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**2017 McKinney-Vento Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Grants**

**2017 LOCAL NEW AND RENEWAL PROJECTS REVIEW PROCESS**

While all decisions about the San Francisco Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review Process are subject to review and approval by the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB), our community values public input and community discussion around all aspects of the CoC. In the event of requirements or policy directives in the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) that necessitate changes to the scoring process, LHCB staff will endeavor to provide a public process for discussion and community input.

* CoC designs a project review process and LHCB approves it prior to NOFA release.
* HomeBase collects Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) and supplemental information as needed.
* HomeBase completes assessment and review of renewal projects and prepares project evaluations.
* After the NOFA is released, application and project review documents are updated to address any unexpected elements of the NOFA. If feasible, the Funding Committee will meet to discuss proposed changes to the application and project review process. All changes are approved by LHCB at next meeting.
* Projects receive preliminary scores with their project evaluations and are invited to provide a narrative response to be considered by the Priority Panel.
* Applicants attend a Bidders’ Conference, receive application materials, and have time to complete and submit their applications.
* LHCB staff will recruit Priority Panel members, prioritizing members who have served as Priority Panelists in the past or who have other relevant experience. Priority Panel members will sign “no conflict of interest” and confidentiality statements.
* All projects will submit applications to DHSH, including a HUD Project Application, required local application materials, and match documentation. All documents should be submitted in-person to [Charles](mailto:charles.minor@sfgov.org) Minor at 1360 Mission St. ***and*** electronically via the instructions on the Proposal Submission Checklist.
  + Late applications received within 48 hours of the due date/time will receive a 15-point score reduction. A 5-point reduction will be applied to any project that fails to submit either the electronic or paper copy of the application by the application deadline. Incomplete applications cannot be cured for Priority Panel scoring, but, if selected for funding by the Priority Panel, must be corrected prior to HUD submission.
* Priority Panel members are trained, as appropriate, and receive applications. Panelists review applications.
* LHCB staff and HomeBase review project applications and provide technical feedback. DHSH/LHCB staff determines whether project thresholds are met.
* If an agency has a grant for a program that it would like to transfer to another program in the agency, perhaps because the original project is not meeting HUD performance expectations or is no longer as needed in the community, that agency may “reallocate to itself.”
  + Agencies considering this option should consult with HSH and/or HomeBase, as grant amendment may be a better option. There are some requirements involved in changing a program via reallocation, including the populations that must be served under the 2017 NOFA.
  + In the competition, only that agency may apply for the earmarked funding as long as the reallocated project application is reasonably strong and is compliant with HUD requirements. The reallocated project application will be scored with the other new projects. The application must score at least on a comparable level with the other new project applications.
    - If the application is reasonably strong, an extra 5 points (parallel to the bonus points for renewal permanent housing) will be added to the final score and the project will be placed in rank order with the renewal projects. The project may be in Tier 1 or Tier 2, depending on its score.
    - If the application is not reasonably strong, the Panel may use the funding for another new project, rank the new project at the bottom of Tier 2, or suggest the agency revert to the old program.
* Priority Panel meets to review and discuss applications together, identify technical assistance needs, and to continue to individually score them. Priority Panel members then finalize individual scores. Scores are added and applications are ranked and placed into either Tier 1 or Tier 2.
