

CoC Debriefing Summary | FY 2013

CoC Name: Dearborn/Dearborn Heights/Westland/Wayne County Co
 CoC Number: MI-502
 High Score: 143.25
 Low Score: 45.00

This chart indicates the maximum amount of points available for each scoring category and the actual score the CoC received.

Scoring Category	Maximum Score (Points)	CoC Score (Points)
<i>CoC Strategic Planning and Performance</i>	69	52
<i>CoC Coordination of Housing and Services</i>	28	18
<i>Recipient Performance</i>	15	6
<i>CoC Housing, Services, and Structure</i>	13	9
<i>Leveraging</i>	5	0
<i>Homeless Management Information System</i>	11	10
<i>Point-in-Time Count</i>	9	7
CoC Application Score	150	102
<i>Bonus Points</i>	6	2
Total CoC Score with Bonus Points	156	104

Competition Summary:

- More than \$1.7 billion was awarded in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 portion of the FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program Competition.
- The FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program Competition NOFA applies for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.
 - Collaborative Applicants were required to complete the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application for which the score received covers both fiscal years.
 - Project applicants completed the FY 2013 project applications for FY 2013 funds and will be required to complete the FY 2014 project applications for FY 2014 funds.
- There were 15 Collaborative Applicants who requested Unified Funding Agency (UFA) designation. Two (2) Collaborative Applicants were awarded UFA designation in FY 2013: CA-606 and OH-503.
- The FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program Competition NOFA included 7 policy priorities:
 - Strategic Resource Allocation;
 - Ending Chronic Homelessness;
 - Ending Family Homelessness;
 - Removing Barriers to CoC Resources;
 - Maximizing the Use of Mainstream Resources;
 - Building Partnerships; and
 - Other Priority Populations.
- For the FY 2013 portion of the FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program Competition, the national Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) amount exceeded the \$1.7 billion available

after adjustments were made as a result of sequestration. CoCs were required to rank all projects applying for grant funds – renewal projects, new projects created through reallocation, CoC planning and UFA costs projects.

- CoCs were instructed to prioritize all projects and to notify project applicants if their projects were accepted or rejected 15 days prior the CoC Program Competition application submission deadline of February 3, 2014. All new projects created through reallocation, CoC Planning, UFA costs, and renewal project applications were required to be ranked on the CoC Priority Listing, using a unique ranking number for each project.
- The FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application was redesigned, placing the strategic planning and performance together so that Collaborative Applicants could report on the CoC's performance and then provide information about their plan to improve or maintain performance.
- The FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program Competition NOFA included detailed scoring information about each section, with a breakdown of possible points and a description of how the CoC could receive the maximum score available.
- The CoC Consolidated Application had two parts: the CoC Application and the Project Priority Listing, which included the locally approved and ranked project applications. Both the CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listing must have been submitted for the CoC Consolidated Application to be considered complete and received by the application submission deadline.
- The tiers in the FY 2013 CoC Program Competition were financial thresholds. Tier 1 was equal to the CoC's ARD approved in the Registration process less 5 percent or as approved by HUD during the 7-day grace period which ended December 4, 2013. Tier 2 was the remaining amount of FY 2013 ARD plus the approved amounts for CoC planning and UFA costs.
- A project application was required for both renewal and new projects created through reallocation, CoC planning, and UFA costs projects. Renewal project applicants were only required to verify basic project and budget information, and certify the request for renewal. New project applicants had to complete the project application in its entirety, including selection of the requested initial grant term, in order to be considered for funding.
- All renewal projects that were prioritized in Tier 1 and met project quality and threshold requirements received one year of funding. All new projects that were prioritized in Tier 1 and **met project quality and threshold requirements** were awarded funding.
- Transitional and permanent housing projects that were prioritized in Tier 2 and met project quality and threshold requirements were awarded. Other types of projects prioritized in Tier 2, including HMIS, SSO, CoC planning, and UFA costs, were not awarded because there was not enough funding.
- Due to funding limitations, the only new projects CoCs could have applied for were those created through reallocation, CoC planning, and UFA costs (if applicable). Due to funding limitations, CoCs could not apply for Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN), even if PPRN was higher than the CoC's ARD.
- The FY 2013 Tier 1 renewal awards were announced April 8, 2014.
- The FY 2013 Tier 2 renewal awards were announced June 19, 2014.
- The FY 2013 New, CoC Planning, and UFA Costs awards were announced June 19, 2014.
- There was no minimum CoC Application score required to receive new projects. However, CoC Applications with higher scores had a better chance of being awarded projects ranked in Tier 2. These scores will also be used for the conditional selection of project applications in the FY 2014 funding process.

