# 2019 Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Scoresheet for Emergency Shelter, Prevention, and Street Outreach Components

Applicant Organization: 

Components Requested:  
☐ Street Outreach  ☐ Emergency Shelter  ☐ Prevention

*Note: A separate scoresheet is being used for Rapid Rehousing. HMIS and/or Admin requests will not be scored, but applicants must articulate how the funds will be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Need and Design</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points based on percentage equivalent of score for each component requested)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Area-Wide Systems Coordination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Financial Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Agency Experience and Capacity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other Requirements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points** 200

Application Attachment Checklist

_____ Proof of 501(c)3 Status
_____ 2019 ESG Certifications and Assurances
_____ Evidence of Submission to State Clearinghouse
_____ Certification of Local Approval (required for emergency shelter only)

_____ Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report(s) (CAPER) for applicants currently receiving ESG-Funded for the period April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019, for EACH ESG project component the applicant currently has active in KYHMIS or a comparable database for Victim Service Providers (VSPs)
A. PROJECT NEED AND DESIGN - 100 Max Points based on percentage score received in this Section. For example, Agency A applies for Emergency Shelter and Street Outreach and receives xxx out of the xxx points available for those combined sub-sections. This equates to xxx % or xxx points for this Section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Total Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Outreach</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____ X 100 = ____%</td>
<td>= ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Street Outreach (SO)—73 Points Possible  Subtotal Points Awarded: ____

**Reviewer:** List proposed counties where SO will be available: ___________________________________________

1. Number of counties where applicant’s proposed street outreach will be available? (App. Sec. B.1, Q1)

☐ 0 pts  1 county
☐ 1 pts  2 counties
☐ 2 pts  3 counties
☐ 3 pts  4 counties
☐ 4 pts  5 or more counties

2. Did applicant adequately describe the need for the project in the proposed service area, including using quantitative data? (App. Sec. B.1, Q2)

☐ 10 pts  Adequately described need, including quantitative data.
☐ 5 pts   Somewhat described need and/or did not include adequate quantitative data.
☐ 0 pts   Did not adequately describe need.

2a. In applicant’s response to need for project in the proposed area, did applicant demonstrate that street outreach is already available in some of the counties within its LPC, thereby justifying why it is proposing to serve fewer than 5 counties? (App. Sec. B.1, Q1-Q2)

☐ 2 pts   Yes (or will serve 5 or more counties)
☐ 0 pts   No

3. Are eligibility criteria correct for ESG SO? (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must serve only eligible clients) (App. Sec. B.1, Q3)

☐ 5 pts   All correct
☐ 3 pts   Some correct
☐ 0 pts   None correct
4. Applicant described correct types of supporting documentation used to determine client eligibility. (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must use correct documentation) (App. Sec. B.1, Q4)

☐ 5 pts  All correct
☐ 3 pts  Some correct
☐ 0 pts  None correct

5. Frequency of street outreach activities across applicant’s proposed service area. (App. Sec. B.1, Q5)

☐ 7 pts  More than once a month
☐ 5 pts  Once a month
☐ 3 pts  Twice per quarter
☐ 1 pts  Once per quarter
☐ 0 pts  Less frequently than quarterly

6. Applicant has a strong plan to reach the most vulnerable people living unsheltered, especially those least likely to access shelter and services. (App. Sec. B.1, Q5)

☐ 10 pts  Applicant has strong plan in place to reach most vulnerable
☐ 5 pts  Applicant’s plan to reach most vulnerable is adequate but could be more effective (or described better).
☐ 0 pts  Applicant does not have an adequate plan in place

7. Applicant has a strong plan to assess participants to determine need and connect participants with shelter, housing, and services. (App. Sec. B.1, Q6)

☐ 10 pts  Applicant has strong plan in place to assess need and connect to appropriate assistance
☐ 5 pts  Applicant’s plan to assess and help participants connect to assistance is adequate, but could be more effective (or described better).
☐ 0 pts  Applicant does not have an adequate plan to assess participants and/or connect them with appropriate assistance.

