renewal project applications to ensure threshold requirements have been met. The CoC Collaborative Applicant will provide data and reporting to complete the First Year Renewal Project Rating Tool.
- d) Project applications meeting threshold requirements will be rated on performance criteria that establish benchmark outcomes to drive system-level performance outcomes.
- e) Rank projects in order of priority for funding, with the highest priority project being #1 and the lowest priority project for funding being the last number in the CoC Program Project Priority List.
- f) Approve the final project applications for submittal in the CoC Consolidated Plan.
- g) Authorize the CoC Collaborative Applicant to notify in writing Applicants/Subrecipient Agencies on decision to “accept” or “reject” project applications.

For template of the scoring tool, see Appendix C, First Year Renewal Project Rating Tool.

7. NEW PROJECT RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

OAEH NOFO Committee

- a) Review new project applications to ensure threshold requirements have been met. The CoC will determine priority of projects per application year.
- b) Score capacity of Applicant/Subrecipient Agency to carry-out the proposed HUD- project, using approved new project scoring tool.
- c) Rank projects in order of priority for funding, with the highest priority project being #1 and the lowest priority project for funding being the last number in the CoC Program Project Priority List.
- d) Approve the final project applications for submittal in the CoC Consolidated Plan.
- e) Authorize the CoC Collaborative Applicant to notify in writing Applicants/Subrecipient Agencies on decision to “accept” or “reject” project applications.

For template of the scoring tool, see Appendix D, New Project Rating Tool

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

8. REALLOCATION PROCESS

OAEH NOFO Committee

Reallocation, as outlined in the OAEH Reallocation Policy, is the process the CoC uses to shift funds to create one or more new projects or expand existing projects within the annual renewal demand (ARD) for CoC Program funds. Providers are encouraged to apply for new projects through reallocation of existing project funds.

The CoC will determine priority of projects per application year. During the comprehensive review of renewal projects, the NOFO Committee will use the scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and addresses priorities based on System Performance Measurement (SPM) outcomes, housing gaps analysis, and homeless demographic data collected during Point-in-Time and from CoC-validated community data. The NOFO Committee may recommend reallocation of funds to the CoC Collaborative Applicant when reallocations would reduce homelessness, address an underserved homeless population, or in the event of low-performing projects.

See Appendix E, OAEH Reallocation Policy.

9. PROJECT RANKING PROCESS AND PROJECT PRIORITY LISTING

OAEH NOFO Committee

The NOFO Committee is responsible for:

- a) Review proposed project scores.
- b) Rank projects in order of priority for funding, with the highest priority project being #1 and the lowest priority project for funding being the last number in the CoC Program Project Priority List.
- c) Approve the final project applications for submittal in the CoC Consolidated Application.
- d) Authorize the CoC Collaborative Applicant to notify in writing each agency of Final Project Application Acceptance, Reductions, Rejections, and Rankings, with accepted applications invited to submit in e-snaps.
- e) Publish rankings as dictated by HUD CoC NOFO timeline and requirements.
- f) Present Consolidated Application for CoC Approval at OAEH Executive Board Meeting.

Supportive Services Projects – Per published CoC priorities, the CoC prioritizes beds; therefore, all new Supportive Service Only (SSO) projects, including Coordinated Entry and HMIS, are to be ranked in Tier 2, unless determined to be a CoC priority approved by the OAEH Executive Board.

Street Outreach Projects – Per published CoC priorities, the CoC prioritizes beds; therefore, all new Street Outreach (SO) projects are to be ranked in Tier 2, unless determined to be a CoC priority approved by the OAEH Executive Board.

Safe Haven Projects – New Safe Haven (SH) projects are not currently eligible for HUD CoC funding. In the event they become eligible, SH projects are to be ranked in Tier 2.

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

10. APPEAL PROCESS

The project sponsor agency (recipient/subrecipient) may bring forward concerns to the OAEH NOFO Committee regarding the written decision for selection. Concerns will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by OAEH NOFO Committee.