- New projects created through reallocation were limited to new permanent supportive housing projects that serve people experiencing chronic homelessness as defined in 24 CFR 578.3 and new rapid re-housing projects for homeless households with children coming from the streets or emergency shelters.
- Some of the new project applications created through reallocation requested an amount high than the amount made available through reallocation. This resulted in the request amounts being reduced. For example, a CoC may have only reallocated \$10,000 and a new reallocated project requested \$15,000. In these cases, the new reallocated project was reduced to \$10,000, the amount available for reallocation.
- In order for a new project created through reallocation to be considered for conditional funding, the CoC Application had to clearly state that it was using reallocation on the Reallocation Forms. In a few cases, the CoC selected "No" to both reallocation questions which resulted in HUD rejecting new projects created through reallocation.
- Other than CoC planning and UFA costs, any new project application submitted by a CoC that did not reallocate funds was rejected entirely.
- Renewal project application budgets were expected to match the final HUD-approved FY 2013 Grant Inventory Worksheets (GIWs). Project application budgets that exceeded the Annual Renewal Amount (ARA) on the final HUD-approved GIW were reduced to match the amount approved by HUD on the GIW.
- Similarly, renewal rental assistance projects were expected to match the HUD-approved GIW unit configuration as reflected on the final HUD-approved GIW. Any renewal rental assistance that submitted a project application with a different unit mix had the unit configuration changed to the final HUD-approved GIW unit configuration.
- There were a total of 6 bonus points possible:
 - 2 bonus points were awarded to CoCs where 100 percent of the project applications requested 7 percent or less in project administration costs. The key is that all projects submitted by the CoC, renewal and new, must have met this goal – any CoC awarded these points on the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application must ensure that ALL project applications submitted in the FY 2014 funding process remain at 7 percent or lower;
 - 2 bonus points were awarded to CoCs where no SSO projects (excluding those that were awarded in the FY 2012 CoC Program Competition for coordinated assessment) were prioritized in Tier 1; and
 - 2 bonus points were awarded to CoCs that accurately and completely included all submitted project applications on the HUD-2991 form (Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan).
- No CoCs were approved to serve persons defined as homeless under paragraph (3) of the definition of homeless in 24 CFR 583.5. As the CoC Application covers 2 funding years, FY 2013 and FY 2014, no project application will be permitted to use HUD funds to serve this population for FY 2013 or FY 2014.

Points to Consider:

- It is imperative that CoCs have a full accounting of ALL CoC-funded projects within their geographies. This includes knowing the total number of CoC-funded projects, the types of projects, and their expiration dates. All eligible renewal grants must be indicated on the final HUD-approved Grant Inventory Worksheet.
- Only those renewal projects that had an operating end date in calendar year 2014 were eligible for renewal.