  + Renewal projects that are for permanent supportive housing for leasing, rental assistance, or operations will receive 4 bonus points in scoring and will be ranked, and placed in Tiers, with that preference.
  + Renewal projects that are for permanent supportive housing for leasing, rental assistance, or operations and commit all turnover units to housing chronically homeless individuals or families will receive 1 bonus point in scoring and will be ranked, and placed in Tiers, with that preference.
  + Renewal projects that do not yet have performance data for a full year of operation will be held harmless and awarded full points on all scoring factors that cannot be evaluated.
    - First-time renewal housing projects that propose to apply for fewer than 90% of the units in their original New Project application will not be held harmless, and will receive two-thirds points on all scoring factors that cannot be evaluated.
  + Renewal HMIS and Support Services for Coordinated Entry projects will be ranked at the bottom of Tier 1.
  + New HMIS and Support Services for Coordinated Entry project applications will be ranked at the top of Tier 2.
  + If the HUD tier rules allow for projects to “straddle” the tiers, i.e. to fall partially in Tier 1 and partially in Tier 2, then the top-scoring non-HMIS, non-Coordinated Entry project in Tier 2 will be moved to straddle the tiers.
  + New projects will be scored and ranked based on the New Project Scoring Tool.
    - The San Francisco CoC prioritizes projects with established track records in enhancing system performance. To promote system performance by increasing housing stability, preventing returns to homelessness, and shortening episodes of homelessness, new projects that are not “reallocating to themselves” will not be ranked above projects that meet community performance benchmarks for housing stability or increase in income.
    - Except that new projects may be ranked above other projects in Tier 2 according to their scores, to encourage reallocation based on performance.
  + The Priority Panel may also identify projects that should be reallocated, in whole or in part, in favor of a new project. Before making a reallocation recommendation, the Panel must review the project’s past performance for the prior three years.
    - The Panel must review the following materials:
      * The project’s current year performance assessment and application materials,
      * The project’s position on the Panel’s preliminary ranked list for the current year,
      * The San Francisco CoC Priority Listing for the prior two years, and
      * The Project Evaluation Reports compiled by HomeBase for the prior two years.
* Preliminary scoring results are delivered to applicants with a reminder about the appeals process.
* All applicants that are eligible to appeal will receive all Priority Panelist scores in advance of the appeals deadline. Projects facing reallocation will have additional appeal rights (see separate Appeals Policy for more detail). In addition, Priority Panel score sheets will be made available upon written request after the competition closes on September 28, 2017. All applicants can also report any discrepancies in their score sheet, although this is not considered an official appeal.
  + If a panelist assigns a score, for any scoring factor, that is *lower* than the project’s pre-scored points for that factor, that panelist will be asked to explain their decision. Relevant Priority Panel comments on that factor will be provided along with the project’s Priority Panel score sheet.
* Appeals, if any, are reviewed by the Appeals Panel of non-conflicted LHCB Members.
* LHCB meets to consider and approve a final CoC ranked funding list. If any renewal project does not apply for funding or is identified by the Priority Panel as in need of reallocation, that funding may be reallocated to a new project. **The LHCB will make all final decisions about reallocating funding from any project.**
* If funding becomes available after approval of the final ranked list, through reallocation or budget corrections, LHCB staff will offer the excess funding to new project applicants in order of project ranking.
* Projects will submit copies of letters or documentation for all match resources listed in their application.
* Applications will be submitted with the city-wide application and applicants will be invited to attend the 2017 NOFA Debrief.

