



2022

Continuum of Care Annual and Supplemental Competitive Funding Process Summary



Sutton, Jeannie
Lee County Human and Veteran Services
9/15/2022

PROCESS TIMELINE

DATE	PROCESS
JULY 5, 2022	Renewal Applicants Notified via Email of 2022 CoC Funding Competition Opening
JULY 11, 2022	Request for Applications for 2022 Continuum of Care Funding (RFA# 08-2022-COC) Published: https://www.leegov.com/dhs/funding
JULY 19, 2022	Addendum #1 Published for RFA# 08-2022-COC: https://www.leegov.com/dhs/funding
AUGUST 5, 2022	Documents for Project Renewal Due from Renewal Project Applicants
AUGUST 10, 2022	All Renewal Project Applications Submitted to Performance Evaluation and Ranking Committee for Review in accordance with the 2021 Ranking and Reallocation Procedures found at: https://www.leegov.com/dhs/Documents/CoC/ 2021%20Reallocation%20and%20Ranking%20Policies%20and %20Procedures.pdf
AUGUST 15, 2022	New Project Applications for Supplemental and New 2022 CoC Projects Due by 5 pm.
AUGUST 17, 2022	Performance Evaluation and Ranking Committee Meeting to Review, Score and Rank Renewal Project Applications: Microsoft Teams meeting Join on your computer or mobile app Click here to join the meeting Or call in (audio only) +1 321-414-2159,,321290559# United States, Orlando Phone Conference ID: 321 290 559# Find a local number Reset PIN
AUGUST 17, 2022	All New Project Applications Submitted to Performance Evaluation and Ranking Committee for Review in accordance with the 2021 Ranking and Reallocation Procedures found at: https://www.leegov.com/dhs/Documents/CoC/2021%20Reallocation%20and%20Ranking%20Policies%20and%20Procedures.pdf
AUGUST 25, 2022	Performance Evaluation and Ranking Committee Meeting to Review, Score and Rank New Project Applications: Microsoft Teams meeting

	Join on your computer or mobile app Click here to join the meeting Or call in (audio only) +1 321-414-2159,,250943536# United States, Orlando Phone Conference ID: 250 943 536# Find a local number Reset PIN
SEPTEMBER 14, 2022	Notice of Conditional Selection or Non-Selection Sent to Project Applicants via Email.
SEPTEMBER 15, 2022	List of Conditionally Selected Projects Posted Online.
SEPTEMBER 26, 2022	Draft Annual Continuum of Care Consolidated and Project Applications and Priority Listing Posted Online for Public Review
OCTOBER 14, 2022	Draft Supplemental Unsheltered NOFO Continuum of Care Consolidated and Project Applications and Priority Listing Posted Online for Public Review.

PROJECTS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING

2022 Renewal Project Applications

Applications currently funded by CoC funding, there are 8 renewal PSH and RRH projects.

Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Units	Total Renewal Amount
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	CASL Rental Assistance	12	\$199,656
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	CASL Supportive Services	0	\$128,157
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	SVDP Returning Home Lee County	10	\$211,012
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	Southwest Florida Connect SSO-CE	0	\$165,000
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	CASL Permanent Supportive Housing	0	\$171,458

2022 Projects being Reallocated (available for new projects)

Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Units	Total Renewal Amount
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	The Salvation Army Rapid Rehousing	29	\$640,620
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	Goodwill Rapid Rehousing	12	\$212,976
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	HVS LIFT Rapid Rehousing	8	\$113,471
Lee County Board of County Commissioners	JFCS Rapid Rehousing	4	\$106,206

LIST OF NEW PROJECTS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING

2022 Continuum of Care Annual Application

Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Units	Total New Amount
Community Assisted and Supported Living	Lee County RTF II PSH	16+	\$688,073.80
Community Assisted and Supported Living	Lee County PSH Scattered Site Rental Assistance	40	\$296,234.40
Catholic Charities	DV RRH	30	\$256,726.80
Catholic Charities	RRH	25	\$369,353.00

2021 Supplemental CoC Application to Address Unsheltered Homelessness

Applicant Name	Project Name	Total Units	Total New Amount
HVS	CoC Planning Grant	0	\$35,800.00
Catholic Charities	Youth RRH	52	\$578,792.00
SVDP	Lee County Scattered Site PSH	31	\$578,792.00