- As stated in the FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program NOFA, ineligible renewal projects were removed from a CoC's ARD prior to determining the final National ARD for the award process.
- Any FY 2012 new project applications, excluding CoC planning projects that did not go to grant agreement by December 31, 2013 were also removed from a CoC's GIW which resulted in a reduction of the CoC ARD by the amount of the project removed.
- Each year, changes are made to the annual CoC Program Competition NOFA. The categories, emphasis, and scoring issues discussed in this debriefing apply specifically to the FY 2013 portion of the FY2013 and FY2014 CoC Program Competition. However, in relation to the FY 2014 funding process, CoCs, Collaborative Applicants, and project applications must carefully review the FY 2014 Funding Notice as there are changes.
- It is the responsibility of the CoC and project applicants to ensure that all questions are fully addressed.
- Many CoCs and project applicants received less than full points on questions, because the questions were not completely answered or they repeated the same answer in several questions where it was not relevant.
- All CoC and project applications had to be completed in full as previous year's information was not imported. On-screen instructions, detailed instructions, instructional guides, and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) were available on the OneCPD Resource Exchange (which is now the HUD Exchange).
- Project applicants that requested lower funding or fewer units than what they were eligible to apply received the lesser amount or fewer units and will not be able to apply for the higher ARA in future competitions.
- Project applicants were required to give a project description on Form 3B. of the project application. The project description should have addressed the entire scope of the proposed project and fully answered the question as outlined by the Hide/Show instructions. For renewal projects, a simple copy and paste from the previous application may not have fully addressed the entire question.
- Project application budgets were reduced accordingly if they exceeded the available ARA, the amount available through reallocation, the maximum allowed for CoC planning, or the maximum allowed for UFA costs. This included reductions due to unauthorized changes to the rental assistance unit configuration.
- New permanent housing (PSH or RRH) project applications that requested an amount entirely outside of the reallocation process were rejected.
- If a project's application budget was reduced to the point where it was not enough to fund 1 unit or serve 1 person in the project, the reduced project was rejected.
- As no CoCs were approved to serve persons covered under paragraph (3) of the definition of homeless in 24 CFR 583.5. Project applications that indicated they would serve persons defined as homeless under paragraph 3 were conditioned and required to confirm that the project(s) will only serve persons who are eligible.
- New permanent housing (PSH or RRH) projects that stated participants would come from transitional housing projects were conditioned and must agree that all participants will come from eligible locations:
 - PSH participants can only come from the streets, other places not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, or safe havens.
 - RRH participants can only come from the streets or emergency shelters.
- Overall, it was apparent that many CoC and project applicants did not fully read the provided detailed instructions and/or Hide/Show instructions for each application type. The responses provided to the questions within the applications were either

incomplete or unresponsive. This resulted in lower CoC scores as evident by the median CoC score, and rejected project applications.

Reallocation:

- As mentioned previously, other than CoC planning and UFA costs, the only new project applications allowed were those that were reallocated from eligible renewal projects.
- For those eligible renewal project applications that were reallocated in part, meaning a portion of their eligible renewal funding was reallocated to create a new project:
- The renewal project will be required to continue to serve the same number of homeless persons, with the same number of units, and the same level of service. For those eligible renewal projects that were reallocated in whole, meaning all of the eligible renewal funding for a project was reallocated to create a new project:
- When the operating year ends in calendar year 2014, the project will no longer receive HUD funding and therefore, must retain other sources of funding to continue operations or find other suitable projects in which it can transfer participants. New projects created through reallocation that were awarded funds:
 - Are not a continuation of reallocated renewal projects.
 - Cannot serve the same participants that currently reside in the reallocated renewal projects:
 - New Permanent Supportive Housing projects serving chronically homeless participants as defined in 24 CFR 578.3. Participants who come from transitional housing projects are ineligible.
 - New Rapid Re-housing projects can only serve those who come directly from the streets or emergency shelters. Participants who come from transitional housing projects are ineligible.
 - Participants who are fleeing domestic violence are eligible for both types of permanent housing projects so long as they are coming from one of the eligible locations (i.e., the streets, other places not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, or safe havens). Transitional housing is not an eligible location.