The process is welcoming to persons with disabilities, persons who have experienced homelessness, and persons with limited English proficiency. If you need any accommodations, please contact Charles Minor at [Charles.Minor@sfgov.org](mailto:charles.minor@sfgov.org) or 415-355-5209.
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**APPEALS POLICY and PROCESS**

Applicants may appeal if: (1) the project is not funded or receives less funding than the amount in the application; (2) the project is ranked in Tier 2 of the CoC application (in which the applicants funding may be at risk); or (3) the project falls into the bottom portion of Tier 1, as described below. All notices of appeal must be based on the information submitted by the application due date. No new or additional information will be considered, unless the project is facing reallocation. Omissions to the application cannot be appealed. The decision of the Appeal Committee will be final.

The Appeal Committee will be made up of three (3) members of the Local Homeless Coordinating Board**,** along with one non-voting representative from the Priority Panel. The voting members will not have participated on the original Priority Panel or have a conflict of interest with any of the agencies applying for McKinney funding. The role of the Appeal Committee is to read and review only those areas of the application that are being appealed.

**PROCESS**

* A preliminary ranked CoC Program funding list is posted.
* Each agency will have one (1) business day to request copies of their score sheets, including relevant panel comments. Programs will contact HomeBase at [sfNOFA@homebaseccc.org](mailto:sf@homebaseccc.org) to request score sheets. Once requested, score sheets will be emailed to programs.
* Eligible Appeals: Any project that is 1) not funded or receives less funding than the amount in the application; 2) a renewal project that is ranked in Tier 2 of the CoC application (in which the applicant’s funding may be at risk); or 3) falls into the bottom portion of Tier 1 that equals the Tier 2 amount may appeal the application’s score based on their score sheets. The preliminary CoC Program project funding list will indicate which applications fall into these categories at the time it is posted.
* Any sponsor agency may report any discrepancies in their score sheet to Charles Minor at (415) 355-5209 for the purpose of avoiding such errors in scoring in future years, and such report will not constitute an appeal.
* Any and all appeals must be received in writing within the two (2) and a half business-day appeal period; therefore, all written appeals for applications that are eligible to appeal at the time the preliminary McKinney project priority list is posted must be received by **12:00 p.m. on September 6, 2017 via email.**
* All notices of appeal must be submitted electronically to HomeBase at [sfNOFA@homebaseccc.org](mailto:sf@homebaseccc.org) **AND** Charles Minor at [Charles.Minor@sfgov.org](mailto:charles.minor@sfgov.org). Please note that appeals sent only to [Charles.Minor@sfgov.org](mailto:charles.minor@sfgov.org) will not be considered.
* The notice of appeal must include a written statement specifying in detail each and every one of the grounds asserted for the appeal. The appeal must be signed by an individual authorized to represent the sponsor agency (i.e., Executive Director) and must include (highlight and/or cite) the specific sections of the application on which the appeal is based. The appealing agency must specify facts and evidence sufficient for the Appeal Committee to determine the validity of the appeal. That is, the notice of appeal must have attached the specific areas of the application being appealed and must also clearly explain why the information provided is adequate to gain additional points.
* If a program is facing reallocation, in part or in whole, the appealing agency may submit a more robust appeal. These appeals can include any information the agency feels is relevant, whether or not it was included in the project’s original application. The program will also be given the opportunity to make a brief in-person presentation to the Appeal Committee.
* The Appeal Committee will review and evaluate all notices of appeal and decide whether or not the appeal has any validity based on the appeal policy.
* All valid appeals will be read, reviewed and evaluated by the Appeal Committee.
* The Appeal Committee will hear any in-person presentations by projects facing reallocation. The appealing agency can send up to two staff members to the presentation. The presentation is limited to 5 minutes. Following the presentation, the Appeal Committee will have the opportunity to ask questions of the appealing agency. The results of the in-person presentation will not have an effect on the project’s rank; it can only be used to reverse a decision to reallocate funds. The decision of the Appeal Committee will be released after deliberation.
* Appeal Committee deliberates.
* Agencies will receive, in writing, the decision of the Appeal Committee within 2 business days.
* Appeals Panel List is submitted for consideration and approval by LHCB.

2017 McKinney-Vento Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Grants

**2017 RENEWAL PROJECT SCORING TOOL**

**THRESHOLD CRITERIA**

**(Required but not scored. If “no” for any threshold criteria, the project is ineligible.)**

| **Item** | **Maximum Available Score** |
| --- | --- |
| **HMIS Implementation:** Projects that do not participate in HMIS are not eligible for funding, unless the project is a victim-service agency, serving survivors of domestic violence, or a legal services agency. | N/A |
| **Coordinated Assessment:** Projects that have not agreed to participate in Coordinated Assessment, when it is available for the project type, are not eligible for funding, unless the project is a victim-service agency or serving survivors of domestic violence. | N/A |
| **CoC Strategic Plan Compliance:** Project aligns with the San Francisco CoC Strategic Plan. | N/A |
| **Equal Access:** The project ensures equal access for program participants regardless of sexual orientation or gender identify, in compliance with federal law and the 2017 CoC Program NOFA. | N/A |
| **Training and Technical Assistance:** All projects must agree to be responsive to training and technical assistance from the Collaborative Applicant and the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB). | N/A |
| **Substantially Changed Systems:** All projects agree to inform LHCB and Collaborative Applicant if they have key personnel changes or substantially changed systems (such as changes to client admissions criteria). | N/A |
| **Recent Financial Statement:** Projects must provide an up to date (within last 21 months) audited financial statement, and single audit (if applicable) | N/A |

**STATEMENT OF POLICY**

All of the Scored Criteria in this tool measure renewal projects’ contribution to improving the San Francisco Continuum of Care’s System Performance by strengthening the overall system of care, through data collection, coordination, prioritization, and improved client outcomes. Certain scoring factors relate to specific HUD System Performance Measures, as enumerated in each factor.