PROJECT RANKING TOOLS

2022 Lee County CoC Funding New Project Ranking Tool

This portion of the ranking tool will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant	Threshold Requirements
(Lee County HVS).	
Proposal was submitted by deadline.	
If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant is a local government or non-profit organization with 501c3 Status. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant agency has been in operation for at least 12 months prior to application deadline. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Organization is NOT listed on the excluded parties list. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Application is signed by agency official designated to execute contracts. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Eligible to Apply	
HVS Review Staff Initial: Date of Threshold Review:	

2022 Lee County CoC Funding New Project Ranking Tool

	This portion of the ranking tool will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant (Lee County HVS).
	Proposal was submitted by deadline. If no, ineligible to apply.
	Applicant is a local government or non-profit organization with 501c3 Status If no, ineligible to apply.
	Applicant agency has been in operation for at least 12 months prior to application deadline <i>If no, ineligible to apply.</i>
İ	Organization is NOT listed on the excluded parties list. If no, ineligible to apply.
	Application is signed by agency official designated to execute contracts If no, ineligible to apply.
	Eligible to Apply
	HVS Review Staff Initial:
L	Date of Threshold Review:

Project Scoring

Please enter your score for each scoring criteria based on the project proposal.

While most scoring factors are related to specific questions, reviewer may consider all elements of the proposal to determine score for each item. Please use only whole and half points.

Priority 1 Project Outcomes (Performance Measures): The project has a estimated outcomes that are within CoC and HUD standards, and support the goal of making homelessness in Lee Countrare, brief, and one-time. Addressing - Length of time person remains homeless; Extent to whic persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations return to homelessness: Number of persons no longer homeless; Jobs and income growth.

Maximum Point Value: 10

Priority 2 Innovation: The project is innovative, and addresses housing and service needs in manne not already found within the CoC, or addresses housing and service needs for a population no currently being served in the CoC. The project is designed around a national best practice or existin evidence based program.

Maximum Point Value: 15

Priority 3 Workforce Coordination: Does the project coordinate with workforce developmen boards to provide permanent housing and rapid rehousing with integrated services. Points will be awarded for projects that have written documentation to demonstrate partnership with loca workforce development centers to improve employment opportunities

Maximum Point Value: 10

Priority 3 Health Care Coordination: Does the project coordinate with physical and behaviora healthcare organizations to provide integrated services to program participants. Points should only be awarded for projects that have written documentation to demonstrate partnership with public apprivate healthcare organizations to assist program participants to obtain services, treatment, and/office medical insurance to address healthcare needs

Maximum Point Value: 10

Priority 3 Housing Coordination: Does the project coordinate with housing providers, including bu not limited to the Public Housing Authorities, landlords, or other permanent housing resources to provide permanent housing units to program participants. Points should only be awarded for project that have written documentation to demonstrate partnership with public and private organizations to assist program participants to obtain permanent housing

Maximum Point Value: 10

Priority 3 Engagement of Persons with Lived Experience & Equity: Does the project applicant demonstrate active engagement of persons with lived experience. Active engagement may be demonstrated through membership on the organization's board, having persons with lived experience in paid staff positions, or through a regular, documented process for consulting persons with live experience in program design. Is the organization's Board and Staff composition representative of the population being served.

Maximum Point Value: 10

Priority 4 Housing First: The project will strictly adhere to low barrier and housing first practices that centers on providing people experiencing homelessness with housing as quickly as possib (within 30 days or less) — and then providing services as needed (within 30 days or less) — and then providing services as needed (within 30 days or less) — and then providing services as needed (within 30 days or less) — and then providing services as needed (within 30 days or less) — and then providing, and reporting, and will be able to carry out activities within the funding period Maximum Point Value; 5 Agency's Capacity and Experience: The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are houseless, formerly houseless or risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes dear efforts to provide quality periode through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required Maximum Point Value; 5 Budget, Match and Laverage: The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services Maximum Point Value; 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and address to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value; 5	that centers on providing people experiencing homelessness with housing as quickly as possib (within 30 days or less) – and then providing services as needed Maximum Point Value: 10 Priority 4 Timeliness: The agency has a clear schedule for project implementation, spending, an reporting, and will be able to carry out activities within the funding period Maximum Point Value: 5 Agency's Capacity and Experience: The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or a risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required Maximum Point Value: 5 Maximum Point Value: 5 Budget, Match and Leverage: The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are cligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project als uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value: 5	Th pri g.	Priority 4 Alignment with Community Goals and Needs: The project will assist the CoC in achieving stated goals and/or is a project specifically identified as a priority within the RFA. The project will help to ensure homelessness in Lee County is rare brief and one-time, and fill a gap services or housing. Maximum Point Value: 5
Agency's Capacity and Experience: The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or a risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required Maximum Point Value: S Budget, Match and Leverage: The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value: 5	Agency's Capacity and Experience: The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or a risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required Maximum Point Value: 5 Budget, Match and Leverage: The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services. Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value: 5	bi ed	that centers on providing people experiencing homelessness with housing as quickly as possib (within 30 days or less) – and then providing services as needed
needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or a risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required Maximum Point Value: 5 Budget, Match and Leverage: The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services. Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered fo funding. Maximum Point Value: 5 Total	needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or a risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required Maximum Point Value: 5 Budget, Match and Leverage: The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value: 5	od.	reporting, and will be able to carry out activities within the funding period
under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services. Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value: 5 Total	under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services. Maximum Point Value: 5 Proposal Presentation: The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. Maximum Point Value: 5	ra h ed	needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or a risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "soft hand-offs" when referrals are required
clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered fo funding. Maximum Point Value: 5 Total	clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered fo funding. Maximum Point Value: 5	ls es	under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project als- uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services
	Total	fo g. 5	clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered fo funding Maximum Point Value: 5
Total Available Points = 100			
	Total Available Points = 100	0	Total Available Points = 100