FY 2013 Point Structure:

For the FY2013 CoC Program Competition, HUD awarded up to 150 total points for all scoring categories: CoC Strategic Planning and Performance; CoC Coordination of Housing and Services; Recipient Performance; CoC Housing, Services, and Structure; Leveraging; Homeless Management Information System; and Point-in-Time Count. A detailed explanation of each category is provided below to assist your continuum in its self-evaluation

Part I: CoC Strategic Planning and Performance – 69 possible points

In this section, HUD reviewed CoC Applications based on the CoC's plan for and progress to reduce homelessness and decrease the number of recurrences of homelessness. HUD focused on chronic homelessness and particularly those who have had the longest experiences of homelessness. HUD evaluated CoCs on the extent in which their work furthers the achievement of HUD's goals as articulated in HUD's Strategic Plan and *Opening Doors*. CoC scores were awarded based on the following:

- The extent in which CoCs are making progress to end chronic homelessness by 2015. This included how the CoC would increase the number of permanent supportive housing beds for chronically homeless persons through new project requests and either current or committed use of existing permanent supportive housing beds that are not already dedicated to serve chronically homeless persons (prioritization). For a CoC to receive maximum points in this section, it needed to demonstrate that it will increase the number of available permanent supportive housing beds dedicated to chronically homeless persons and that it would prioritize the chronically homeless in at least 85% of their non-dedicated permanent supportive housing turnover beds.
- The extent to which participants obtain and maintain permanent supportive housing or permanent housing and how CoCs demonstrated success. HUD was looking for at least 80 percent of participants either obtaining or maintaining permanent supportive housing or permanent housing and the CoC's plan to improve housing stability.
- The extent to which CoC-Program funded projects assisted participants to increase income through employment and non-employment sources. This is one way to ensure housing stability and decrease the possibility of returning to homelessness. In this section, it was crucial to distinguish between income growth through EMPLOYMENT and income growth through NON-EMPLOYMENT sources.
- The extent to which CoC-Program funded projects assisted participants in obtaining mainstream benefits. CoC-funded projects had to demonstrate that they had a systematic approach to assisting homeless persons identify and apply for mainstream benefits for other federal programs such as TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, SCHIP, WIC, etc. This included assisting participants in applying for mainstream benefits, supplying transportation to appointments, use of a single application for multiple types of benefits, and follow-up procedures to ensure mainstream benefits were received.
- The last objective was brand new in FY 2013. It asked Collaborative Applicants to provide information about how they would increase the number of homeless households with children that would receive assistance through rapid re-housing that was funded from ANY source. CoCs also had to provide information related to the written standards they have in place for those rapid re-housing projects.
- Section 1 of the NOFA also included questions related to the following:
 - The extent in which CoCs were incorporating the goals of *Opening Doors* into local plans. To be fully responsive, the Collaborative Applicant had to describe how each of the four goals of *Opening Doors* were being incorporated in the CoC, the progress made to date, and whether the CoC was on target to meet each goal.
 - How CoCs were assessing and removing existing barriers to entry in projects funded through the CoC program and the Emergency Solution Grants program, or ESG. Collaborative Applicants needed to describe specific barriers that currently exist, the manner in which barriers were assessed, and the specific steps the CoC will take to reduce those barriers.
 - If the Collaborative Applicant described an outreach plan to end homelessness among households with dependent children, particularly those in unsheltered situations. Many Collaborative Applicants only generally discussed what they are doing to address family homelessness but did not specifically mention the CoCs outreach plan which resulted in lost points.
 - How the Collaborative Applicant addressed the needs of domestic violence survivors. Collaborative Applicants were expected to provide information on the existing projects that serve this population, which most did, but they also needed to describe what policies are in place within the CoC to ensure safety and privacy.

- How the CoC was identifying and engaging unsheltered homeless persons. Most CoCs talked generally about how they conduct outreach to persons that are unsheltered but did not go into detail about the specific outreach plan to reach this population.
- How the Collaborative Applicant describes the CoC's efforts to end youth and veteran homelessness. In this case, many CoCs did not demonstrate how they coordinate with the local VA and VA funded programs to provide housing and services to veterans, or they did not explain how available CoC Program or ESG funding is used to serve those veterans that are not eligible for VA funded housing or services, including those veterans who were dishonorably discharged.

