

# 2022 Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Rapid Rehousing (RRH) Component Scoresheet

Applicant Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Service Area (Counties): \_\_\_\_\_

Category	Points Possible	Points Received	
A. Project Need	20		
B. Project Design	92		
C. Area-Wide Systems Coordination	15		
D. Financial Plan	20		
E. Agency Experience and Capacity	30		
F. Other Requirements and Performance	35		<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>212</b>		

### Application Attachment Checklist

\_\_\_\_\_ Proof of 501(c)3 Status (required for non-profit applicants)

\_\_\_\_\_ 2022 ESG Certifications and Assurances Form

\_\_\_\_\_ Evidence of Submission to State Clearinghouse

\_\_\_\_\_ Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report(s) (CAPER), if applicable

\_\_\_\_\_ RRH Termination Policy

\*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—20 Points Possible**

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Number of counties where proposed RRH will be available? (App. Sec. B.4, 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, 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, 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 Sheltered homelessness in proposed service area compared to Balance of State rate as determined by the 2022 K-Count. KHC will calculate the rates.**

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

**4. Local Prioritization Community (LPC) Coordinated Entry Lists demonstrate immediate need for project. (Confirmed by KHC).**

- 3 pts      Yes
- 0 pts      No households meeting target population requirements of applicant's RRH project on list.

**B. Project Design—92 Points Possible**

Points Awarded: \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Will project provide rental assistance? (App. Sec. B.4, Q5)**

- 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, Q5.a)**

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

**3. If applicant doesn't provide flexibility, did they provide appropriate justification for why the policy is necessary and how it helps to end homelessness. (App. Sec. B.4, Q5.a)**

- 2 pts Yes (or applicant provides flexibility)
- 0 pts Justification not sufficient (or project does not provide rental assistance)

**4. Applicant provided adequate justification for why rental assistance is not provided. (App. Sec. B.4, Q5.b)**

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

**5. Applicant selected the correct eligible populations for ESG RRH. (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must serve only eligible clients) (App. Sec. B.4, Q6)**

- 5 pts Yes
- 0 pts No

**6. Applicant listed the correct KHC ESG Toolkit form name for the form that tells what documents must be included in the client file for each RRH program participant. (Note: If awarded funding, applicant must use correct documentation) (App. Sec. B.4, Q7)**

- 5 pts Yes
- 0 pts No

**7. Applicant described process and planning tools used to determine what type(s) of RRH assistance is needed by the participant to obtain and maintain housing. (App. Sec. B.4, Q8)**

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

**8. Applicant has a strong plan to work with participants during the housing search process to help them identify and obtain housing. (App. Sec. B.4, Q9a)**

- 10 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants identify and obtain permanent housing.
- 5 pts Applicant's plan to help participants identify and obtain permanent housing will help participants but could be more effective (or described better).
- 0 pts Applicant does not have an adequate plan.

**9. Applicant has a strong plan to ensure participants receive other financial assistance besides paying for rent (e.g., security deposits, moving cost assistance, etc.), if needed, to help them obtain housing so these financial barriers do not prevent people from securing housing. (App. Sec. B.4, Q9b)**

- 10 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to ensure participants receive financial assistance for housing obtainment needs besides rental assistance, when needed by participant.
- 5 pts Applicant's plan to help participants will help but could be more effective (or described better).
- 0 pts Applicant does not have an adequate plan.

**10. Applicant outlined a strong plan to effectively use case management and other services to help participants 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, Q10)**

- 10 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants maintain permanent housing.
- 5 pts Applicant's plan to help participants maintain permanent housing will help participants, but could be more extensive to have a greater likelihood of success (or described better).
- 0 pts Applicant does not have an adequate plan.

**11. Applicant has strong plan to help participants increase their income through employment. (App. Sec. B.4, Q11)**

- 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants increase income through employment.
- 3 pts Applicant has a plan to help participants increase income through employment but lacks enough detail to determine its strength or needs improvement.
- 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help participants increase income through employment.

**12. Applicant has strong plan to help participants increase their income through non-earned, non-employment sources such as SSI or SSDI. (App. Sec. B.4, Q11)**

- 5 pts Applicant has strong plan in place to help participants increase income through non-earned sources.
- 3 pts Applicant has a plan to help participants increase income through non-earned sources but lacks enough detail to determine its strength or needs improvement.
- 0 pts Applicant does not have a plan to help participants increase income through unearned sources.