Category	Objective	Maximum Point Value	Rubric
Priority 1 Project Outcomes	The project has estimated outcomes that are within CoC and HUD standards, and support the goal of making homelessness in Lee County rare, brief, and one-time. Addressing the length of time person remains homeless; the extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations; returns to homelessness; and jobs and income growth.	10	9-10 The Project has estimated outcomes that are within CoC and HUD standards, and support the goal of making homelessness in Lee County rare, brief, and one-time. The project has detailed plans to address the length of time person remains homeless; the extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations; returns to homelessness; jobs and income growth; and the agency has a proven track record in Lee County of meeting those objectives in previously funded projects 7-8 The Project has estimated outcomes that are within CoC and HUD standards, and support the goal of making homelessness in Lee County rare, brief, and one-time. The project has detailed plans to address the length of time person remains homeless; the extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations; returns to homelessness; jobs and income growth; and the agency has a proven track record in other counties of meeting those objectives in previously funded projects 4-6 The Project has estimated outcomes that are within CoC and HUD standards, and support the goal of making homelessness in Lee County rare, brief, and one-time. The project has some general plans to address the length of time person remains homeless; the extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations; returns to homelessness; jobs and income growth; but the agency has not adequately met those objectives in previously funded projects 0-3 The Project does not adequately estimate outcomes that are within CoC and HUD standards, or support the goal of making homelessness in Lee County rare, brief, and one-time. The project lacks adequate plans to address the length of time person remains homeless; the extent to which persons who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations; returns to homelessness; jobs and income growth; and the agency has not adequately met those objectives in previously funded projects
Priority 2 Innovation	The project is innovative, and addresses housing and service needs in manner not already found within the CoC, or addresses housing and service needs for a population not currently being served in the CoC. The project is designed around a national best practice or existing evidence based program.	15	15- The project is innovative, addresses housing and service needs in a manner not already found within the CoC, AND addresses housing and service needs for a population not currently being served in the CoC. The project is also designed around a national best practice or existing evidence based program 6-14 The project is innovative, addresses housing and service needs in a manner not already found within the CoC, OR addresses housing and service needs for a population not currently being served in the CoC. The project is also designed around a national best practice or existing evidence based program 0-5 The project is not innovative, or does not address housing and service needs in a manner not already found within the CoC, or does not address housing and service needs for a population not currently being served in the CoC. The project is not designed around a national best practice or existing evidence based program
Priority 3 Coordination with Workforce Development Boards	The project applicant demonstrates collaboration and coordination with workforce development boards. Applicants must attach Memoranda of Understanding and/or commitment letters detailing the amount of funds being committed to support the project and the estimated number of program participants that will be assisted.	10	 9-10 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with Workforce Development Boards. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership which detail the amount of funds being provided to support the project. The agency has a proven track record in Lee County of coordinating with Workforce Development Boards to increase employment income for program participants. 7-8 The project has a plan to coordinate with Workforce Development Boards. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership that details the amount of funds being provided to support the project. The agency does not have a proven track record in other counties of coordinating with Workforce Development Boards to increase employment income for program participants. 5-6 The project has a plan to coordinate with Workforce Development Boards. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership, but does not detail the amount of funds being provided to support the project. The agency does not have proven track record in other counties of coordinating with Workforce Development Boards to provide housing subsides other than CoC and ESG to stabilize clients in housing. 0-4 The project does not have a detailed plan to coordinate with Workforce Development Boards to provide housing with integrated services, or the agency lacks written documentation to demonstrate partnership with Workforce Development Boards to assist program participants to increase employment income for program participants.