8. Proposed street outreach project will use a low-barrier, Housing First model. (App. Sec. B.1, Q7)

☐ 10 pts  Yes
☐ 5 pts  Somewhat, but needs improvement or further clarification
☐ 0 pts  No

2. Emergency Shelter (ES)—142 Points Possible  Subtotal Points Awarded: ____

1. Does other year-round emergency shelter (ES) exist (besides the applicant’s ES) in the county where it proposes to provide ESG ES for the specific population you will serve? This will be confirmed by KHC. (App. Sec. B.2, Q1-Q3)

☐ 0 pts  Yes
☐ 2 pts  No
2. Did applicant adequately describe the need for the project in the proposed service area, including using quantitative data, explaining how project will strengthen the community’s homelessness response system, and justifying why any current ES is insufficient to meet need? (App. Sec. B.2, Q4)

☐ 10 pts  Adequately described need, including quantitative data.
☐ 5 pts   Somewhat described need and/or did not include adequate quantitative data.
☐ 0 pts   Did not adequately describe need.

3. Rate of homelessness in proposed service area compared to Balance of State rate as determined by the 2019 K-Count. KHC will calculate the rates.

☐ 3 pts   More than BoS rate
☐ 2 pts   75% to 100% of BoS rate
☐ 1 pts   50%-74.99% of BoS rate
☐ 0 pts   Less than 50% of BoS rate

4. Rate of unsheltered homelessness in proposed service area compared to Balance of State rate as determined by the 2019 K-Count. KHC will calculate the rates.

☐ 5 pts   More than BoS rate
☐ 4 pts   75% to 100% of BoS rate
☐ 3 pts   50%-74.99% of BoS rate
☐ 2 pts   25%-49.9% of BoS rate
☐ 1 pts   1%-24.99% of BoS rate
☐ 0 pts   No unsheltered

5. Applicant described process and tools used to assess what type of services and housing are needed by the participant to obtain and maintain housing. (App. Sec. B.2, Q5)

☐ 10 pts  Adequately described process/tools used to determine specific housing and service needs
☐ 5 pts   Somewhat described process/tools used to determine specific housing and service needs
☐ 0 pts   Did not adequately describe process/tools used to determine specific housing and service needs

6. Applicant outlined a strong plan to help participants obtain permanent housing as quickly as possible, including case management techniques utilized, coordination with the KY BoS CoC Coordinated Entry System, the frequency and strategy to engage participants, and how participants are helped when ESG or CoC-funded housing is not available or appropriate. (App. Sec. B.2, Q6)

☐ 10 pts  Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants obtain permanent housing.
☐ 5 pts   Applicant’s plan to help participants identify permanent housing meets minimum expectations, but could be more effective (or described better).
☐ 0 pts   Applicant does not have an adequate plan to help participants obtain permanent housing.
7. Are eligibility criteria correct for ESG ES? (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must serve only eligible clients) (App. Sec. B.2, Q7)

☐ 5 pts All correct
☐ 3 pts Some correct
☐ 0 pts None correct

8. Applicant described correct types of supporting documentation used to determine client eligibility. (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must use correct documentation) (App. Sec. B.2, Q8)

☐ 5 pts All correct
☐ 3 pts Some correct
☐ 0 pts None correct

Low-Barrier, Housing-Focused Shelter

9. Does the shelter require a criminal background check (besides sex offender status) before a person can spend the night? (App. Sec. B.2, Q9)

☐ 3 pts No
☐ 0 pts Yes

10a. If yes, applicant provided a reasonable explanation for why the specific background check is necessary. (App. Sec. B.2, Q9.a)

☐ 2 pts Yes (or does not require background checks beyond sex offender status)
☐ 1 pt Somewhat
☐ 0 pts No

11. Does the shelter require a household to have income in order to stay in the shelter? (App. Sec. B.2, Q10)

☐ 5 pts No
☐ 0 pts Yes

11a. If yes, applicant provided a reasonable explanation for why having income is necessary. (App. Sec. B.2, Q10.a)