Summary of CoC Results on Part I:

- Overall, failure to read and follow all instructions and training materials that were provided for this competition resulted in a loss of points in each section of Part I.
- Many CoCs did not adhere to the instructions on how to demonstrate numeric achievements, specific steps toward meeting the numeric goals, or identifying stakeholders by name.
- Most CoCs provided partial answers to the questions in this section and did not provide fully detailed information which affected the score for each question in the section that was scored.
- CoCs that received full points typically provided a list of specific steps, detail on how each step would be accomplished and by when, and who was responsible for implementing the steps.
- On average, only 47% of CoCs' non-dedicated permanent supportive housing turnover beds become prioritized for chronically homeless persons in 2013.
- The majority of CoCs demonstrated that they met the housing stability goal of 80% in 2013, with an overall average among all CoCs of 85%. By 2015 CoCs are projecting to improve to an overall average of 87% achieving housing stability. The majority of CoCs demonstrated that they met the goal of increasing the number of participants obtaining mainstream benefits to 56% with an overall average of 64% of participants obtaining mainstream benefits in 2013. Again, CoCs are committing to improvement with a projected increase of the overall average to 70% in 2015.
- Many CoCs do not currently have any rapid re-housing programs and also indicated that they do not plan to create them, and as a result, they lost points.

Part II: CoC Coordination of Housing and Services - 28 possible points

For this section, CoCs were to provide information that demonstrates the coordination of their housing and service resources with other systems of care that serve homeless persons and that housing and services within the CoC are coordinated. Additionally, CoC's were evaluated on previous performance regarding the following areas:

- **Preventing Homelessness**: Collaborative Applicants were asked to describe their efforts and strategy to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless **and** the extent in which that strategy has been successful.
- **Discharge planning**: Collaborative Applicants had to describe the extent in which they are working to ensure that persons being discharged from a publicly-funded institution or system of care are not released into homelessness.
- **Consolidated Plan**: Consolidated Plans for the jurisdiction(s) within the CoC had to include the CoC's strategic plan goals for addressing and reducing homelessness.
- **Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing**: Collaborative Applicants had to demonstrate that they have marketing practices in place that affirmatively further fair housing by marketing housing to persons that are the least likely to access

housing absent special outreach. To receive full credit, responses to this question needed to be specific to marketing and also describe how the CoC determined which populations were underserved.

- **ESG Coordination**: CoCs were scored on the extent in which the CoC consults with the ESG jurisdiction or jurisdictions to determine allocation of ESG funding. Many CoCs lost points in this area. To receive maximum points, the response needed to specifically address both the 2012 and 2013 allocations. Collaborative Applicants also had to provide a description of how performance of ESG-funded projects is evaluated.
- **Coordination with other funding sources**: Collaborative Applicants had to provide information about the extent in which they coordinate with other programs, however, the list of programs that needed to be included was new this year. To receive maximum points, Collaborative Applicants had to describe how they participate in and coordinates with other funding and service opportunities including Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Runaway and Homeless Youth, Head Start, philanthropic organizations and foundations, and other housing and service programs funded through Federal, State, or local government resources.
- **Coordination with Public Housing Authorities**: HUD asked Collaborative Applicants to describe the extent in which they are collaborating with one or more PHAs within the CoCs' geographic area. Overall, the vast majority of CoCs received full points for this question. CoCs lost points if they did not specify an actual PHA with which they are coordinating.
- **Coordinated Assessment**: Collaborative Applicants also had to discuss the extent in which they have implemented and are currently operating, a coordinated assessment system. Maximum points were awarded to CoCs where it was clear that the system was already in place and how it is used throughout the entire geography of their CoC.
- **Adopting a Housing First Model**: Collaborative Applicants had to address the extent in which their Permanent Supportive Housing projects have adopted a Housing First approach. Points were given based on the extent in which the permanent supportive housing projects submitted for a particular CoC indicated that they were following a Housing First approach.
- **Educational Assurances**: CoCs were also scored on the extent in which there are established policies in place requiring homeless service providers to ensure that all children are enrolled in an educational program and connected to services within the community. In another question, Collaborative Applicants had to describe how their CoCs collaborate with local education authorities to identify homeless households and make sure they are informed of eligibility for services under subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- **Preventing Involuntary Separation**: New this year, CoCs were scored on the extent in which they had policies in place that prohibit practices in emergency shelters and housing programs funded under ESG and CoC that would deny admission to families with children under the age of 18 OR that would separate families, frequently a male son between the ages of 15 and 18, within their housing. To receive full points, Collaborative Applicants needed to acknowledge that the CoCs have a written policy in place, OR where policies do not currently exist, Collaborative Applicants had to describe the steps they would take to develop and implement written policies.
- **Affordable Care Act**: Collaborative Applicants had to discuss how the CoCs and homeless assistance providers within their geographic areas are participating in