Priority 3 Health Care Coordination	The project coordinates with healthcare organizations, (including organizations that provide mental health services), to provide permanent housing and rapid rehousing with integrated services. Points should only be awarded for projects that have written documentation to demonstrate partnership with public and private healthcare organizations to assist program participants to obtain medical insurance to address healthcare needs. Written documentation may include MOUs or other agreements establishing a working relationship.	10	9-10 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with healthcare organizations (including organizations that provide mental health services) to provide housing with integrated services. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership with public and private healthcare organizations to assist program participants to obtain physical and behavioral health care services and/or medical insurance to address healthcare needs. The documentation includes the funding and/or dollar value of resources committed to support the project. The agency has a proven track record in Lee County of coordinating with healthcare organizations to provide housing with integrated services. 7-8 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with healthcare organizations (including organizations that provide mental health services) to provide housing with integrated services. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership with public and private healthcare organizations to assist program participants to obtain physical and behavioral health care services and/or medical insurance to address healthcare needs. The documentation includes the funding and/or dollar value of resources committed to support the project. The agency does not have a proven track record in other counties of coordinating with healthcare organizations to provide housing with integrated services. 5-6 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with healthcare organizations (including organizations that provide mental health services) to provide housing with integrated services. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership with public and private healthcare organizations to assist program participants to obtain physical and behavioral health care services and/or medical insurance to address healthcare needs. The documentation does n
Priority 3 Coordination with Housing Resources	The project applicant demonstrates collaboration and coordination with Public Housing Authorities (PHAs), landlords and other housing providers that provide housing subsidies not funded through CoC or ESG programs (e.g., Housing Choice Vouchers, Support Vouchers, private subsidies, etc.) Applicants must attach Memoranda of Understanding and/or commitment letters detailing the number of subsidies or units being provided to support the project.	10	9-10 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership PHAs which detail the number of subsidies or units being provided to support the project. The agency has a proven track record in Lee County of coordinating with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers to provide housing subsides other than CoC and ESG to stabilize clients in housing. 7-8 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership PHAs, landlords or other housing providers which detail the number of subsidies or units being provided to support the project. The agency does not have a proven track record in other counties of coordinating with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers to provide housing subsides other than CoC and ESG to stabilize clients in housing. 5-6 The project has a detailed plan to coordinate with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers. The agency has written documentation including Memoranda of Understanding and/or Commitment letters to demonstrate partnership with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers, but does not detail the number of subsidies other than CoC and ESG being committed to stabilize clients in housing. The agency lacks a proven record of coordinating with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers to provide housing subsides other than CoC and ESG to stabilize clients in housing. 0-4 The project does not have a detailed plan to coordinate with PHAs, landlords or other housing providers, or the agency lacks written documentation to demonstrate partnership to provide permanent housing resources to program participants.
Priority 3 Engagement of Persons with Lived Experience and Equity	The project applicant demonstrates active engagement of persons with lived experience. Active engagement may be demonstrated through membership on the organization's board, having persons with lived experience in paid staff positions, or through a regular, documented process for consulting persons with lived experience in program design. The organization's Board and staff composition are representative of the population being served.	10	9-10 The project applicant demonstrates active engagement of persons with lived experience. Persons with lived experience sit on the organization's board AND persons with lived experience are employed in paid staff positions. The organization has a regular, documented process for consulting persons with lived experience in program design. The organization's board and staff composition are very representative of the population being served. 7-8 The project applicant demonstrates active engagement of persons with lived experience. Persons with lived experience sit on the organization's board OR persons with lived experience are employed in paid staff positions. The organization has a regular, documented process for consulting persons with lived experience in program design. The organization's board and staff composition are somewhat representative of the population being served. 4-6 The organization has a regular, documented process for consulting persons with lived experience in program design. The organization's board and staff composition are somewhat representative of the population being served. 0-3 The organization does not have a regular, documented process for consulting persons with lived experience in program design. The organization's board and staff composition are somewhat representative of the population being served.