☐ 2 pts Yes (or does not require income)
☐ 1 pt Somewhat
☐ 0 pts No

12. Does the shelter require people to submit to breathalyzer tests or any other type of drug/alcohol test in order to enter the shelter? (App. Sec. B.2, Q11)

☐ 5 pts No
☐ 0 pts Yes
12a. If yes, applicant provided a reasonable explanation for why a drug/alcohol test is necessary. (App. Sec. B.2, Q11.a)

☐ 2 pts  Yes (or does not require drug/alcohol test)
☐ 1 pt  Somewhat
☐ 0 pts  No

13. Does the shelter require people staying in the shelter to participate in supportive services in order to stay? (App. Sec. B.2, Q12)

☐ 3 pts  No
☐ 0 pts  Yes

13a. If yes, applicant provided a reasonable explanation for why participation is necessary. (App. Sec. B.2, Q12.a)

☐ 2 pts  Yes (or does not require service participation)
☐ 1 pt  Somewhat
☐ 0 pts  No

14. Does the shelter have a curfew? (App. Sec. B.2, Q13)

☐ 3 pts  No
☐ 0 pts  Yes

14a. If yes, applicant provided a reasonable explanation for why the curfew is necessary. (App. Sec. B.2, Q13.a)

☐ 2 pts  Yes (or does not have a curfew)
☐ 1 pt  Somewhat
☐ 0 pts  No

14b. If yes, does the shelter make accommodations for people who have work schedules that conflict with the curfew policy (App. Sec. B.2, Q13.a)

☐ 1 pts  Yes (or does not have a curfew)
☐ 0 pts  No

14c. If yes, shelter makes effort to connect people needing shelter “after hours” with other shelter resources/solutions. (App. Sec. B.2, Q13.a)

☐ 1 pt  Yes (or does not have a curfew)
☐ 0 pts  No or not a very solid effort
15. Applicant demonstrates a commitment to moving towards a more low-barrier, housing-focused shelter model. (App. Sec. B.2, Q14)

☐ 12 pts Yes, demonstrated both steps that have already been taken and a plan for moving forward.
☐ 9 pts Yes, described a well thought out plan for how to evaluate existing/modify policies going forward.
☐ 6 pts Yes, described a somewhat well-thought out plan to evaluate/modify existing policies going forward.
☐ 3 pts Is contemplating the transition but did not articulate a well-thought out plan for moving forward.
☐ 0 pts No

16. Applicant has strong plan to help participants increase their income, including through employment and non-earned income such as SSI or SSDI (if applicable). (App. Sec. B.2, Q15)

☐ 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants increase income.
☐ 3 pts Applicant has a plan to help participants increase income but lacks enough detail to determine its strength.
☐ 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help participants increase income.

17. Applicant has strong plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits for which they may be eligible. (App. Sec. B.2, Q15)

☐ 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants obtain mainstream benefits.
☐ 3 pts Applicant has a plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits but lacks enough detail to determine its strength.
☐ 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits.

18. Applicant will provide transportation assistance either with ESG funds, match, or by connecting participants to transportation assistance through another source. (App. Sec. B.2, Q16-Q16.b)

☐ 3 pts Yes
☐ 0 pts No

19. Applicant provides meaningful opportunities for participants to volunteer or be employed by the agency to assist with the shelter’s work. (App. Sec. B.2, Q17)

☐ 3 pts Yes
☐ 0 pts No

20. Applicant has strong plan to help connect participants with outpatient health services, mental health services, and substance use treatment if needed (and chosen by participant). (App. Sec. B.2, Q18)

☐ 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to connect participants with appropriate health services.
☐ 3 pts Applicant has a plan to connect participants with appropriate health services but lacks enough detail to determine its strength.
☐ 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help connect participants with appropriate health services.
21. Applicant described other services it will provide or connect participants to to help them be able to obtain and maintain housing. (App. Sec. B.2, Q19)

