Public Posting - Availability of Grants for Homelessness

Date: August 7, 2024

The St. Clair County Continuum of Care (SCCCoC) announces the availability of grants to prevent and end homelessness through the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's "Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the FY 2024-FY 2025 Continuum of Care Competition." The CoC is open to, and it will accept and consider proposals from organizations that have not previously received CoC Program Grants. Organizations that have not received CoC funding in the past are encouraged to apply.

NEW PROJECTS

- New project types eligible for funding: (a) Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) (b) Permanent Housing Rapid Rehousing (PH-RRH), (c) Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid Rehousing components (TH-RRH), (d) HMIS, and (e) Coordinated Entry. (refer to the NOFO for detailed information about each project type)
- Projects dedicated to serving survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking that provide (a) Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing, (b) Joint Transitional Housing-Permanent Housing or (c) Support Services Only Coordinated Entry.

Applicants for new projects must submit a letter of intent, including project type and estimated amount of request, to Chris Anderson at Christina.Anderson@co.st-clair.il.us by August 13, 2024. Agencies are urged to read the NOFO before submitting a letter of intent. To access the funding notice, go here. All new projects applicants must complete an electronic application in e-snaps and the New Project Application Form by September 17, 2024.

RENEWAL PROJECTS

- Applicants for renewal projects must indicate their intent to renew or voluntary reallocate funds by notifying Chris Anderson at Christina. Anderson@co.st-clair.il.us by August 13, 2024.
- Renewal projects must complete their e-snaps applications and provide answers to four narrative
 questions and ten Housing First questions using the following Renewal Project Application Form by
 September 17, 2024

ALL PROJECTS

The CoC uses an inclusive, objective review and ranking process to prioritize projects for funding. Applicants should review the attached scoring criteria to understand how the CoC will evaluate projects. The St. Clair County Intergovernmental Grants Department will notify all applicants of acceptance and ranking, rejection, or modification of their projects no later than October 3, 2024.

Please understand that HUD has specific requirements for applicants, including:

- The Rank & Review Committee will carefully review the qualifications of the applicant and the proposed project to assure that they meet HUD's threshold requirements.
- Projects that (1) are eligible; (2) meet HUD's threshold requirements; (3) demonstrate need; and (4) demonstrate organizational capacity, will be accepted, and ranked in priority order using the CoC's scoring criteria (included below).
- Individuals, for-profit organizations, and unincorporated entities are not eligible to apply.
- Applicant organizations must use the e-snaps system to submit their proposals. If interested, you are strongly urged to create an "Applicant Profile" in e-snaps immediately. Select this link to access the login page for *e-snaps*. Contact the CoC for help with this process.

Contact Christina Anderson at Christina. Anderson@co.st-clair.il.us for more information.

St. Clair County Continuum of Care

Renewal Project Scoring Tool

Threshold Questions (Pass/Fail)

Category	Required Attachment	Received Yes/No
Evidence of Agency's Not-For- Profit Status	501(c)3 Letter	•
Agreement to Participate in Coordinated Entry	CoC Coordinated Entry Letter	
Match	Letter of Intent from Agency	
Most Recent Audit	Audited Financial Statement from last completed fiscal year	
Evidence of HMIS Participation (or comparable database)	CoC APR for prior program year	
Outstanding HUD Audit Findings	Audit Outcome Document	
HUD Monitoring Finding (within the last 2 years)	Documentation of Corrective Action Plan from HUD and related correspondence	
DHS Monitoring Finding (within the last 2 years)	Documentation of Corrective Action Plan from HUD and related correspondence	

Project Supports the Needs of the CoC Community Criteria

Category	Scoring Ruberic		Source	Max	Score
Bad Hallianian and a film size	100-88%	4 points	SAGE	4	
	87-75%	3 points			
Bed Utilization - percent of housing assets being utilized	74-62%	2 points			
assets being utilized	61-51%	1 point			
	>/= 50%	0 points			