	and original information to be considered for funding. Total Available Points	100	considered for funding. 0-2 The proposal is not well organized, and does not adhere to RFA instructions. Narratives are not clear or concise. The proposal lacks new or original information to be considered for funding
Proposal Presentation	The proposal is organized, and adheres to RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new	5	5- The proposal is well organized, and adheres to all RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and concise, and the proposal presents new and original information to be considered for funding. 3-4 The proposal is organized and adheres to most RFA instructions. Narratives are clear and the proposal presents adequate new and original information to be
Budget, Match, and Leverage	The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services.	5	5- The project has a detailed, reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project also uses leveraged funds to expand available housing and services. 3-4 The project has a reasonable budget, all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, and adequate match has been committed. The project does not have detailed plans to expand available housing and services 0-2 The project lacks a detailed, reasonable budget, not all anticipated costs are eligible under one of the available funding sources, or adequate match have not been committed. The project lacks plans to expand available housing and services
Agency's Capacity and Experience	The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through a person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "warm hand-off" when referrals are required.	5	5- The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through a person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "warm hand-off" when referrals are required. The agency has a proven track record in Lee County and has demonstrated positive outcomes through system performance measures, including data quality 3-4 The agency has at least 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes clear efforts to provide quality services through a person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "warm hand-off" when referrals are required. The agency has a track record outside of Lee County in demonstrating positive outcomes through system performance measures 0-2 The agency has less than 12 months experience addressing the needs of and providing services to low income households who are homeless, formerly homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. The agency also makes limited efforts to provide quality services through a person centered, housing focused model and ensuring "warm hand-off" when referrals are required. The agency does not have a track record of demonstrating positive outcomes through system performance measures
Priority 4 Timeliness	The agency has a clear schedule for project implementation, spending, staffing and reporting, and will be able to carry out activities within the funding period.	5	5- The agency has a clear, detailed, and feasible schedule for project implementation, spending, staffing, and reporting, and has a proven track record of carrying out activities within past funding periods in Lee County in a timely fashion 3-4 The agency has a clear and feasible schedule for project implementation, and has carried out activities in Lee County in a timely fashion, or has carried out activities in past funding periods in other counties in a timely fashion 0-2 The agency does not have a clear and feasible schedule for project implementation, or has not carried out funded activities in a timely fashion
Priority 4 Housing First	The project will strictly adhere to low barrier and housing first practices, that centers on providing people experiencing homelessness with housing as quickly as possible (within 30 days or less) – and then providing services as needed.	10	 9-10 The project proposal clearly defines low barrier and housing first practices, aims to house clients within 30 days, and the agency has a proven track record in Lee County in putting low barrier policies into practice, and housing people within 30 days of referral 7-8 The project proposal clearly defines low barrier and housing first practices, aims to house people within 30 days of referral, and the agency has demonstrated in other continuums the ability to house people within 30 days of referral 4-6 The project does not adequately define low barrier and housing first practices or commit to quickly housing individuals, and the agency has limited experience in rapidly housing individuals experiencing homelessness 0-3 The project does not adequately define low barrier and housing first practices or commit to quickly housing individuals, and the agency has no experience in rapidly housing individuals experiencing homelessness
Priority 4 Alignment with Community Goals and Needs	The project will assist the CoC in achieving stated goals and/or is a project specifically identified as a priority within the RFA. The project will help to ensure homelessness in Lee County is rare brief and one-time, and fill a gap in services or housing. The project aligns with Lee County CoC's Plan for Serving Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness with Severe Service Needs	5	5- The project directly addresses the stated goals and needs of the CoC, fills a gap in services or housing, and will help ensure that homelessness in Lee County is rare, brief, and one-time. The project directly aligns with Lee County CoC's Plan for Serving Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness with Severe Service Needs 3-4 The project addresses some or part of the goals of the CoC, or addresses the goals indirectly. The project will help ensure that homelessness in Lee County is rare, brief, and one-time The project indirectly aligns with Lee County CoC's Plan for Serving Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness with Severe Service Needs 0-2 The project does not directly align with the goals of the CoC or Lee County CoC's Plan for Serving Individuals and Families Experiencing Homelessness with Severe Severe Service Needs

FY 2021 Lee County CoC Renewal Project Ranking Tool for SSO Projects	
This portion of the ranking tool will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant (Lee County HVS).	Threshold Requirements
Letter of intent to renew/reallocate was submitted by deadline If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant has met the HUD threshold requirements outlined in the current year NOFA If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant has a current CoC funded program that is eligible for renewal If no, ineligible to apply.	
Organization is NOT listed on the excluded parties list. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Letter of intent to renew/reallocate is signed by agency official designated to execute contracts. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Eligible to Apply	
HVS Review Staff Initial: Date of Threshold Review:	