**13. Applicant has strong plan to help participants obtain mainstream benefits for which they may be eligible. (App. Sec. B.4, Q11)**

- 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.

**14. 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, Q12)**

- 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.

**15. Applicant description of its termination policy including what circumstances would constitute grounds for program termination, is consistent with its Written Termination Policy attached to the application. (App. Sec. B.4, Q13 and attachment)**

- 5 pts Yes
- 2 pts Somewhat
- 0 pts No

**16. Applicant’s Termination Policy, as reflected in the Written Termination Policy attached to application, is consistent with the housing retention principles of the Housing First model (Application Attachment).**

- 5 pts Applicant clearly demonstrates full fidelity to housing retention principles of Housing First.
- 3 pts Applicant somewhat demonstrates fidelity to housing retention principles of Housing First.
- 0 pts Applicant has significant inconsistencies with housing retention principles of Housing First or did not attach required Written Termination Policy to application.

<b>C. Area-Wide Systems Coordination—15 Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Awarded _____</b>
---	-----------------------------

**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.

<b>D. Financial Plan—20 Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Awarded _____</b>
---	-----------------------------

**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 non-RRH components if being requested):**

- 10 pts Greater than 115%
- 8 pts 106-115%
- 6 pts 101-105%
- 4 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

<b>E. Agency Experience and Capacity—30 Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Awarded _____</b>
---	-----------------------------

**1. Agency has experience administering grants related to ESG RRH. (App. Sec. Agency Experience)**

- 10 pts Agency has administered all ESG RRH for 3 consecutive years or more (at least since the 2019 ESG allocation)
- 7 pts Agency has not administered ESG RRH with ESG funding for 3 consecutive years, but has since 2021 or with ESG-CV funding.
- 5 pts Agency has not administered ESG/ESG-CV funding but has received RRH funding from other local, state, or federal governmental sources (e.g., CoC, SSVF).
- 3 pts Agency has not administered any type RRH, 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 RRH.

**2. Agency staff who will be involved in the ESG RRH program have administered federal housing program 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 (2019, 2020, 2021), 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 ES20 grants (or ES21 grants did not have ES20 funding), 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 ES20 or ES21 grant)
- 0 pts      No

<b>F. Other Requirements and Performance—35 Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Awarded _____</b>
---	-----------------------------

**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 attachments to this application.**

- 5 pts      Yes
- 0 pts      No

**3. HMIS Data Quality relating to known destinations at the time of exit (ESG/ESG-CV RRH, depending on what applicant currently administers).**

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

**4. Exits to Permanent Housing**

- 5 pts      If current ESG-RRH or ESG-CV 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 or ESG-CV)
- 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.

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

- 4 pts Average length is 30 days or less (or 45 days or less for VSPs) (or N/A if not currently administering ESG-RRH or ESG-CV)
- 2 pts Average length is 31-45 days (or 46-60 days for VSPs) or applicant does not provide rental assistance and length of time is not more than 45 days (60 days for VSPs).
- 1 pts Average length is 46-60 days (or 61-75 days for VSPs)
- 0 pts Average length more than 60 days (or more than 75 days for VSPs)

**6. Applicant submitted CAPER through Sage by KHC deadline (confirmed by KHC, for current ESG PREV grantees)**

- 3 pts Yes (or not a current ESG PREV grantee)
- 0 pts No

**7. Applicant submitted last three required Data Quality Reports to KHC's HMIS team on time (confirmed by KHC for current HMIS users (HMIS-comparable database users for VSPs) with open PREV projects).**

- 3 pts Yes (or does not use HMIS/HMIS-comparable database for VSP for an PREV project)
- 0 pts No

**CoC Participation**

**8. At least one person from applicant's agency attended the 2021 KY Balance of State CoC Membership Meeting held via webinar on December 15 or listened to the recording by 12/31/2021.**

- 5 pts Yes
- 0 pts No

**9. Bonus: At least one person from applicant's agency attended a 2022 K-Count training via webinar on February 7 or February 9, 2022.**

- 2 pts Yes
- 0 pts No

**10. Bonus: At least one person from applicant's agency attended the 2022 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) training via webinar on Feb. 16, 2022.**

- 3 pts Yes
- 0 pts No