Project Complies with CoC Policies and Procedures

Category	Sco	ring Ruberic	Source	Max	Score
Coordinated Entry, possess of	100-75%	5 points			
Coordinated Entry - percent of participants entering project with a	74-60%	3 points	HMIS	_	
referral from Coordinated Entry	59-10%	1 point	HIVIIS	,	
referral from coordinated entry	>/= 10% 0 points				
Adherence to Housing First Principles	-	h "yes" in a 10 question interview	Interview Attached to Project Application	10	
CoC Participation - percentage of	100 - 75%	2 points	oints Rosters & Meeting		
participation in CoC meetings	> 50%	0 points	0 points Minutes 3 points	2	
Fund Management - percentage of allocated funds expended during	100%	3 points			
	99-85%	2 points	SAGE	2	
the grant year	84-70%	1 point	JAGE	,	
tile grant year	> 70%	0 points		5	
Data Quality percentage of	100%	3 points			
Data Quality - percentage of completeness of client level data in	99-94%	2 points	SAGE	,	
HMIS	93-89%	1 point	SAGE	3	
IIIVIIS	> 89%	0 points			
	100-90%	5 points			
Permanent Housing Placement -	89-80%	4 points			
percentage of clients successfully	79-70%	3 points	SAGE	_	
exiting to permanent housing or sae housing when participating in	69-60%	2 points	SAGE	١	
DV projects	59-50%	1 point			
ov projeco	> 50%	0 points			

System Performance Measures

Category	Ruberic		Source	Max	Score
	> 30 days	10 points			
Length of Stay in Project *length	31-60 days	8 points		10	
of time between when a person	61-180 days	6 points	HMIS		
enters a project and when they	181-365 days	4 points	HIVIIS		
move into a residence	366-730 days	2 points			
	> 730 days	0 points			

	<u>></u> 85%	10 points]		
	84-75%	8 points			
Length of Stay in Project (TH Only)	74-65%	6 points			
*percentage of persons in the	64-55%	4 points	HMIS	10	
project for 9 months or less	54-45%	2 points]		
ĺ	49-25%	1 point]		
l	< 25%	0 points	1		
	< 10%	5 points			
Return to Homelessness -	11-40%	4 points	1		
percentage of clients that returned	41-50%	3 points	HMIS	5	
to homelessness after successfully	51-60%	2 points	HIVIIS		
exiting a project.	61-90%	1 point]		
	> 90%	0 points]		
	100-90%	10 points			
	89-69%	8 points			
Percentage of Adults with NEW or	68-48%	6 points	SAGE	10	
INCREASED earned income	47-27%	4 points	SAGE	10	
	26-11%	2 points]		
	< 10%	1 point			
	100-50%	5 points			
[49-38%	4 points			
Percentage of Adults with NEW or	37-26%	3 points	SAGE	5	
INCREASED other income	25-14%	2 points] SAGE		
	13-6%	1 point]		
	<u><</u> 5%	0 points	<u> </u>		

Severity of Needs Criteria

Category		Ruberic	Source	Max	Score
	>80%	4 points			
Percentage of Adults with No or	79-59%	3 points			
Low Income	58-38%	2 points	SAGE	4	
Low income	37-21%	1 point			
	<u><20%</u>	0 points			
	>80%	4 points	SAGE		
	79-59%	3 points			
rcentage of Adults with mental illne	58-38%	2 points		4	
[37-21%	1 point			
	<u><</u> 20%	0 points			
	> 60%	4 points			
Percentage of Adults with Alcohol	59-39%	3 points			
Percentage of Adults with Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse	38-18%	2 points	SAGE	4	
and/or Drug Abuse	17-5%	1 point			
	<u><</u> 5%	0 points			

	60%	4 points			
Percentage of clients that were	59-39%	3 points			
Chronically Homeless when they	38-18%	2 points	SAGE	4	
entered the project	1-17%	1 point			
	<u><</u> 5%	0 points			
	60%	4 points			
Percentage of Percent with History	59-39%	3 points			
Percentage of Persons with History or Fleeing DV	38-18%	2 points	SAGE	4	
or Fleeling DV	17-5%	1 point			
	< 5%	0 points			

Racial Equity Factors - Narrative Responses

	Response clearly defines an established p feedback from persons with lived experie examples of change in program operation 15 points	ence and cites specific	
Plan to incorporate Lived Experience Feedback	Response shows basic understanding of need for feedback and openness to incorporate change = 7 points		
	Response indicates agency has not attempted to gather		
	feedback or implement changes based on participant input = 0		
	points		
	Max Score:	15	
	Point(s) Awarded:		