☐ 3 pts Yes
☐ 0 pts No

22. Applicant provided a reasonable explanation for why funds are being requested for minor and/or routine repairs at this time. (App. Sec. B.2, Q20)

☐ 5 pts Yes (or not requesting funds for this activity)
☐ 3 pts Somewhat reasonable, but lacks detail
☐ 0 pts No

23. Renovation (App. Sec. B.2, Q21)

☐ 5 pts Yes (or not requesting funds for this activity)
☐ 3 pts Somewhat reasonable, but lacks detail
☐ 0 pts No

24. HMIS Data Quality relating to known destinations at the time of exit.

☐ 5 pts No “don’t know”, “refused”, or “missing” data for Destination at Exit for ES (or N/A if currently not administering ESG-ES)
☐ 3 pts Less than error rate for system-wide ES
☐ 1 pt up to 1 percentage point more than error rate for system-wide ES.

25. Exits to Permanent Housing

☐ 5 pts If current ESG-ES grantee, exits to permanent housing more than 3 percentage points greater than system-wide rate for ES (or N/A if not currently administering ESG-ES)
☐ 3 pts Exits to permanent housing up to 2.9 percentage points more than system-wide rate for ES.
☐ 1 pt Exits to permanent housing equal to system-wide rate for ES.
☐ 0 pts Exits to permanent housing less than system-wide rate for ES.

26. Returns to Homelessness (excluding VSPs)

☐ 5 pts If current ESG-ES grantee, no returns to homeless for persons exiting to PH since April 1, 2018 (or N/A if not currently administering ESG-RRH or a VSP)
☐ 3 pts Returns to homelessness less than system-wide ES rate.
☐ 1 pt Returns to homelessness equal to up to 2.9 percentage points more than system-wide rate for ES.
☐ 0 pts Returns to homelessness greater than 3 percentage points more than system-wide rate for ES.
3. Prevention (PREV)—65 Points Possible  

Subtotal Points Awarded: ______

Reviewer: List proposed counties where ESG Prevention will be available: ________________________________

1. Number of counties where applicant’s proposed street outreach will be available? (App. Sec. B.3, Q1)

☐ 0 pts  1 county
☐ 1 pts  2 counties
☐ 2 pts  3 counties
☐ 3 pts  4 counties
☐ 4 pts  5 or more counties

2. Did applicant adequately describe the need for the project in the proposed service area, including using quantitative data and explaining how project will strengthen the community’s homelessness response system? (App. Sec. B.3, Q2)

☐ 10 pts  Adequately described need, including quantitative data.
☐  5 pts  Somewhat described need and/or did not include adequate quantitative data.
☐  0 pts  Did not adequately describe need.

3. Are eligibility criteria correct for ESG PREV? (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must serve only eligible clients) (App. Sec. B.3, Q3)

☐ 5 pts  All correct
☐ 3 pts  Some correct
☐ 0 pts  None correct

4. Applicant described correct types of supporting documentation used to determine client eligibility. (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must use correct documentation) (App. Sec. B.3, Q4)

☐ 5 pts  All correct
☐ 3 pts  Some correct
☐ 0 pts  None correct

5. Applicant described an appropriate plan to assess eligible participants to determine level of need and their potential to achieve stable housing within 24 months or less within a 3-year period. (App. Sec. B.3, Q5)

☐ 5 pts  Applicant has appropriate plan in place to determine need and assess potential.
☐ 3 pts  Applicant has an adequate plan but lacks enough detail to determine its strength.
☐ 0 pts  Applicant does not have an adequate plan.

6. Applicant demonstrated how it will effectively use ESG Prevention funds to help people remain housed. (App. Sec. B.3, Q6)

☐ 5 pts  Applicant will use ESG funds effectively.
☐ 3 pts  Applicant’s use of funds is appropriate but lacks detail to determine effectiveness.
☐ 0 pts  Applicant did not demonstrate how funds will be used to effectively help participants.
7. Applicant has strong plan to help participants increase their income, including through employment and non-earned income such as SSI or SSDI (if applicable). (App. Sec. B.3, Q7)

☐ 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants increase income.
☐ 3 pts Applicant has a plan to help participants increase income but lacks enough detail to determine its strength.
☐ 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help participants increase income.