**SCORED CRITERIA**

| **Item** | | | | | | **Maximum Available Score** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Program Performance and Client Outcomes** | | | | | **47** | |
| **1a** | Performance on 2017 San Francisco CoC Performance Measures compared to other similar projects.  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 2, 3, 4, 7* | | | | | 17 points.\*\* | |
| 1b | **Projects may receive points under any one of the following criteria based on outcomes reported in the APR:** | | | | |  | |
| 1b1 | If ***Permanent Supportive Housing or Services to Persons in PSH project***: Percentage of project participants\* that achieve housing stability in an operating year, by remaining in permanent housing or exiting to permanent housing, is at least 80%.  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7* | | | | | 10 pts.\*\* 98-100%  9 pts. 94-97.9%  8 pts. 90-93.9%  7 pts. 86-89.9%  6 pts. 82-85.9%  5 pts. 78-81.9%  4 pts. 75-77.9%  3 pts. 72-74.9%  2 pts. 70-71.9%  0 pts. <70% | |
| 1b2 | If ***Rapid Rehousing or Services to Rapid Rehousing project***: The percentage of project participants\* that achieve housing stability in an operating year, by exiting to permanent housing, is at least 80%.  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7* | | | | | 10 pts.\*\* 90-100%  9 pts. 85-89.9%  8 pts. 80-84.9%  7 pts. 75-79.9%  6 pts. 70-74.9%  5 pts. 65-69.9%  4 pts. 62-64.9%  3 pts. 59-61.9%  2 pts. 55-58.9%  0 pts. <55% | |
| 1b3 | If ***Transitional Housing for Youth***: The percentage of project participants\* that achieve housing stability in an operating year, by exiting to permanent housing, is at least 70%.  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7* | | | | | 10 pts.\*\* 80-100%  9 pts. 75-79.9%  8 pts. 70-74.9%  7 pts. 65-69.9%  6 pts. 60-64.9%  5 pts. 55-59.9%  4 pts. 52-54.9%  3 pts. 49-51.9%  2 pts. 45-48.9%  0 pts. <45% | |
| 1b4 | If ***Other Services-Only project***: The percentage of leavers in all CoC-funded projects that obtained or maintained non-cash mainstream benefits at project exit is at least 56%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | | | 10 pts.\*\* 92-100%  9 pts. 83-91.9%  8 pts. 74-82.9%  7 pts. 65-73.9%  6 pts. 56-64.9%  5 pts. 47-55.9%  4 pts. 38-46.9%  3 pts. 29-37.9%  2 pts. 20-28.9%  1 pts. 1-19.9%  0 pts. 0% | |
| **1c** | **Projects may receive points under any one of the following criteria based on outcomes reported in the APR:** | | | | |  | |
| 1c1 | If ***Permanent Supportive Housing Project***: The percentage of participants that increase income from entry to follow up/exit is at least 20%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | | | **Permanent Supportive Housing** | |
| 10 pts.\*\* 80-100%  9 pts. 60-79.9.9%  8 pts. 45-59.9%  7 pts. 25-44.9%  6 pts. 20-24.9%  5 pts. 15-19.9%  4 pts. 11-14.9%  3 pts. 8-10.9%  2 pts. 5-7.9%  1 pts. 1-4.9%  0 pts. 0% | |
| 1c2 | If ***Rapid Re-Housing, Transitional Housing for Youth, or Supportive Services Only Project***: The percentage of leavers that increase income from entry to exit is at least \_\_%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | **Rapid Re-Housing** | **Transitional Housing for Youth** | | **Supportive Services Only** |