- a) The project sponsor agency will submit to the OAEH NOFO Committee a written appeal within five business days of the ranking decision notification. The appeal will include supporting information as to why the ranking decision should be reconsidered.
- b) The OAEH NOFO Committee will reconvene to receive and review the appeal statement.
- c) The project sponsor agency will attend the meeting to answer questions the OAEH NOFO Committee may have in reviewing the appeal.
- d) The OAEH NOFO Committee will make a decision, which will be sent to the applicant in writing. Further appeals, if needed following the decision of the OAEH NOFO Committee, should be made to the CoC Lead Applicant. Following resolution, the CoC Collaborative Applicant will proceed with filing the CoC Program application in accordance with this policy and the determination of the OAEH NOFO Committee and/or CoC Lead Applicant.

11. GRANT AWARD

CoC Collaborative Applicant Notification

Upon HUD award announcement, the CoC Collaborative Applicant will notify selected applicants of the pending award. HUD will issue grant agreements in accordance with 24 CFR part 578.23.

Project Implementation

Technical assistance for project implementation will be provided by HUD.

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: OAEH Code of Conduct and Recusal
- Appendix B: Renewal/Expansion Project Rating Tool
- Appendix E: First Year Renewal Rating Tool
- Appendix D: New Project Rating Tool
- Appendix E: OAEH Reallocation Policy

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

APPENDIX A

OAEH Code of Conduct and Recusal

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 benefits to the organization that the member represents. Therefore, any individual participating in or influencing decision-making must identify actual or perceived conflicts of interest as they arise and comply with the spirit of this policy. Individuals with a conflict of interest should abstain from discussion and abstain from voting on any issue in which they have a conflict. An individual with a conflict of interest, who is also the committee chair, shall yield that position during discussion and abstain from voting on the item.

Written conflict of interest disclosure statements will be provided by each member annually or upon membership approval. This form must be updated on a yearly basis, and members will not be able to vote until the statement is on file. All voting members shall have the right to recuse themselves from voting on a matter without providing an excuse.

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

APPENDIX B

RENEWAL/EXPANSION PROJECT RATING TOOL

Performance-based project rating and ranking in support of the CoC System Performance Outcomes

CoC Ranking Date:
Performance Period:

Of Participants (Q5a):
Of Households (Q8a):

Project Name: _____

Project Type: _____

Project Type = TH for Transitional Housing; SH for Safe Haven; RRH for Rapid Rehousing; and PSH for Permanent Supportive Housing

Applicant Name: _____

Subrecipient Agency Name: _____

CoC Program Funding Request: _____

Total Project Score (52 points): _____

Previous CoC Awarded Amount: _____

APPLICATION NARRATIVE RATING		15 POINTS
A.	Project participates in the CoC HMIS and CES, compliant with CoC Policies and Procedures and HUD Coordinated Entry Notice (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
B.	Project agency attended 75% or more of quarterly OAEH General Membership meetings during the last calendar year (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
C.	Project implements Housing First principles, including no preconditions or barriers to entry except as required by funding sources, and provision of necessary supports to maintain housing and prevent a return to homelessness (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
D.	Project addresses the unique needs of underserved and marginalized populations by offering relevant services to participants and ensuring program staff and other personnel are well-equipped to deliver such services. Describe initiatives and components including, but not limited to, communication/marketing, staff training, lived experience integration, and partnerships developed and implemented to further these efforts (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
E.	Project aligns with priorities identified in the CoC's OAEH <i>Strategic Plan and OAEH Strategic Action Plan</i> (1.5 points)	
F.	Project aligns with the federal priorities identified in this NOFO and <i>ALL IN: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness for 2022 to 2025</i> (1.5 points)	
Provide an executive summary of any barriers and/or challenges the project faced in the last year. (This summary required but not scored)		

APPLICANT AND SUBRECIPIENT AGENCY (IF ANY) FINANCIAL RATING		10 POINTS
G.	Applicant is effectively utilizing HUD CoC funds. Includes satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing HUD CoC grant as evidenced by CoC quarterly monitoring throughout the grant term (Yes both = 3 points (1.5 points for drawdown, 1.5 points for performance) No = 0 points)	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

H.	Acceptable HUD audit of Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) since the last NOFO cycle. Audit does not contain indications of material, performance, financial, or accounting problems Audit Not Applicable = 3 points Yes, Audit was Conducted, No Findings = 3 points Yes, Audit was Conducted, Corrective Action Plan was Submitted and/or Approved = 3 points Yes, Audit was Conducted but Corrective Action Plan was not Submitted by Deadline = 0 points	
I.	Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) has 25% match commitments that satisfy CoC Program Rule requirements for source and amount (Yes = 2 points, No = 0 points)	

PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT OUTCOMES (RENEWAL)		27 POINTS
J.	Reduce Length of Time Homeless (4 points) RRH: On average participants spend 45 days or less from Project Start to Housing Move-In date (APR Q22c) 4 points = 45 or less days 3 points = 46 – 53 days 2 points = 54 – 65 days 1 point = 66 or more days PSH: On average participants spend 80 days or less from Project Start to Housing Move-In date (APR Q22c) 4 points = 80 or less days 3 points = 81 – 90 days 2 points = 91 – 100 days 1 point = 101 or more days	
K.	Reduce Returns to Homelessness (4 points) RRH, PSH: Percent of participants return to homelessness within 24 months of exit to PH (SPM 2 – Custom ICA Report) 4 points = up to 3% 3 points = 4-5% 2 points = 6% 1 point = 7% or above	
L.	Increased Earned Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Stayers) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a1) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a1)	
M.	Increased Earned Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Leavers) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a2) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a2)	
N.	Increased Earned Income: Change in Adults Earned Income During the Reporting Period (2 points) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (HMIS Monitoring Report) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (HMIS Monitoring Report)	
O.	Increased Any Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Stayers) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a1) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a1)	
P.	Increased Any Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Leavers) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a2) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a2)	
Q.	Increased Non-Cash Benefits: Change in Adults Non-Cash Benefits During the Reporting Period (2 points) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (HMIS Monitoring Report) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (HMIS Monitoring Report)	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

R.	<p>Increase Access to Permanent Housing (4 points)</p> <p>RRH: Percent of people exit program to permanent housing (Q23c PH Dest / Q5a Leavers)</p> <p>4 points = 80% and above 3 points = 65% - 79% 2 points = 50% - 64% 1 point = 35% - 49% 0 points = 34% and below</p> <p>PSH: Percent of people retain PSH or exit to other permanent housing (Q23c PH Dest + Q5a Stayers / Q5a Total Persons Served)</p> <p>4 points = 95% and above 3 points = 80% - 94% 2 points = 65% - 79% 1 point = 50% - 64% 0 points = 49% and below</p>	
S.	<p>HMIS Data Quality: Timeliness (2 points)</p> <p>75% of data entered within 0 to 3 days of project start date (ICA Custom Report)</p>	
T.	<p>De-obligation 10% or more of HUD funds</p> <p>Recent project grant term 10% or more of total HUD funds recaptured by HUD at grant term</p> <p>10%-25% = minus 1 point 26%-50% = minus 2 points 51% or more = minus 3 points</p>	
U.	<p>Annual CoC Monitoring Score (2 point)</p> <p>No Concerns or Concerns and/or Findings resolved within 30 days of monitoring results notification</p>	
V.	<p>CES Compliance and Participation: 1.5 pts each = 3 points total</p> <p>RRH, PSH: All referrals come from Coordinated Entry System (1.5 pts)</p> <p>RRH, PSH: Program is represented at CoC Case Conferencing in accordance with OAEH CES Policies & Procedures at a rate of at least 75% per quarter (1.5 pts)</p>	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

APPENDIX C

FIRST TIME RENEWAL RATING TOOL

Performance-based project rating and ranking in support of the CoC System Performance Outcomes

CoC Ranking Date:
Performance Period:

Of Participants (Q5a):
Of Households (Q8a):

Project Name: _____

Project Type: _____

Project Type = TH for Transitional Housing; SH for Safe Haven; RRH for Rapid Rehousing; and PSH for Permanent Supportive Housing

All First-Year Renewal Projects can be placed into Tier 1 if at least 7 out of 10 benchmarks are reached in the Narrative and Financial Section. The Performance Section is not included in the benchmarks rating but is required if the project has enough implementation data at the time of scoring.