8. Applicant has strong plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits for which they may be eligible. (App. Sec. B.3, Q7)

☐ 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants obtain mainstream benefits.
☐ 3 pts Applicant has a plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits but lacks enough detail to determine its strength.
☐ 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits.

9. Applicant described how it will assess the service needs of participants and how participants will be connected with appropriate resources. (App. Sec. B.3, Q8)

☐ 5 pts Adequately described process/tools used to determine specific housing and service needs
☐ 3 pts Somewhat described process/tools used to determine specific housing and service needs
☐ 0 pts Did not adequately describe process/tools used to determine specific housing and service needs

10. Applicant utilizes a low-barrier, Housing First model for program entry. (App. Sec. B.3, Q9)

☐ 5 pts Yes
☐ 0 pts No

10a. If applicant screens people out for 1) having too little or no income, 2) active or history of substance abuse, 3) having a criminal record, or 4) being a survivor of domestic violence, applicant provided reasonable explanation. (App. Sec. B.3, Q9.a)

☐ 3 pts Yes (or uses a low-barrier, Housing First model for program entry)
☐ 0 pts No

11. Applicant utilizes a low-barrier, Housing First model for program termination. (App. Sec. B.3, Q10)

☐ 5 pts Yes
☐ 0 pts No

11a. If applicant terminates people for 1) failure to participate in supportive services, 2) failure to make progress on a service plan, 3) loss of income, 4) being a survivor of domestic violence, or 5) any other activity not covered in a lease agreement typically found in the project’s geographic area; applicant provided reasonable explanation. (App. Sec. B.3, Q10.a)

☐ 3 pts Yes (or uses a low-barrier, Housing First model for termination)
☐ 1 pt Somewhat
☐ 0 pts No
### B. Area-Wide Systems Coordination—15 Points Possible

1. Applicant’s proposed project component(s) enhances the efforts of its Local Prioritization Community to ensure homelessness is rare, brief, and non-recurring.

- [ ] 5 pts  Applicant described how its project component(s) enhances its LPC’s efforts.
- [ ] 3 pts  Applicant somewhat described how its project component(s) enhances its LPC’s efforts.
- [ ] 0 pts  Applicant’s description does not adequately demonstrate how its existence enhances the LPC’s ability to ensure homelessness is rare, brief, and non-recurring.

2. Applicant described any existing or planned partnerships with other programs targeted to people experiencing homelessness (including at-risk of homelessness), how applicant will coordinate with these programs to best assist participants (as appropriate) and, how it worked with other organizations in its service area to determine its proposed ESG project component(s) is/are needed.

- [ ] 5 pts  Applicant demonstrates experience with and commitment to coordination with other homeless service providers.
- [ ] 3 pts  Applicant somewhat demonstrates experience with and commitment to coordination with other homeless service providers.
- [ ] 0 pts  Applicant did not demonstrate experience with or commitment to coordination with other homeless service providers.

3. Applicant described any existing or planned partnerships with mainstream resources providers to enhance the efforts of the overall social services system in applicant’s proposed service area.

- [ ] 5 pts  Applicant demonstrates experience with and commitment to coordination with mainstream resources providers.
- [ ] 3 pts  Applicant somewhat demonstrates experience with and commitment to coordination with mainstream resources providers.
- [ ] 0 pts  Applicant did not demonstrate experience with or commitment to coordination with mainstream resources providers.