| 10 pts.\*\* 95-100%  9 pts. 85-94.9%  8 pts. 75-84.9%  7 pts. 65-74.9%  6 pts. 54-64.9%  5 pts. 44-53.9%  4 pts. 34-43.9%  3 pts. 24-33.9%  2 pts. 10-23.9%  1 pts. 1-9.9%  0 pts. 0-.9% | 10 pts.\*\* 85-100%  9 pts. 70-84.9%  8 pts. 50-69.9%  7 pts. 45-49.9%  6 pts. 40-44.9%  5 pts. 20-39.9%  4 pts. 15-19.9%  3 pts. 10-14.9%  2 pts. 5-9.9%  1 pts. 2-4.9%  0 pts. 0-1.9% | | 10 pts.\*\* 95-100%  9 pts. 80-94.9%  8 pts. 60-79.9%  7 pts. 40-59.9%  6 pts. 30-39.9%  5 pts. 20-29.9%  4 pts. 15-19.9%  3 pts. 10-14.9%  2 pts. 5-9.9%  1 pts. 2-4.9%  0 pts. 0-1.9% |
| 1d | **Projects may receive points under any one of the following criteria based on outcomes reported in the APR:** | | | | |  | |
| 1d1 | If ***Permanent Supportive Housing Project***: The percentage of participants that obtained or maintained mainstream cash income sources at follow-up or project exit is at least 56%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | | | **Mainstream Cash Income Sources at Follow-up or Exit:**  5 pts.\*\* 83-100%  4pts. 65-82.9%  3 pts. 47-64.9%  2 pts. 29-46.9%  1 pts. 1-28.9%  0 pts. 0% | |
| 1d2 | If ***Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, or Supportive Services Only Project***: The percentage of leavers that obtained or maintained mainstream cash income sources at project exit is at least 56%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | | | **Mainstream Cash Income Sources at Exit:**  5 pts.\*\* 83-100%  4pts. 65-82.9%  3 pts. 47-64.9%  2 pts. 29-46.9%  1 pts. 1-28.9%  0 pts. 0% | |
| 1e | **Projects may receive points under any one of the following criteria based on outcomes reported in the APR:** | | | | |  | |
| 1e1 | If ***Permanent Supportive Housing Project***: The percentage of participants that obtained or maintained non-cash mainstream resources at follow-up or project exit is at least 56%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | | | **Non-Cash Mainstream Resources at Exit:**  5 pts.\*\* 83-100%  4pts. 65-82.9%  3 pts. 47-64.9%  2 pts. 29-46.9%  1 pts. 1-28.9%  0 pts. 0% | |
| 1e2 | If ***Transitional Housing, Rapid Re-Housing, or Supportive Services Only Project***: The percentage of leavers that obtained or maintained non-cash mainstream resources at project exit is at least 56%.  *HUD System Performance Measure 4* | | | | | **Non-Cash Mainstream Resources at Exit:**  5 pts.\*\* 83-100%  4pts. 65-82.9%  3 pts. 47-64.9%  2 pts. 29-46.9%  1 pts. 1-28.9%  0 pts. 0% | |
| **2** | **Budget** | | |  | | **5** | |
| 2a | 25% match is required for all grant funds, except leasing funds. | | | | | **Match**:  5 pts. >25%  4 pts. 20-24.9%  3 pts. 15-19.9%  2 pts. 10-14.9%  1 pts. 5-9.9%  0 pts. 0-4.9% | |
| **3** | **Administrative Efficiency** | | | | | **44** | |
| 3a | **Client Feedback Process:**   1. Does the project have a Resident Advisory Board, Client Advisory Board, or a client member of the agency’s Board of Directors?  * Yes = 1 point * No = 0 points  1. Does the project have a formal process for collecting client or resident feedback?  * Yes = 2 point * No = 0 points  1. Give one example of a time the project responded to client or resident feedback, in the past 2 years, by making a change to the program. (500 characters)  * Example = 2 point * No example = 0 points | | | | | 5 | |
| 3b | Project has been responsive to outstanding or pending HUD monitoring findings, HSA findings, City-wide joint fiscal monitoring findings, financial audit findings, and has no other indication of major capacity issues. Projects must provide an up to date (within last 21 months) audited financial statement, and single audit (if applicable) in order to document this criteria   * Projects with outstanding monitoring findings from the past year (or most recent financial audit) received 3 points. * Projects with outstanding monitoring findings that have remained unresolved for more than 1 year receive 1 point. * Projects that do not provide requested documentation of audit(s) and/or monitoring receive 0 points. | | | | | *No outstanding findings*: 6pts  *Outstanding findings*: 3pts  *Findings unresolved for more than one year*: 1pt  *Requested documentation not provided*: 0pts | |