	Applicant's plan clearly defines how prog persons have equal access to services = 1		
Plan to Ensure Racial Equity in Service Delivery	Plan shows basic understanding of potential barriers facing persons of color without specific plan to overcome barriers = 7 points		
	Plan is vague and poorly-structured, or information is missing = 0 points		
	Max Score:	15	
Point(s) Awarded:			

3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel Within 5 Within 1 Within 1	budget modifications urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds turn of funds turn of funds low CoC average % average 0% average 5% average 0% average 10% average	5 points 4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points 4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points	5 - 5 - 14	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel Within 5 Within 1 Within 1	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds turn of funds urn of funds low CoC average % average 0% average 5% average 0% average	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points 4 points 3 points 2 points 1 points	5	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel Within 5 Within 1 Within 1	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds turn of funds urn of funds low CoC average % average 0% average 5% average 0% average	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points 4 points 3 points 2 points 1 points	5	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel Within 5 Within 1	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds turn of funds urn of funds low CoC average % average 0% average 5% average	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points 4 points 3 points 2 points	5	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel Within 5	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds turn of funds urn of funds low CoC average % average 0% average	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points 4 points 3 points	5	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel Within 5	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds urn of funds urn of funds ow CoC average % average	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points 4 points	_	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret Equal to or bel	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds turn of funds urn of funds	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points 5 points	_	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re > 15% ret	urn of funds urn of funds curn of funds turn of funds curn of funds	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point 0 points	_	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret 13-14% re	urn of funds urn of funds urn of funds turn of funds	4 points 3 points 2 points 1 point	_	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu 9-11% ret	urn of funds urn of funds :urn of funds	4 points 3 points 2 points	_	Score
3-4% retu 5-8% retu	urn of funds urn of funds	4 points 3 points	_	Score
3-4% retu	urn of funds	4 points	IVIAX	Score
		•	IVIAX	Score
100-98% without budget modifications			iviax	Score
_	Point(s) Awarded:		NA	
Max Score: 15				
mssmg – o pomis				
rian is vague and p nissing = 0 points	oorly-structured, or inf	ormation is		
N :				
afety planning and	d resource linkages = 7	points		
Plan shows basic understanding of the importance of				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
• •		am will ensure		
• •	arly defines how progr			
vi	persons are assi th community re	persons are assisted with safety planni th community resources = 15 points		persons are assisted with safety planning and linked th community resources = 15 points

St. Clair County Continuum of Care **New Project Scoring Tool** Threshold Questions (Pass/Fail) **Required Attachment** Received Yes/No Evidence of Agency's Not-For-501(c)3 Letter Profi<u>t Status</u> Agreement to Participate in CoC Coordinated Entry Letter and HMIS (or comparable database) Coordinated Entry/HMIS Match Letter of Intent from Agency Most Recent Audit Audited Financial Statement from last completed fiscal year Evidence of HMIS Participation (or CoC APR for prior program year **Project Supports the Needs of the CoC Community Criteria** Category **Scoring Ruberic** Source Max Score Critical Shortage 4 points Project Type - Need for various **HUD Annual CoC** Shortage 3 points project type in the CoC based on Population and the demographics of the homeless Subpopulation 4 Saturation 2 points population and subpopulation Report, and Project groups application Over-Saturation 1 point Category **Scoring Ruberic** Source Max Score Critical Shortage 4 points Project Location - geographical Project Application Shortage 3 points area served by the various project and United States Saturation 2 points Census Data type Over-Saturation 1 point **Scoring Ruberic** Category Source Max Score Critical Shortage 4 points **HUD Annual CoC** 3 points Population Served - subpopulation Shortage Population and group served within the CoC by Saturation 2 points Subpopulation Report, and Project project type application 1 point Over-Saturation Category **Scoring Ruberic** Source Max Score Housing First - barriers to program Interview attached to 1 Point for each "yes" in a 10 question interview 10 entry requirements project application Category **Scoring Ruberic** Source Max Score Rapid Rehousing - Increase of RRH Rapid Rehousing Project 1 Point Project Application beds in the CoC 0 Points Non-Rapid Rehousing Project **Scoring Ruberic** Max Score Source Permanent Supportive Housing -Fits needs 1 Point Housing type fits the needs of Project Application Does not fit needs 0 Points target population **Scoring Ruberic** Max Score Category Source Mainstream Services - plans to Engages mainstream services 1 Point connect and engage with Project Application 1 mainstream services Does not engage mainstream services 0 Points **Scoring Ruberic** Max Score Category Source Membership 1 Point CoC Membership- partnership or Attendance Rosters 1 engagement with Coc and Meeting Minutes Non-Membership 0 Points Page **7** of **9**

