

WI Balance of State CoC: Project Scoring Tool 2022

CoC Project Scoring Tool – Purpose:

The CoC Competition requires the CoC to evaluate and rank projects. The CoC is required to use objective, performance-based scoring criteria and selection priorities to determine the extent to which each project addresses HUD’s policy priorities. According to HUD, “CoCs should reallocate funds to new projects whenever reallocation would improve outcomes and reduce homelessness and consider how much each project spends to serve and house an individual/family as compared to other projects serving similar populations.”

The CoC Project Scoring Tool lays out the criteria and points possible. Each project receives a total score. Those scores are placed on one Tier, with those projects having the most points going on top and those with the least number of points going on the bottom. The top scoring projects are those that are ending homelessness, have high performance indicators, and address HUD’s policy priorities.

Clarification about Tier 1 and Tier 2:

The separation of the one Tier into two Tiers occurs when HUD provides the limit, or the floor. This represents the total amount of funding that can be on Tier 1 with the rest going on Tier 2. That limit has been 94% of our CoC’s annual renewal demand (ARD). The ARD is the total amount of funds it would take to fund all the current projects again. With 94% as a limit on Tier 1, that means 6% of the ARD must be on Tier 2. Even if all projects scored 90% on the CoC Project Scoring Tool, 6% of the funds will still be on Tier 2. If our ARD is \$10 million, then \$600,000 of project money must be on Tier 2.

CoC Project Scoring Tool – Process:

All CoC-funded housing projects will be ranked using the WI Balance of State CoC Project Scoring Tool. The scoring criteria is based on performance, both operations and project level. The information and data used to complete the evaluation tool includes: CoC project annual performance report (APR) submitted in SAGE, ICA generated HMIS reports, and CoC project applications. The maximum possible number of points a project can earn is 192 points.

SECTION 1

Final Board Policy Decisions

- (1) HMIS grant will be placed on Tier 1, at the bottom of the scorable projects.
- (2) SSO-CE and SSO-CE DV grant will be placed on Tier 1, after the HMIS grant.
- (3) New projects created with reallocated relinquished funds will be placed after the renewable new projects on Tier 1.
- (4) BONUS projects that include the HUD priorities (i.e. partnership with health care, other housing funds) that are identified in the NOFO will be placed at the top of Tier 2. These HUD priorities lead to bonus points or additional scoring advantage for the CoC. BONUS projects that do not include the HUD priorities will be placed at the bottom of Tier 2.

- (5) To be used in scoring, the APR submission must be accepted by HUD in SAGE. If there is an issue, confirmed by the HUD Milwaukee Field Office, the agency must notify the CoC Director. Limited, case-by-case, exceptions may be made.
- (6) Any renewable (non-new) project will be scored using the CoC Project Scoring Tool. All projects scoring 70% or higher and in good standing with HUD and the Balance of State CoC will automatically be eligible to submit a Project Application. If a project falls below threshold 3 consecutive grant years (i.e. 2019, 2021, 2022), the CoC reserves the right to involuntarily reallocate the entire grant.
- Any renewable (non-new) project falling below 70% must submit a Decision Form to the CoC Director. The Decision Form includes: relinquish the grant funds, reallocate the grant funds, or request reconsideration.
 - If a project fell under threshold during the FY2019 CoC Competition, the project must request an Exemption. This must be done in writing and outlining the steps taken to resolve the issues identified in the FY2019 CoC Competition and request for reconsideration process.
 - If the project is in good standing with HUD, the Balance of State CoC, and making improvements in coordination with the Board and/or BOS Staff recommendations, the project will be allowed to submit a Project Application.
 - If the project is not in good standing with HUD, or the Balance of State CoC, or has not made the improvements recommend by the Board or BOS Staff, the project will be required to complete the Decision Form.
- (7) If an agency spent less than 75% of their grant (1st year grant exempt), the agency must submit an explanation and plan to address or make changes to prevent it from happening again. If the agency has spent less than 75% of their grant after 2 years, the amount unspent will be involuntarily reallocated.
- (8) If any agency's unit utilization is less than 80%, the agency must submit an explanation and plan to address or make changes to prevent it from happening again. If an agency has a unit utilization less than 80% after 2 grant years, the funding will be involuntarily reallocated, and budget adjusted.

SECTION 2

Draft Timeline

If the NOFO is released and the competition begins July 1, 2022 and is due mid-October, then the a similar timeline will be followed. A final timeline will be posted on the website and sent out in email at the beginning of the competition.

| | |
|--------------|--|
| July 1 | Competition begins |
| August 15 | Draft Scoring Tool results posted on website |
| August 31 | Deadline for APR submissions in SAGE for use in scoring |
| September 1 | Threshold determination and notice to projects |
| September 15 | Projects under threshold decision deadline |
| September 16 | 2 nd Draft Scoring Tool results posted on website |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| September 30 | Bonus and new project application deadline |
| October 1 | Final Scoring Tool results posted on website |
| October 8 | Deadline to appeal scoring tool results, request permission to reallocate |