Project Sco	oring
Please enter your score for each scoring criteria based on the project application. While most scoring to determine score for each item. Please	
Access: The Coordinated Entry System covers 100% of the CoC's Geographic Area, and is accessible by all persons, including those who are least likely to seek services. Maximum Point Value: 20	
Assessment: The Coordinated Entry System provides a standardized assessment process that provides fair and equal access to services for all persons seeking assistance. Maximum Point Value: 20	
Prioritization: The coordinated entry system prioritizes people most in need of assistance Maximum Point Value: 20	
Referral: The Coordinated Entry System quickly refers persons to permanent housing resources based on their vulnerability. Maximum Point Value: 20	
Financial and Monitoring: The agency expended 100% of awarded funds by the end of the most recent grant year, documented at least 25% matching funds, maintained a regular drawdown schedule and used a suitable proportion of funds for housing and supportive services Maximum Point Value: 20	
Total	0.00
Total Available Points = 100	
Rank:	
Reviewer Signature	
Reviewer N	ame
Committee Member's Overall Observations/Concerns:	

FY 2021 Lee County CoC Renewal Project Ranking Tool for PS	SH Projects
This portion of the ranking tool will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant (Lee County HVS).	
Letter of intent to renew/reallocate was submitted by deadline. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant has met the HUD threshold requirements outlined in the current year NOFA. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant has a current CoC funded program that is eligible for renewal. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Organization is NOT listed on the excluded parties list. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Letter of intent to renew/reallocate is signed by agency official designated to execute contracts. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Eligible to Apply	
HVS Review Staff Initial:	
Date of Threshold Review:	

Project Scoring

Please enter your score for each scoring criteria based on the funded project report card. While most scoring factors are related to specific data points, reviewer may consider all elements of the project to determine score for each item. Please use only whole and

specific data points, reviewer may consider all elements of the project to determine score for each item.	Please use only whole and
Housing Stability: The total number of leavers that exit the CoC funded program to a Permanent Housing	
Destination.	
Local Target for RRH programs: 75% or more; Local Target for PSH Programs 85% or more.	
Maximum Point Value: 12	
12 Points- More than 90% of program participants remain in PSH or exit to a Permanent Housing	
Destination	
10 Points- Between 80% and 90% of program participants remain in PSH or exit to a Permanent Housing	
Destination	
8 Points- Between 70% and 80% of program participants remain in PSH or exit to a Permanent Housing	
Destination	
6 Points- Between 60% and 70% of program participants remain in PSH or exit to a Permanent Housing	
Destination	
4 Points- Between 50% and 60% of program participants exit remain in PSH or to a Permanent Housing	
Destination	
0 Points- Less than 50% of program participants remain in PSH or exit to a Permanent Housing	1
Destination	
Exits to Homelessness: The number of persons that exit the CoC funded program to homelessness. Local	
Target for PSH and RRH Programs less than 10%.	
Maximum Point Value: 12	
12 Points- Less than 10% of persons exit the program to homelessness	
10 Points- Between 10% and 20% of persons exit the program to homelessness	

6 Points- Between 20% and 30% of persons exit the program to homelessness

0 Points- More than 30% of persons exit the program to homelessness

Living Situation at Project Entry: The number of persons that enter the CoC funded from homelessness. Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs is 100% from Safe Haven, Emergency Shelter, or Place not meant for human habitation. **Maximum Point Value: 8** 8 Points-100% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for Habitation or Emergency 6 Points- More than 90% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for Habitation or **Emergency Shelters, but less than 100%** 4 Points- Between 75% and 90% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for **Habitation or Emergency Shelters** 0 Points-Less than 75% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for Habitation or **Emergency Shelters** Average Length of Time Homeless: The number days a persons is homeless once they are enrolled in a CoC Funded Program Local Target is 45 days or less. **Maximum Point Value: 9** 9 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is less than 45 days 6 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is between 46 and 90 days 3 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is between 91 and 120 days 0 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is ≥ 121 days Returns to Homelessness: The number of leavers that exited a CoC funded program to a permanent housing designation, then returned to homelessness after 6, 12, or 24 months. Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs less than 10% **Maximum Point Value: 9** 9 Points- Less than 10% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit 7-8 Points- Between 10% and 20% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit 5-6 Points- Between 20% and 35% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit 0 Points- More than 35% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit

ased or maintained	
	Increasing Income: The number of persons in a CoC funded program that increased or ma
income.	
	Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs is 45% o
m Point Value: 7	Maximum Point V
1. 1.4. 1.1.	7D : 4 M d 900/ C ; d
ained their income	7 Points- More than 80% of persons in the program increased or maintained their
ained their income	5 Points- Between 45% and 80% of persons in the program increased or maintained their
affica their fileoffic	3 Tollis- Between 4370 and 8070 of persons in the program increased of maintained them
ained their income	3 Points- Between 30% and 45% of persons in the program increased or maintained their
	training 2000 and 1000 at persons in the program increases of imministration
ained their income	0 Points- Less than 30% of persons in the program increased or maintained their
* 1* 4 11 41	H . D. C.
	Housing First: The project strictly adheres to low barrier and housing first practices, as indicate
sment Tool Score.	Housing First Assessment Too
	Maximum Point V
in i vint value, o	IVI AXI III UIII F OIII C
and demonstration	Coordinated Entry: The percent of program entries received from Coordinated Entry, and demon
	that high need clients are being served, as indicated by an average VI SPDAT score that ex
or the project type.	minimum prescribed for the proj
e before CE was in	Local target of CE entries is 100% for RRH projects. PSH programs were in existence before C
	place, and should not be penalized for percent under 100%. Local target for VI-SPDAT Sc
endation for PSH.	recommendation for RRH, 8+ (for individuals) and 9+ (for families) recommendation
	Maximum Point V
ini i dint vaiue. 6	Maximum 1 ont
to program entry	8 Points- 100% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra
	The state of the s
	6 Points- More than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to program entry,
am entry, but less	
am entry, but less than 100%	tha
am entry, but less than 100%	
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry	tha 0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry rate that more than	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry rate that more than vere service needs.	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service.
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry rate that more than vere service needs.	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry rate that more than vere service needs.	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service.
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service.
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. am Point Value: 8 as greater than 10	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater
am entry, but less than 100% to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. am Point Value: 8 as greater than 10	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 Is between 8 and 10	O Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater 7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between the
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 Is between 8 and 10	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 Is between 8 and 10	O Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater 7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between the
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 I between 8 and 10 Vas between 6 and 8	O Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater 7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between the following program was between the program was between the program was between the following program was between the progr
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 I between 8 and 10 Vas between 6 and 8	0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater 7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between the
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 I between 8 and 10 Vas between 6 and 8	O Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater 7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between the following program was between the program was between the program was between the following program was between the progr
to program entry rate that more than vere service needs. Im Point Value: 8 Is greater than 10 I between 8 and 10 Vas between 6 and 8	O Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to progra Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that m 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service Maximum Point V 8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater 7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between the following program was between the program was between the program was between the following program was between the progr

HMIS Data Quality: The project applicant meets or exceeds the HMIS Data Quality Standards established by the CoC, and ensures that all data is entered within 48 hours of receipt. Maximum Point Value: 8	
8 Points- The applicant completed over 95% of required fields in HMIS for all Households	
6 Points- the applicant completed between 85% and 95% of required fields in HMIS for all Households	
4 Points- The applicant completed between 75% and 85% of required fields in HMIS for all Households	
0 Points- The applicant completed less than 75% of required fields in HMIS for all Households	
Financial and Monitoring: The agency expended 100% of awarded funds by the end of the most recent grant year, documented at least 25% matching funds, maintained a regular drawdown schedule, and used a suitable proportion of funds for housing and supportive services. Maximum Point Value: 6	
Active CoC Membership: The agency has been represented at CoC meetings held during the program year. Maximum Point Value: 5	
Total	
Total Available Points = 100	
Reviewer Signature	
Reviewer Name	
Committee Member's Overall Observations/Concerns:	

FY 2021 Lee County CoC Renewal Project Ranking Tool for RRH Projects

This portion of the ranking tool will be completed by the Collaborative Applicant (Lee County HVS).	
Letter of intent to renew/reallocate was submitted by deadline. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant has met the HUD threshold requirements outlined in the current year NOFA. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Applicant has a current CoC funded program that is eligible for renewal. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Organization is NOT listed on the excluded parties list. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Letter of intent to renew/reallocate is signed by agency official designated to execute contracts. If no, ineligible to apply.	
Eligible to Apply	
HVS Review Staff Initial: Date of Threshold Review:	

Project Scoring

Please enter your score for each scoring criteria based on the funded project report card. While most scoring factors are related to specific data points, reviewer may consider all elements of the project to determine score for each item. Please use only whole and half points.

Housing Stability: The total number of leavers that exit the CoC funded program to a Permanent Housing Destination.

Local Target for RRH programs: 75% or more; Local Target for PSH Programs 85% or more.