Applicant Name: _____

Subrecipient Agency Name: _____

CoC Program Funding Request: _____

Previous CoC Awarded Amount: _____

APPLICATION NARRATIVE RATING		8 Yes Possible
A.	Project participates in the CoC HMIS and CES, compliant with CoC Policies and Procedures and HUD Coordinated Entry Notice (Yes or No)	
B.	Project agency attended 75% or more of quarterly OAEH General Membership meetings during the last calendar year (Yes or No)	
C.	Project implements Housing First principles, including no preconditions or barriers to entry except as required by funding sources, and provision of necessary supports to maintain housing and prevent a return to homelessness (Yes or No)	
D.	Project addresses the unique needs of underserved and marginalized populations by offering relevant services to participants and ensuring program staff and other personnel are well-equipped to deliver such services. Describe initiatives and components including, but not limited to, communication/marketing, staff training, lived experience integration, and partnerships developed and implemented to further these efforts (Yes or No)	
E.	Project aligns with priorities identified in the CoC's OAEH <i>Strategic Plan and OAEH Strategic Action Plan</i> (Yes or No)	
F.	Project aligns with the federal priorities identified in this NOFO and <i>ALL IN: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness for 2022 to 2025</i> (Yes or No)	
G.	CES Compliance and Participation: RRH, PSH: All referrals come from Coordinated Entry System (Yes or No) RRH, PSH: Program is represented at CoC Case Conferencing in accordance with OAEH CES Policies & Procedures at a rate of at least 75% per quarter (Yes or No)	
Provide an executive summary of any barriers and/or challenges the project faced in the last year. (This summary required but not scored)		

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

Provide narrative around when contract was executed and when eLOCCS access was granted. **(This is required but not scored)**

APPLICANT AND SUBRECIPIENT AGENCY (IF ANY) FINANCIAL RATING		2 Yes Possible
H.	Applicant is effectively utilizing HUD CoC funds. Includes satisfactory drawdowns and performance for existing HUD CoC grant as evidenced by CoC quarterly monitoring throughout the grant term (Yes both = 3 points (1.5 points for drawdown, 1.5 points for performance) No = 0 points)	
I.	Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) has 25% match commitments that satisfy CoC Program Rule requirements for source and amount (Yes or No)	

PROJECT PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT OUTCOMES BASED ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS AT TIME OF SCORING		
This section is required if applicable but is not included in the 7 out of 10 benchmark scoring.		
J.	Reduce Length of Time Homeless (4 points) RRH: On average participants spend 45 days or less from Project Start to Housing Move-In date (APR Q22c) 4 points = 45 or less days 3 points = 46 – 53 days 2 points = 54 – 65 days 1 point = 66 or more days PSH: On average participants spend 80 days or less from Project Start to Housing Move-In date (APR Q22c) 4 points = 80 or less days 3 points = 81 – 90 days 2 points = 91 – 100 days 1 point = 101 or more days	
K.	Increased Earned Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Stayer) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a1) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a1)	
L.	Increased Earned Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Leaver) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a2) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (APR Q19a2)	
M.	Increased Earned Income: Change in Adults Earned Income During the Reporting Period (2 points) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (HMIS Monitoring Report) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased earned income (HMIS Monitoring Report)	
N.	Increased Any Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Stayer) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a1) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a1)	
O.	Increased Any Income: Adults Increase from Start to Latest Status/Annual Assessment (Leaver) (1 point) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a2) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (APR Q19a2)	
P.	Increased Non-Cash Benefits: Change in Adults Non-Cash Benefits During the Reporting Period (2 points) RRH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (HMIS Monitoring Report) PSH: Minimum 25% of participants with new or increased any income (HMIS Monitoring Report)	
Q.	Fund Utilization: Program Implementation on Track to Expend Funds by End of Grant Year (4 points) % expended based on pro-ration of program year progress (Yes = 2 points) (No = 0 points) Request For Funds made in first 3 months of implementation (Yes = 2 points) (No = 0 points)	
R.	Program Implementation: Total Persons Served Who Moved into Housing (4 points) New RRH, PSH Rent Subsidy Program: 30% at 2-months, 60% at 4-months, 90% at 6-months (Q8a)	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

S.	HMIS Data Quality: Timeliness per HMIS Agency Agreement (2 points) 75% of data entered within 0 to 3 days of project start date (ICA Custom Report)	
T.	HMIS Data Quality: Complete and Accurate (2 points) Null/missing below 2% on all HMIS data elements - APR 6a, 6b, 6c, 6d	

APPENDIX D

NEW PROJECT RATING TOOL

Performance-based project rating and ranking in support of the CoC System Performance Outcomes