| 3c | | **Grant Utilization:**  3 points:  The project drew down or invoiced at least quarterly  3 points:  The project   * Used at least 90% of grant funds (legacy SHP only); or * Maintained unit occupancy rate of at least 90% (legacy S+C only). | | | | 6 | |
| 3d | Agency/collaborative participates in Continuum of Care Planning Meetings. | | | | | 5 pts. 12  4 pts. 10-12  3 pts. 7-9  2 pts. 4-6  1 pt. 1-3  0 pts. 0 | |
| 3e | **HMIS Data Quality**  Data quality is calculated as the percentage of data fields that are complete (there is a response entered in that field).  If more than 5% of responses for a given data element are “Don’t Know/Refused”, then all “Don’t Know/Refused” responses for that data element will count as ½ of a complete data field. Otherwise, “Don’t Know/Refused” responses will count as a complete data field. This factor will be scored based on data in Question 7 the project’s APR.  *Contributes to System Performance on HUD System Performance Measures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 by improving data quality.* | | | | | 8 pts. 100%  7 pts. 90-99.9%  6 pts. 80-89.9%  5 pts. 70-79.9%  4 pts. 60-69.9%  3 pts. 50-59.9%  2 pts. 40-49.9%  1 pt. 30-39.9%  0 pts. <30% | |
| 3f | **Low Barrier:**  3 points: The project does not drug test participants on site or require drug testing in the community.  2 points: The project will not disqualify applicants for having too little or no income.  2 points: The project will not disqualify applicants based on information discovered through a credit check or a check for eviction history.  3 points: The project will not disqualify applicants for active or history of substance abuse.  2 points: The project will not disqualify applicants for reasons related to experience of domestic violence (lack of a protective order, period of separation from abuser, law enforcement involvement, etc).  2 points: The project does not conduct criminal background checks for applicants or participants. Projects may be awarded one point if they conduct background checks due to a demonstrated legal requirement from one of the agency’s funding sources.  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3* | | | | | 14 | |
|  | **Community Priority for Housing Types** | | | | | **5** | |
| 4a1 | If program is a legacy S+C project or SHP Permanent Supportive Housing project for **legacy leasing, rental assistance, or operations**, award full points. (Please note 4a1 and 4a2 are mutually exclusive).  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7* | | | | | 4 | |
| 4a2 | If program is a Transitional Housing program serving youth clients. (Please note 4a1 and 4a2 are mutually exclusive).  *HUD System Performance Measures 1, 3, 7* | | | | | 3 | |
| 4b | If a program is a legacy S+C or SHP Permanent Supportive Housing project and commits ***all*** units made available through turnover to housing chronically homeless individuals or families, award full points.  *HUD System Performance Measure 1* | | | | | 1 | |
| **Total Points Available:** | | | **101** | | |  | |