### C. Financial Plan—25 Points Possible

1. Budget charts are completed correctly (e.g., match sources listed)

- [ ] 3 pts  Yes
- [ ] 0 pts  No

2. Proposed budget is consistent with program plan described in Section B of Application.

- [ ] 5 pts  Yes
- [ ] 3 pts  Mostly consistent
- [ ] 0 pts  Not consistent
3. Match amount in relation to applicant’s full ESG request amount (including RRH if being requested):

- ☐ 15 pts Greater than 126% of applicant’s full ESG request amount
- ☐ 12 pts 116-126%
- ☐ 9 pts 106-115%
- ☐ 6 pts 101-105%
- ☐ 3 pts 100%
- ☐ -10 pts Below match requirement (Note: applicant will be required to meet 100% match if funded)

4. For each match source listed, applicant explained how it determined the laws governing the funding source do not prohibit its use for the proposed activity.

- ☐ 2 pts Yes
- ☐ 0 pts No

### D. Agency Experience and Capacity—30 Points Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Agency has experience administering grants related to ESG Emergency Shelter (ES), Prevention (PREV), and/or Street Outreach (SO), whichever are being proposed by applicant.

- ☐ 10 pts Agency has administered all ESG components (ES, PREV, and/or SO) it is proposing for 3 consecutive years or more (at least since the 2016 ESG allocation)
- ☐ 7 pts Agency has not administered all of the ESG components it is requesting (ES, PREV, and/or SO) for three or more consecutive years but has since 2017.
- ☐ 5 pts Agency has not administered ESG ES, PREV, or SO but has received ES, PREV, or SO funding from other sources (e.g., CoC, SSVF, RHY, PATH).
- ☐ 3 pts Agency has not administered any type of ES, PREV, or SO, but has administered projects specifically targeted at helping people experiencing homelessness.
- ☐ 0 pts Agency has no experience administering federal, state, or local government grants similar to ES, PREV, or SO.

2. Agency staff who will be involved in the ESG ES, PREV, and/or SO program have administered federal housing/homeless program grants in the last 2 years.

- ☐ 10 pts 3 or more staff members have administered federal housing/homeless program grants within the past two years.
- ☐ 7 pts 2 staff members have administered federal housing/homeless program grants within the past 2 years.
- ☐ 5 pts 1 staff member has administered federal housing/homeless program grants within the past 2 years.
- ☐ 3 pts No staff members have administered federal housing programs within the past 2 years.

3. In the past 3 years (2016, 2017, 2018), has the agency administered a KHC Housing Contract Administration housing program that currently has uncorrected compliance findings identified by KHC compliance staff?

- ☐ 5 pts No
- ☐ 3 pts Yes but are still within the period allowed by KHC to make corrections.
- ☐ 0 pts Yes and have exceeded time period to make corrections without KHC approval
4. For ES17 grants, agency made a draw at least once every 60 days since the time of its release of funds from KHC.

☐ 5 pts  Yes (or did not have an ES17 grant)
☐ 0 pts  No

E. Other Requirements—30 Points Possible

1. Agency currently participates in the Kentucky Homelessness Management Information System (KYHMIS) or for Victim Service Providers (VSPs), an HMIS-comparable database.

☐ 5 pts  Yes (or applicant does not administer a program currently eligible for HMIS)
☐ 0 pts  No

2. Applicant submitted all required CAPER(s) from KYHMIS or a VSP-comparable database.

☐ 5 pts  Yes (or N/A)
☐ 0 pts  No

3. Applicant submitted all required attachments (excluding CAPERs scored separately).

☐ 5 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No

CoC Participation

5. At least one person from applicant’s agency attended a KY Balance of State CoC Regional Meeting during the month of April 2019.

☐ 5 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No

6. At least one person from applicant’s agency attended the 2018 KY BoS CoC Annual Meeting (in person in Lexington or via webinar) on August 22, 2018.

☐ 5 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No

7. At least one person from applicant’s agency attended a K-Count training (in person or via webinar).

☐ 5 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No

8. **Bonus:** If currently not an ESG-recipient, agency participated in the 2019 K-Count by providing data for its ES or TH project (if it has one) or helping with the unsheltered count (if it doesn’t have current ES or TH).

☐ 5 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No