CoC Ranking Date: _____

Of Participants: _____

Performance Period: _____

Of Households: _____

Project Name: _____

Project Type: _____

Project Type = TH for Transitional Housing; SH for Safe Haven; RRH for Rapid Rehousing; and PSH for Permanent Supportive Housing

Applicant Name: _____

Subrecipient Agency Name: _____

CoC Program Funding Request: _____

Total Project Score (50 points): _____

Total Project Score (w/Acq/Rehab/Con) (58 points): _____

APPLICATION NARRATIVE RATING		18 POINTS
A.	Project describes experience or intent to participate in the CoC HMIS and Coordinated Entry System compliant with CoC Policies and Procedures and HUD Coordinated Entry Notice (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
B.	Project agency attended 75% or more of quarterly OAEH General Membership meetings during the last calendar year (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
C.	Project describes experience with or intent to implement Housing First principles, including no preconditions or barriers to entry except as required by funding sources, and provision of necessary supports to maintain housing and prevent a return to homelessness (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
D.	Project addresses the unique needs of underserved and marginalized populations by offering relevant services to participants and ensuring program staff and other personnel are well-equipped to deliver such services. Describe initiatives and components including, but not limited to, communication/marketing, staff training, lived experience integration, and partnerships developed and implemented to further these efforts (Yes = 3 points, No = 0 points)	
E.	Project aligns with priorities identified in the CoC's OAEH <i>Strategic Plan and OAEH Strategic Action Plan</i> (1.5 points)	
F.	Project aligns with the federal priorities identified in this NOFA and <i>ALL IN: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness for 2022 to 2025</i> . (1.5 points)	
G.	Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) describes rapid implementation of the project to begin housing the first participant in 180 days or less following HUD grant award (Yes=2 points, No=0 points)	
H.	Describe the financial capacity to support project's long-term sustainability (1 point)	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

APPLICANT AND SUBRECIPIENT AGENCY (IF ANY) ACQ. /REHAB. /NEW CONS. (IF APPLICABLE)		8 POINTS
I.	Describe Applicant and Subrecipient's (if any) detailed construction schedule and project's complete budget containing the project milestones, activities, other funding sources, and deliverables. (2 points)	
J.	Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) indicates site control measures that have been taken regarding the property that will become the site. (2 points)	
K.	Are all current zoning and property ownership requirements met for the proposed project? Yes, includes a location map with appropriate zoning for project and proof of ownership (2 points) No, but has described what steps will be taken to ensure compliance with zoning requirements and property ownership (1 point) No, Applicant has not provided information on zoning compliance or property ownership (0 points)	
L.	Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) have indicated the total number of units that will be added to the local Continuum of Care system upon the completion of the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction. (2 points)	
APPLICANT AND SUBRECIPIENT AGENCY (IF ANY) FINANCIAL RATING		9 POINTS
M.	Describe Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) experience in effectively utilizing federal funds in accordance with 2 CFR 200, to include HUD grants and other funding (2 points)	
N.	Acceptable HUD audit of Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) since the last NOFO cycle. Audit does not contain indications of material, performance, financial, or accounting problems Audit Not Applicable = 2 points Yes, Audit was Conducted, No Findings = 2 points Yes, Audit was Conducted, Corrective Action Plan was Submitted and/or Approved = 2 points Yes, Audit was Conducted but Corrective Action Plan was not Submitted by Deadline = 0 points	
O.	Applicant or Subrecipient (if any) provides 25% match commitment that satisfies CoC Program Rule 24 CFR Part 578.73 requirement that includes source and amount (2 points)	
P.	Budget costs are reasonable and allowable. Project is cost-effective when projected cost per person served is compared to CoC average within project type (2 points) CALCULATION METHODOLOGY: Total project cost (HUD \$ Request+25% match) divided by target number of participants.	
Q.	Project is dedicated to serve 100% special needs population under NOFO bonus project requirements (1 point)	