\*Project participants for all housing stability measures exclude deceased clients.

\*\*For criteria based on performance outcomes data, information is collected from the most recent APRs from calendar year 2016. For APRs that received an extension beyond April 1st, 2017 the most recent APR available before April 1st, 2017 will be used. Additionally, projects are evaluated based on a minimum household count of 20 households. If the project did not serve 20 households in a one-year period, data from prior APRs will be added to recent APR data until the 20 household minimum is met (up to a maximum of three APRs).
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**RENEWAL PROJECT SUBRECIPIENT SUBMISSION CHECKLIST**

Renewal Projects for which HSH is the Recipient

|  |
| --- |
| SUBRECIPIENT: |
| PROJECT NAME: |

ON OR BEFORE 12:00 P.M. ON August 14, 2017:

Hand deliver items listed below to Charles Minor at 1360 Mission St. *AND*

Email a copy of the documents requested below (PDF format preferred) to the following address: [sfnofa@homebaseccc.org](mailto:sfnofa@homebaseccc.org).

NOTE: Please place a sheet of colored paper between each requested document, in the physical copy.

All physical copies must be double-sided and *collated!*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Copies Enclosed** | **PDF Emailed** |  | **Number of copies** |
| ⬜ | ⬜ | This Proposal Submission Checklist | 1 copy ***and*** email |
| ⬜ | ⬜ | HUD Project Application | 1 copy ***and*** email |
| ⬜ | ⬜ | Local Project Narrative | 1 copy ***and*** email |
| ⬜ | ⬜ | 2880 Applicant/Recipient Disclosure/Update Report **(leave signature line blank)** | 1 copy ***and*** email |
| ⬜ | ⬜ | Most recent audited financial statement | 1 copy ***and*** email |
| ⬜ | ⬜ | Documentation of match resources | 1 original (with signature) ***and*** email |

|  |
| --- |
| Contact person’s name: |
| Phone: |
| E-mail: |
| FAX: |

For Department use only: DATE received: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ TIME received: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Application received by (name): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**2017 Project Narrative**

**(for renewal projects)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agency name:** | **Project Name:** |
| **Contact person name:** | |
| **Telephone:** | **Email:** |

**Please answer the following questions.**

* **Question 1: Your response to Question 1 should not exceed two pages, single-spaced, 12 point, Times New Roman font, one-inch margins.**

The Priority Panel will use this response to guide its review of your HUD application and Project Evaluation. Please carefully review the **Renewal Project Scoring Tool**, which contains all factors on which the Panel will score your project, as well as your project’s **Project Evaluation** and **preliminary scores**. Then, in a one-page response, provide the following:

1. Identify which scoring factors the Priority Panel should review for your project. Please identify scoring factors by number (e.g. “Factor 3a”). ***The Panel will not review any scoring factor you do not identify in this response.***
2. For each scoring factor you identify, include a specific request with respect to score adjustments, and the basis for the request. (e.g. “Our score on Factor 3a should increase by 2 points.”)
3. For each scoring factor you identify, clearly indicate which section(s) of your application materials or Project Evaluation the Priority Panel should review.
4. For each scoring factor you identify, clearly explain any inaccuracies or additional information panelists should take into account when reviewing your score; and

* **Question 2: Your response to Question 2 should not exceed 150 words.**

Please describe how your project meets the threshold requirement of equal access for program participants regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, in compliance with federal law and the 2017 CoC Program NOFA.

**2017 McKinney-Vento Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Grants**

**LOCAL RENEWAL APPLICATION MATERIALS**

**WHERE TO GET THE DOCUMENTS YOU MAY NEED**

**Timeline:** Please refer to the Submission Checklist (**page 17**) and the Timeline (separate document) to see when these documents are due.

**Each PROJECT must submit the following:**

**1. Project Application**

Visit e-snaps to update or submit application without changes: <http://www.hud.gov/esnaps>

Training Modules can be found at: <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources/>

**2.** **Local Project Narrative (for Renewal Projects)**

Available above **(page 18)** or online at: <http://hsh.sfgov.org/lhcb/2017-continuum-of-care-funding-competition/>

**3. HUD 2880 – Applicant/Recipient Disclosure/Update Report**Available at:<https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=2880.pdf>

**4. Most recent audited financial statement**

**5. Match letters**

You create these using the format provided in Technical Assistance (TA) Handbook for Renewal Projects packet or found at: <http://hsh.sfgov.org/lhcb/2017-continuum-of-care-funding-competition/>

**Trouble downloading?**

**Contact Charles Minor at 415-355-5209 or** [Charles.minor@sfgov.org](mailto:charles.minor@sfgov.org)**.**