enrollment and outreach activities related to helping participants take advantage of the Affordable Care Act.

- **Accessing Other Funding Resources for Supportive Services:** The last question in this section was related to how CoCs are working to maximize the extent in which NON-CoC Program funding is used to pay for supportive services. While the CoC Program allows for payment of certain supportive services costs, it is more efficient for CoCs to use OTHER funding resources whenever possible so that HUD funds can be used for housing related costs. CoCs were scored on the extent in which they demonstrated the steps being taken to work with CoC Program funded providers to access services funded from OTHER resources.

Summary of CoC Results on Part II:

- Overall, failure to read and follow all instructions and training materials that were provided for this competition resulted in a loss of points in each section of Part II.
- Many CoCs lost points in the Preventing Homelessness section because they did not include the extent in which they are coordinating with ESG specifically.
- Many improved their overall discharge planning scores by providing clear descriptions of the policies and procedures that were either being developed or already in place.
- Overall, the vast majority of CoCs received full points for coordinating with Public Housing Agencies. CoCs lost points if they did not specify an actual PHA with which they are coordinating.
- Many Collaborative Applicants provided the same response for each of the Educational Assurances questions, without regard for the distinctions between the two, and consequently did not receive full credit.
- Most CoCs reported some activity related to increasing access to health insurance with the most common reported method of implementation being the use of local in-person assisters that are trained to help individuals enroll in ACA-related programs.

Part III: Recipient Performance – 15 possible points

Scores were based on the extent to which CoCs demonstrated the steps taken to ensure that CoC program funded projects meet the performance expectations outlined by HUD. The criteria included the following:

- The description of the process used to identify consistently low-performing projects and the protocols in place to improve the performance of those projects.
- How the length of time that individuals and families remain homeless will be reduced, including how the CoC will track the length of homeless episodes, the planning process to reduce homelessness, and the use of data from CoC, ESG, and non-HUD funded projects.
- The CoCs outreach strategies for engaging homeless individuals and families, including those with disabilities and limited English proficiency as well as the CoC's strategies for affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Summary of CoC Results on Part III:

- Overall, failure to read and follow all instructions and training materials that were provided for this competition resulted in a loss of points in each section of Part III.
- Most CoCs did not provide a clear process for identify poor-performing projects that included a plan for improving performance.

Part IV: CoC Housing, Services, and Structure – 13 possible points

Under this part, CoCs demonstrated the existence of a coordinated, inclusive, and outcome-oriented community process, including a fair and impartial project review and selection process:

- Consideration of the full range of opinions from individuals or entities with knowledge of homelessness in the geographic area or an interest in preventing or ending homelessness in the geographic area when establishing CoC-wide committees, subcommittees, and workgroups.
- Use of a review and ranking process based on objective criteria that were publicly announced by the CoC. This included a clear demonstration of how project applications were solicited in an open manner and that the project selection process was followed. This also included the methods and process the CoC used to assess project performance, effectiveness, and quality of all requested new and renewal projects and how this was communicated to project applicants.
- CoCs were to indicate an open process to receive proposals from entities that have not previously received funds in prior Homeless Assistance Grants competitions. The description was to specifically describe how the CoC worked with homeless services providers that expressed an interest in applying for HUD funds and what steps were taken to discuss and review proposals as well as provide feedback.

