2019 Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Rapid Rehousing (RRH) Component Scoresheet

Applicant Organization: ____________________________________________________________

Proposed Service Area (Counties): __________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Project Need</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Project Design</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Area-Wide Systems Coordination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Financial Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Agency Experience and Capacity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other Requirements and Performance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points  215

Application Attachment Checklist

_____ Proof of 501(c)3 Status

_____ 2019 ESG Certifications and Assurances

_____ Evidence of Submission to State Clearinghouse

_____ 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)

*Note: A separate scoresheet is being used for Emergency Shelter, Street Outreach, and Prevention. HMIS and/or Admin requests will not be scored, but applicants must articulate how the funds will be used.
# A. Project Need—25 Points Possible

Points Awarded: ______

1. **Number of counties where proposed RRH will be available? (App. Sec. B, Q1)**

- 0 pts  
- 1 pt  
- 2 pts  
- 3 pts  
- 4 pts  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 county</td>
<td>1 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 counties</td>
<td>2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 counties</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 counties</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more counties</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Does other RRH exist in all the counties where you propose to provide ESG RRH for the specific population you will serve? This will be confirmed by KHC. (App. Sec. B.4, Q4)**

- 2 pts  No
- 0 pts  Yes

3. **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 RRH is insufficient to meet need? (App. Sec. B.4, Q5)**

- 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.

4. **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.**

- 5 pts  More than BoS rate
- 3 pts  50%-100% of BoS rate
- 0 pts  Less than 50% of BoS rate

5. **Local Prioritization Community (LPC) Prioritization List demonstrates immediate need for project. (Confirmed by KHC).**

- 4 pts  Yes
- 0 pts  No households meeting target population requirements of applicant’s RRH project on active list.

# B. Project Design—75 Points Possible

Points Awarded: ______

1. **Will project provide rental assistance? (App. Sec. B.4, Q6)**

- 3 pts  Yes
- 0 pts  No
2. Does project allow flexibility in the amount of time a participant may receive rental assistance based on individual need? (App. Sec. B.4, Q6.a)

☐ 2 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No (or project does not provide rental assistance)

3. Applicant provided adequate justification for why rental assistance is not provided. (App. Sec. B.4, Q6.b)

☐ 5 pts  Adequately justified (or project provides rental assistance)
☐ 3 pts  Somewhat justified
☐ 0 pts  Did not justify

4. Are eligibility criteria correct for ESG RRH? (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must serve only eligible clients) (App. Sec. B.4, Q7)

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

5. Applicant described correct types of supporting documentation used to determine client eligibility. (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must use correct documentation) (App. Sec. B.4, Q8)

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

6. Applicant described process and tools used to assess what type of RRH assistance is needed by the participant to obtain and maintain housing. (App. Sec. B.4, Q9)

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

7. Applicant has a strong plan to help participants experiencing Category 1 or 4 homelessness identify permanent housing. (App. Sec. B.4, Q10)

☐ 10 pts  Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants identify 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 identify permanent housing.

8. Applicant outlined a strong plan to effectively use case management to help participants obtain and maintain permanent housing, including explaining the process and tools used to determine need, case management techniques utilized, and the frequency with which case management will be provided. (App. Sec. B.4, Q11)

☐ 10 pts  Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants identify 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 identify permanent housing.
9. 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.4, Q12)

☐ 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.

10. Applicant has strong plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits for which they may be eligible. (App. Sec. B.4, Q12)

☐ 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.

11. 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.4, Q13)

☐ 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.

12. Applicant outlined a clear and appropriate plan ensure its RRH project adheres to a low-barrier, Housing First model. (App. Sec. B.4, Q14)

☐ 10 pts  Applicant’s project design adheres to the principles and practices of Housing First.
☐ 5 pts   Applicant’s project design uses principles and practices of Housing First, but lacks enough detail to determine fidelity to model OR description indicates policies and practices are not fully consistent with model.
☐ 0 pts   Applicant’s design does not adhere to principles and practices of Housing First. (Note: ESG RRH funded through this applicant round must be provided using a Housing First model. KHC reserves the right to reject an application for RRH if it deems the project does not and/or will not meet this standard.)

