Sonoma County 2025 Continuum of Care Competition
Permanent Supportive Housing
New Project Scoring Tool

Measure	Scoring Methodology	Possible Points
A. System Performance Measures (SPM)		
1. SPM 7b. Successful PH Exits: Retention of PH	Proposed percentage of clients served in project that will maintain housing. Scoring: 100-95%= 6 pts., 94-85%= 4 pts., 84-75%= 2 pts., <74% = 0 pts.	6
2. SPM 7b. Successful Exits to PH: exiting to a permanent destination	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project that exit to permanent housing destinations. Scoring: 100-95%= 6 pts., 94-85%= 4 pts., 84-75%= 2 pts., <74% = 0 pts.	6
3. SPM 4. Increase in Earned Income	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project that increase income from employment from entry to exit. Scoring: 100–75% = 5 pts., 74–50% = 3 pts., 49–25% = 1 pt., < 24% = 0 pts.	5
4. SPM 4. Increase in Non-Employment Income	Proposed percentage of clients served in project to meet this outcome Scoring: 100–75% = 5 pts., 74–50% = 3 pts., 49–25% = 1 pt., < 24% = 0 pts.	5
5. SPM 2a. Returns to Homelessness	Proposed percentage of clients served after the first two years of project start date that exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness is: Scoring: <7% in in 12 months = 5 pts., 8-11% in 12 months = 2.5 pts., >12% in 12 months =0 pts.	5
B. Other Objective Criteria		
6. Maximizing the use of Mainstream resources	Proposed percentage of clients served in the project that will receive non-cash benefits such as mainstream health, social, and employment programs. Scoring: 100-95%= 5 pts., 94-85%= 3 pts., 84-75%= 1 pts., <74% = 0 pts.	5
7. Supportive Service Requirements	Project plans to implement supportive services requirements. Scoring: Yes & documentation provided = 5 pts. No= 0 pts.	5
8. Coordination with Housing Partners	The project proposal includes a written commitment of leveraged funding that would subsidize 25% of the units in the proposed project. Leveraged funds must be other than CoC and ESG sources. that would account for 25% of the total requested award in subsidies to pay for units. Scoring: Proposal includes written commitment of 25% of units= 5 pts., Proposal does not include a written commitment= 0 pts.	5
9. Coordination with Healthcare Partners	The project proposal includes a written commitment from a healthcare provider to deliver services to participants using	5

	resources from sources other than CoC or ESG funding. For substance use disorder treatment, the commitment must confirm that services will be available to all participants. For behavioral health or other healthcare services, the commitment must demonstrate that the value of the assistance provided is at least equal to 25% of the project's requested funding. Scoring: Proposal includes a written commitment that meets one of the requirements listed above= 5 pts. Proposal does not include a written commitment for either option= 0 pts.	
10. Availability of Treatment and Recovery Services	Proposed projects provides onsite Substance Use Disorder Services (SUDS). Scoring: SUDS required for project participants with attached agreement attached = 5 pts. SUDS available to all but not required = 2.5 pts. No SUDS on site= 0 pts.	5

C. Agency Capacity and Financial Capacity Assessment

11. Budget	5 points for a budget that is reasonable and meets threshold requirements for eligible expenses. Line-item narratives document how CoC funds requested are essential to helping people become permanently housed. Required 25% match (cash or in-kind) is adequate, from appropriate sources, and accurately calculated. Staff will calculate.	5
12. Cost Effectiveness	Total Project Budget (including estimated match) ÷ number projected to achieve housing performance measures defined in the project application. Less than $5,000 per outcome = 5 points, $5,000 - $9,999 = 4.16 points, $10,000 - $14,999 = 3.33 points, $15,000 - $19,999 = 2.5 points, $20,000 -24,999 = 1.67 points, $25,000-29,999= .83 point, 30,000+ = 0 points	5
13. Project Narrative/Design	Narrative is understandable; project design reflects the experience of applicant in working with proposed population; applicant understands client needs, type and scale, and location of the housing fit population being served, how clients are assisted in receiving mainstream benefits, performance measurement indicators for housing and income meet HEARTH benchmarks, plan to assist clients with rapidly obtaining permanent housing is clear and accessible. Staff will score. Meeting all requirements above= 6 pts. Meeting all but one requirement above= 3 pts.	6

	Narrative was clear, but no measurable outcomes were included= 1 pt. Narrative was not clear and no measurable outcomes were included= 0 pts.	
14. Organizational Capacity and Experience/ Demonstrated Capacity to manage CoC Awards	Providers new to CoC: Demonstrated ability to manage CoC awards or other federal or state funding with experience in leveraging funds. Scored based on application submission in e-snaps. Scoring: Demonstrated capacity from other state or federal awards and experience leveraging funds= 7 pts. No experience with State/federal funding or leveraging funds= 0 pts. CoC Renewal Providers: cumulative rankings from past 3 CoC Competitions. Full points awarded to agencies scoring in the Top 5 of the previous 3 CoC Competitions with no projects falling into At-Risk Tier in past 3 competitions. Scoring: Top 5 past 3 years= 7 pts. Not meeting this criteria= 0 pts.	7
15. Project Readiness	Plan for opening services and housing is understandable, realistic, and timely (e.g., open within 90 days of contract execution- 2026/2027 term). The extent to which the narrative addresses expedited plan for housing placement after technical submission of contract (within 60 days, 120 days, and 180 days). Staff will score. Meeting all requirements= 5 pts. Not meeting all= 0 pts.	5
16. Financial Audit	Scoring based on most recent audit including identification of agency as "low risk", number (if any) of findings. Staff scored. 5 pts. = no findings, timely audit 2.5 pts. = 1-2 finding 1 pt. = 3 findings 0 pts.= 4+ findings or no audit completed	5
D. Local and Other HUD Priorities		
17. HMIS Data Quality, Timeliness	Existing HMIS Providers will be scored based on all HMIS projects. High data quality and timeliness of assessments. HMIS Staff will score. There are 3 criteria: 1) Personally Identifiable Information (Name, DOB, Race & Ethnicity) are at least 95% complete 2) Universal Data Elements & Income and Housing Data Quality are at least 95% complete	3

	3) Timeliness Scoring: Meeting all 3 criteria= 3 pts., Meeting 2/3= 1.5 pts., Meeting 1 or none= 0 pts. If you are not using HMIS data, project will score half points.	
18. Additional local/HUD Priorities	2 points for each goal this is in the proposer either currently does or plans to incorporate: a. Provider will collaborate with corrections partners/law enforcement b. Staff will be trained on and will screen for mainstream resources (e.g. Medi-cal, Calfresh, TANF, substance abuse programs, employment assistance) c. Project will promote/support volunteering, community engagement, and employment services	6
19. Persons with Lived Experience	Seeks feedback from Persons with lived experience or those who have formerly experienced homelessness. Scoring: 2 pts. per question answered yes	6
	Total Points:	100