Summary of CoC Results on Part IV:

- Although HUD encourages the primary decision making group to meet at least monthly, almost all CoCs met at least quarterly.
- Most CoCs described their review and ranking process, but did not receive full points because they failed to attach documentation of the public notification of their process and ranking. Many CoCs indicated that they had a process for receiving proposals from entities that had not previously applied for or received CoC funds; however, there was no detail provided on what that process entailed and how entities received notice of the availability of funds

Part V: Leveraging –5 possible points

CoCs were to demonstrate the extent to which the amount of assistance to be provided to the CoC was supplemented with resources from other public and private sources, including mainstream programs.

- CoCs were expected to have 100 percent participation from all project applicants, new and renewal, in leveraging from all project applicants and a minimum of 150 percent in total leveraging.

Summary of CoC Results on Part V:

The vast majority of Collaborative Applicants failed to meet the criteria for demonstrating a high percentage of CoC funds being supplemented with resources from other public and private sources.

Part VI: Homeless Management Information System – 11 possible points

CoCs were to clearly demonstrate a functioning HMIS that facilitates the collection of information on homeless individuals and families using residential and other homeless services and stores the data in an electronic format. It should be noted that although domestic violence and legal service organizations are prohibited from entering data into HMIS, they are required to have a comparable database that supplies aggregated, non-personally identifiable information to the CoC.

- CoCs should have a governance agreement in place and were required to attach the governance agreement to the CoC application.

- CoCs were assessed on the bed coverage rate for each housing type within the CoC that included emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing.
- CoCs were to report the number of unduplicated client records with null or missing values for the Universal Data Elements on a single day, as selected by the CoC, within the last 10 days of January 2013
- CoCs were assessed on the existing HMIS policies and procedures used to ensure that valid program entry and exit dates were recorded in HMIS. CoCs were to specifically describe the existing policies and procedures in place to ensure the dates were accurately captured and audited on a regular basis and demonstrate that an annual review of the HMIS policies and procedures by the CoC and HMIS leads.
- CoCs were to indicate that they were able to generate APR data from the HMIS for CoC-funded projects. This included specific descriptions of how the CoC audits data collection and evaluates the HMIS.

Summary of CoC Results on Part VI:

- Many CoCs indicated that there was a governance agreement in place, but did not attach the governance agreement to the CoC Application.
- CoCs lost points for having a high percentage of null or missing values.
- CoCs lost points for failing to address each question in this section in full.

Part VII: Point-in-Time –9 possible points

CoCs were awarded points based on the collection, use and submission of the 2013 Point-in-Time count data:

- CoCs were to: 1) conduct both a sheltered point-in-time count and an unsheltered point-in-time count during the last 10 days of January 2013; 2) successfully submit the information in HDX by the April 30, 2013 submission date; and 3) clearly demonstrate how the information obtained during the count was used for local planning purposes.
- CoCs were to specifically indicate if there were increases, decreases, or no changes to the sheltered and unsheltered point-in-time count from the previous official counts as well as identify the gaps and needs in the CoC.
- CoCs were to clearly and specifically describe methods used to collect data on sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations and subpopulations.
- CoCs were assessed on the ability to provide data that is accurate and of high quality based on the point-in-time count. Responses should have described how the CoC engaged in activities that reduced the occurrences of counting unsheltered persons more than once during the point in time count.
- CoCs received points for submitting the Housing Inventory Count to HDX by the April 30, 2012 submission deadline.

Summary of CoC Results on Part VI:

- Although CoCs indicated that they conducted a point-in-time count, the numbers provided in the CoC Application did not match the numbers reported in HDX, which resulted in a loss of points.
- Failure to address each question separately resulted in a loss of points. Responses should have demonstrated consistency with HUD's point-in-time guidelines. CoCs are reminded to read the sheltered and unsheltered questions separately, as some questions may appear to be similar but ask for distinct information. A number of CoCs did not indicate if there was an increase or decrease or no change in the count outcomes from the previous count or did not describe the factors that may have

resulted in the increase, decrease, or no change for both the sheltered and unsheltered populations.