Maximum Point Value: 12

12 Points- More than 90% of program participants exit to a Permanent Housing Destination

10 Points- Between 80% and 90% of program participants exit to a Permanent Housing Destination

8 Points- Between 70% and 80% of program participants exit to a Permanent Housing Destination

6 Points- Between 60% and 70% of program participants exit to a Permanent Housing Destination

4 Points- Between 50% and 60% of program participants exit to a Permanent Housing Destination

0 Points-Less than 50% of program participants exit to a Permanent Housing Destination

Exits to Homelessness: The number of persons that exit the CoC funded program to homelessness. *Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs less than 10%.*

Maximum Point Value: 12

12 Points- Less than 10% of persons exit the program to homelessness

10 Points- Between 10% and 20% of persons exit the program to homelessness

6 Points- Between 20% and 30% of persons exit the program to homelessness

0 Points- More than 30% of persons exit the program to homelessness

Living Situation at Project Entry: The number of persons that enter the CoC funded from homelessness. Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs is 100% from Safe Haven, Emergency Shelter, or Place not meant for human habitation. **Maximum Point Value: 8** 8 Points- 100% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for Habitation or Emergency 6 Points- More than 90% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for Habitation or Emergency Shelters, but less than 100% 4 Points- Between 75% and 90% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for **Habitation or Emergency Shelters** 0 Points-Less than 75% of persons enter the Program from Places not meant for Habitation or **Emergency Shelters Average Length of Time Homeless:** The number days a persons is homeless once they are enrolled in a CoC Funded Program Local Target is 45 days or less. **Maximum Point Value: 9** 9 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is less than 45 days 6 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is between 46 and 90 days 3 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is between 91 and 120 days 0 Points- The average number of days between program entry and move in is \geq 121 days Returns to Homelessness: The number of leavers that exited a CoC funded program to a permanent housing designation, then returned to homelessness after 6, 12, or 24 months. Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs less than 10% **Maximum Point Value: 9** 9 Points- Less than 10% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit 7-8 Points- Between 10% and 20% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit 5-6 Points- Between 20% and 35% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit 0 Points- More than 35% of households return to homelessness within 12 months of program exit

Increasing Income: The number of persons in a CoC funded program that increased or maintained income.

Local Target for PSH and RRH Programs is 45% or more.

Maximum Point Value: 7

7 Points- More than 80% of persons in the program increased or maintained their income

5 Points- Between 45% and 80% of persons in the program increased or maintained their income

3 Points- Between 30% and 45% of persons in the program increased or maintained their income

0 Points-Less than 30% of persons in the program increased or maintained their income

Housing First: The project strictly adheres to low barrier and housing first practices, as indicated by the Housing First Assessment Tool Score. Maximum Point Value: 8	
Coordinated Entry: The percent of program entries received from Coordinated Entry, and demonstration that high need clients are being served, as indicated by an average VI SPDAT score that exceed the minimum prescribed for the project type. Local target of CE entries is 100% for RRH projects. PSH programs were in existence before CE was in place, and should not be penalized for percent under 100%. Local target for VI-SPDAT Scores 4-7 recommendation for RRH, 8+ (for individuals) and 9+ (for families) recommendation for PSH. Maximum Point Value: 8	
8 Points- 100% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to program entry	
6 Points- More than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to program entry, but less than 100%	
0 Points- Less than 90% of households completed a VI-SPDAT prior to program entry	
Serving High Need Clients: The program entries from Coordinated Entry demonstrate that more than 75% of the clients served by the program had severe service needs. Maximum Point Value: 8	
8 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was greater than 10	
7 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was between 8 and 10	
6 Points- The average VI-SPDAT score of clients served by the program was betwen 6 and 8	
	!

8 Points- The applicant completed over 95% of required fields in HMIS for all Households 6 Points- the applicant completed between 85% and 95% of required fields in HMIS for all Households 4 Points- The applicant completed between 75% and 85% of required fields in HMIS for all Households 0 Points- The applicant completed less than 75% of required fields in HMIS for all Households	
Financial and Monitoring: The agency expended 100% of awarded funds by the end of the most recent grant year, documented at least 25% matching funds, maintained a regular drawdown schedule, and used a suitable proportion of funds for housing and supportive services. Maximum Point Value: 6 Active CoC Membership: The agency has been represented at CoC meetings held during the program year. Maximum Point Value: 5 Total	

Total Available Points = 100

Re	viewer Signature		
		Reviewer Name	
mittee Member's Overall Observation	ons/Concerns:		