Category	Scoring Ru	uberic	Source	Max	Score
	Plan gives detailed consideration past experience, details of plans, and impact on Systems Performance Measures	4 points			
Permanent Housing Placement and Rentention- Project plans to	Plan gives a sufficient consideration of past experience, details of plans, and impact on System Performance Measures	3 points	Desirat Application		
increase the percentage of persons who obtain and retain permanent housing	Plan gives a vague consideration of past experience, details of plans, and impact on System Performance Measures	2 points	Project Application	on 4 Max on 4	
	Plan mentions that there is a plan to help participants obtain and retain permanent housing	1 point			
Category	Scoring Ro	uberic	Source	Max	Score
Cook brown Cookb Desirable	Response gives detailed plan to increase cash income	4 points			
Cash Income Growth - Project's plan to increase the percentage of persons who increase cash from	Response gives a sufficient plan to increase cash income	3 points	Project Application		
employment and non- employment resources	Response gives a vague plan to increase cash income	2 points	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	Response mentions a plan to increase cash income	1 point		Max 4	
Category	Scoring R	uberic	Source	Max	Score
	Response gives a detailed plan to	4 points			
eturns to Homelessness - roject's plan to decrease number	decrease returns to homelessness Response gives a sufficient plan to decrease returns to homelessness	3 points	_		
of persons who return to homelessness after exiting the	Response gives a vague plan to decrease returns to homelessness	2 points	Project Application	Max 4 Max 6	
project	Response mentions a plan to decrease returns to homelessness	1 point]		
Category	Scoring Ri	uberic	Source	Max	Score
VICTIM SERVICE PROVIDER: Plan to ensure all clients are assisted with safety planning and connected to community resources.	Applicant's plan clearly defines how pro assisted with safety planning and linked 6points Plan shows basic understanding of the in resource linkages = 3 points Plan is vague and poorly-structured, or i	with community resources = mportance of safety planning and	Project Application	6	
	Severity of Nee	ods Critoria		Max 4 Max 4	
	Severity of Nee	eus Criteria			
Category	Scoring R	uberic	Source	Max	Score
Racial Equity - project's ability to identify service participation	Response indicates focus on racial equity	4 points			
barriers experienced by persons of color and implement effective	Response gives a sufficient plan to decrease returns to homelessness	3 points	Project Application	4	
strategies to make it easier for minority persons to access	Response gives a vague plan to decrease returns to homelessness	2 points	-		
services	Response mentions a plan to decrease returns to homelessness	1 point			
Category	Scoring Ri	uberic	Source	Max	Score
Chronically Homeless - projects	Response indicates strong project focus and support of chronically homeless Response indicates sufficient focus	4 points			
focus on addressing the needs of the chronically homeless	and support of chronically homeless	3 points	Project Application	on 4 Max on 4 Max tion 6 Max Max	
subpopulation	Response indicates minimal focus and support of chronically homeless Response mentions focus and support	2 points	_		
	of chronically homeless	1 point			

Improving System Performance Measures

Category	Scoring Ru	uberic	Source	Max	Score
	Response includes detailed plan to support the mentally anphysically disabled subpopulations	4 points			
Mentally and Physically Disabled- project focus on addressing the	Response includes a sufficient plan to support the mentally and physically disabled subpopulations	3 points	Draiget Application		
needs of the mentally and physically disabled subpopulation	Responses includes a vague plan to support the mentally and physically disabled subpopulations	2 points	Project Application		
	Response mentions a plan top suppor the mentally and physically disabled subpopulations	1 point			
Category	Scoring Ru	uberic	Source	Max	Score
Lived Experience - Project's plan to incorporate feedback from	Response indicates a commitment and detailed plan to solicit and incorporate feedback from persons with lived experience	4 points			
persons with lived experience of homelessness into its policies and	Response gives a sufficient plan to solicit feedback	2 points	Project Application	Max 4	
procedures.	Response gives vague plan to support households without children	0 points			
		Max Score	9	-	50
		Total Project S	core		