PROJECT DESIGN OF HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES		23 POINTS
R.	Severity of Needs (0-2 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) demonstrate how the project will assist underserved populations to include persons with a history of victimization such as domestic violence, sexual assault; criminal histories; substance use disorders; mental health; or chronic homelessness	
S.	Housing Emphasis (0-2 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) prioritize 75% or more of Federal CoC Program funds to provide housing activities, e.g., rent assistance, leasing units, acquisition, rehabilitation, and/or construction of affordable housing units. For TH: Application and Subrecipient (if any) demonstrate dedicated beds/units, whether in partnership w/signed letter of support or already secured (requires documentation of secured already beds/units).	
T.	Reduce Length of Time Homeless (0-4 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) describe how the project will house homeless populations to demonstrate a reduction in the length of time people experience homelessness	
U.	Successful Permanent Housing Placement and Reduced Returns to Homelessness (0-4 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) describe the housing barriers experienced by the target population and	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

	demonstrates how the project will increase permanent housing placement and retention in housing	
V.	Increased Employment Income (0-3 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) describe how the project will demonstrate assisting the population to increase employment income	
W.	Increased Mainstream Benefits (0-3 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) describe how the project will demonstrate assisting the population to access mainstream benefits, including but not limited to SSI/SSDI, SNAP, Medicaid/Medicare	
X.	Increase access to healthcare through coordination with healthcare organizations (0-2 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) identify partnerships with healthcare organizations to assist participant access to benefits and services	
Y.	Serves currently underserved populations (0-3 points) Applicant and Subrecipient (if any) describe how they will use project to address and serve populations currently underserved by local programming as identified through consultation with the local CoC.	

Bonus Points		5 POINTS
Z.	Meets Continuum of Care Priorities (0-5 points) Project addresses community need through established Continuum of Care population and/or project type priorities. Projects that address multiple CoC priorities will receive bonus points based on the highest ranked priority. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project addresses CoC priority #1 = 5 points - Project addresses CoC priority #2 = 4 points - Project addresses CoC priority #3 = 3 points - Project addresses CoC priority #4 = 2 points - Project addresses CoC priority #5 = 1 point - Project does not address CoC priorities = 0 points 	

MO-600 CoC Greene/Christian/Webster County, Missouri
CoC PROGRAM APPLICATION RATING AND RANKING PROCESS

APPENDIX E

Reallocation Policy

Background: The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (commonly known as “HUD”) required that Continuums of Care (CoC) carefully evaluate and review all renewal projects and develop a reallocation process for projects funded with CoC funds. Reallocation is an important tool used by CoCs to make strategic improvements to their homelessness system. Through reallocation, the CoC can create new projects that are aligned with HUD’s goals, by eliminating projects that are underperforming or are more appropriately funded from other sources. Reallocation is particularly important when new resources are not available.

Policy Statement: Under the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH), the HUD reallocation process allows CoC’s to fund new or existing projects by transferring all or part of funds from any existing CoC grant which is eligible for renewal to a new or existing project.

The Ozarks Alliance to End Homelessness (OAEH) monitors all programs through review of quarterly reports to determine agency capacity and ability to implement performance measure goals and objectives. All renewal projects are reviewed by the OAEH NOFO Committee. Part of this review looks at how the projects performed. During this process, a project could be considered for voluntary or involuntary reallocation.

An agency may apply for a voluntary reallocation of funds from one project to a different project. However, the OAEH may also find it necessary to consider an involuntary reallocation. A recommended involuntary reallocation from the OAEH NOFO Committee would require approval of the OAEH Executive Board. Approval of an involuntary reallocation would only come from the OAEH Executive Board after it has determined all reasonable attempts to resolve the concerns with the agency have failed. It is initially envisioned that an involuntary reallocation would be rare and would likely be a course of last resort. The OAEH does not take the involuntary reallocation process lightly.

The recommendation for voluntary or involuntary reallocation may be based on any one of the following HUD criteria and the overall score of the project evaluation.

- Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;
- Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
- History of inadequate financial management accounting practices;
- Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
- History of other major capacity issues that have significantly impacted the operation of the project and its performance;
- Timeliness in reimbursing sub recipients for eligible costs. HUD will consider a project applicant as meeting this standard if it has drawn down grant funds at least once per month;
- History of serving ineligible persons, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes;
- History of non-compliance with the OAEH Coordinated Entry System Policies and Procedures; or,
- Programs did not consistently meet OAEH’s performance measures.

However, ranking near or at the bottom of performance measures or project evaluation scores will not lead automatically to involuntary reallocation.