C. Area-Wide Systems Coordination—15 Points Possible  Points Awarded _____

1. Applicant’s RRH project enhances the efforts of its Local Prioritization Community to ensure homelessness is rare, brief, and non-recurring. (App. Sec. Area-Wide Systems Coordination, Q1)

☐ 5 pts   Applicant described how its project enhances its LPC’s efforts.
☐ 3 pts   Applicant somewhat described how its project 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 the proposed RRH project is needed. (App. Sec. Area-Wide Systems Coordination, Q1)

☐ 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. (App. Sec. Area-Wide Systems Coordination, Q2)

☐ 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.

### D. Financial Plan—25 Points Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 pts</td>
<td>Greater than 126% of applicant’s full ESG request amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 pts</td>
<td>116-126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pts</td>
<td>106-115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pts</td>
<td>101-105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10 pts</td>
<td>Below match requirement (Note: applicant will be required to meet 100% match if funded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Budget charts are completed correctly (e.g., match sources listed) (App. Sec. Financial Plan)

☐ 3 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No

2. Proposed budget is consistent with program plan described in Section C of Application. (App. Sec. Financial Plan)

☐ 5 pts  Yes
☐ 3 pts  Mostly consistent
☐ 0 pts  Not consistent

3. Match amount in relation to applicant’s full ESG request amount (including for other ESG components besides RRH): (App. Sec. Financial Plan)

☐ 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. (App. Sec. Financial Plan)

☐ 2 pts  Yes
☐ 0 pts  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Agency Experience and Capacity—30 Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agency has experience administering grants related to ESG RRH. (App. Sec. Agency Experience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 10 pts</td>
<td>Agency has administered ESG RRH for 3 consecutive years or more (at least since the 2016 ESG allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 7 pts</td>
<td>Agency has not administered ESG RRH for three or more consecutive years but has since 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5 pts</td>
<td>Agency has not administered ESG RRH but has received RRH funding from other sources (e.g., CoC or SSVF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 3 pts</td>
<td>Agency has not administered any type of RRH, but has administered similar projects (e.g., HOME or TBRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 0 pts</td>
<td>Agency has no experience administering federal, state, or local government grants similar to RRH.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Agency staff who will be involved in the ESG RRH program have administered federal housing programs grants in the last 2 years. (App. Sec. Staff Experience) |  
| □ 10 pts | 3 or more staff members have administered federal housing program grants within the past two years. |
| □ 7 pts  | 2 staff members have administered federal housing program grants within the past 2 years. |
| □ 5 pts  | 1 staff member has administered federal housing 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? (App. Sec. Agency Experience) |  
| □ 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 |
### F. Other Requirements and Performance—45 Points Possible Points Awarded _____

**Data Quality and Performance**

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

4. HMIS Data Quality relating to known destinations at the time of exit (for ESG-ES and ESG-RRH, depending on what applicant currently administers).

   - ☐ 5 pts No “don’t know”, “refused”, or “missing” data for Destination at Exit for ESG-ES and/or ESG-RRH (or N/A if currently not administering ESG-ES or ESG-RRH)
   - ☐ 3 pts Less than error rate for ES and/or RRH
   - ☐ 1 pt At least one project component (ESG-ES or ESG-RRH) less than error rate for all ES or RRH.

5. Exits to Permanent Housing

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

6. Returns to Homelessness (excluding Non-VSPs)

   - ☐ 5 pts If current ESG-RRH 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 RRH rate.
   - ☐ 0 pts Returns to homelessness greater than system-wide RRH rate.

7. Average length of time from Project Entry to Housing Move-In Date from HMIS CAPER 22c.

   - ☐ 5 pts Average length is 14 days or less (or 30 days or less for VSPs) (or N/A if not currently administering ESG-RRH)
   - ☐ 3 pts Average length is 15-30 days (or 31-45 days for VSPs)
   - ☐ 1 pt Average length is 31-45 days (or 46-60 days for VSPs)
   - ☐ 0 pts Average length more than 45 days (or more than 60 days for VSPs)
**CoC Participation**

8. 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

9. 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

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

☐ 5 pts Yes
☐ 0 pts No