SECTION 3 – Timely Submission (8 points possible)

| Criteria | 0 points | -2 points |
|--|----------|------------------------|
| HUD APR submitted on time in SAGE Submission of APR ending in 2021 (2022 if available) | On time | Late |
| Turned in Board requested information for the purposes of the Collaborative Application on time & complete | * | Late Incomplete |
| Turned in Project Application for review on time | On time | Late |

| Criteria | 8 pts | 6 pts | 4 pts | 2 points | 1 point | 0 points |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Action Plan Progress | Coalition set goals, fully met goals, and created new goals | Coalition set goals, fully met some goal(s) and made progress on other goal(s), and created new goal(s) or expanded clearly on original unmet goals | Coalition set goals, did not meet any goal(s) but provided explanation as to why, is continuing to work on these, and has set other goal(s) and/or expanded on the unmet ones | Coalition set goals, did not meet any goal(s), provided minimal explanation, and does not plan to continue addressing or meeting these goal(s), has set a new goal(s) | Coalition set goals, did not meet any goal(s), did not provide any explanation, or identify a reason, has set new goal(s) | Coalition did not set goals and/or has not set new goal(s) |

As stated on page 1, once the NOFA drops and competition officially begins, a final timeline will be posted to the website and sent out in email. A set deadline will be included for any project that wishes to submit a new APR in SAGE. The most recently submitted APR in SAGE and accepted by HUD will be used for scoring purposes.

SECTION 4 – Program Performance Operations (50 points possible)

| | Criteria | 5 points | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
|---|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Effective Use of Federal Funds | Spent 95 - 100% of grant | Spent 90 – 94.9% of grant | Spent 85 – 89.0% of grant | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | Unit Utilization – annual average | 96-100% | 90-95% | 80-89% | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | Data Completeness: Don't Know, Missing, Refused | 0% - 1.0% | 1.1% - 2% | 2.1% - 3% | 3.1% - 4% | Greater than 4.1% |
| 4 | eLOCCS Drawdown Rates | Once per quarter | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Exceptions:

- New and first year renewals shall be exempt from scoring in the category of “Effective Use of Federal Funds” and “Unit Utilization” and will receive full points for each of those criteria.
- If an agency cannot access eLOCCS due to contractual issues with HUD, the agency is responsible to provide evidence of this situation to the Balance of State. If sufficient proof is provided, the agency will be exempt from the category of “eLOCCS Drawdown Rates” and receive full points for eLOCCS Drawdown Rates criteria.

| | Criteria | 5 points | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| 5 | Housing First: Non-Homeless Situations | 95-100% of exits were non-homeless destinations | 90-94% of exits were non-homeless destinations | 80-89% of exits were non-homeless destinations | 70-79% of exits were non-homeless destinations | 69% or less of exits were non-homeless destinations |
| 6 | Housing First: Reason for Exit | 95-100% of the reasons for exit met criteria | 90-94% of the reasons for exit met criteria | 80-89% of the reasons for exit met criteria | 70-79% of the reasons for exit met criteria | 69% or less of the reasons for exit met criteria |
| 7 | Housing First Monitoring Assessment: Access to Housing | Fully Compliant | Mostly Compliant | Somewhat Compliant | Somewhat non-compliant | Mostly Non-Compliant |
| 8 | Housing First Monitoring Assessment: Participant Input | Fully Compliant | Mostly Compliant | Somewhat Compliant | Somewhat non- | Mostly Non-Compliant |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | | compliant | |
| 9 | Housing First Monitoring Assessment: Leasing/Rental Assistance | Fully Compliant | Mostly Compliant | Somewhat Compliant | Somewhat non-compliant | Mostly Non-Compliant |
| 10 | Housing First Monitoring Assessment: Services | Fully Compliant | Mostly Compliant | Somewhat Compliant | Somewhat non-compliant | Mostly Non-Compliant |

HMIS Report (ran by ICA)

- Housing First is predicated on belief that people should be re-housed when possible and all efforts should be made to prevent the return into homelessness.
 - Exits to homelessness: if a household was exited from a CoC project into a non-homeless situation
 - Reasons for Exit: if a household was exited for reasons other than non-payment of rent, non-compliance with program rules, or disagreement with rules/persons (these are considered not in line with housing first). The criteria would include reasons other than those listed above.

Housing First Assessment – this tool will be used during all desk and in-person monitorings. Points will be awarded based on the results of the project’s most recent monitoring results.

- This 5-point scale will be used for each criterion on the housing first assessment tool:
 - Fully Compliant
 - Mostly Compliant
 - 1-2 minor changes needed
 - wording in documents need to be updated but in practice agency and staff are practicing housing first
 - Somewhat Compliant
 - 1-2 practices may need to be changed
 - documents need to be updated to be housing first
 - more staff training recommended
 - Somewhat Non-compliant
 - Agency has significant changes to be made to documents and practice
 - More agency and staff training required
 - Mostly Non-Compliant
 - Rules, documents, and practices are not housing first
- The criteria within the housing first assessment will include the following:
 - Access to housing
 - Projects are low barrier at entry. Households are not denied for access within the housing first guidelines
 - Participant-centered intake process

- Compliant with equal access policy
- Participant input
 - Staff are educating participants on housing first and tenants are informed of their full rights and responsibilities as a tenant
 - Agencies and staff are creating formal opportunities for participant input and feedback about the project.
- Leasing/rental assistance
 - Housing is considered permanent
 - Participant choice in unit selection
 - Full tenant rights, including but not limited to no clauses that would be different than any other tenant; tenants are educated on their lease and rights as a tenant; eviction avoidance
- Services
 - Participant choice in services
 - Participant-centered planning, case plan development, goals
 - Services continually offered even in if temporary change in housing status (short stay in institution)
 - Services offered up to 6 months beyond exit
 - Effective services are offered, and staff are trained in effective strategies known to increase stability and form trusting relationship (harm reduction, motivational interviewing, trauma-informed approaches, strengths-based)

SECTION 5 – Program Performance Measures (32 points possible)

| | PSH Criteria | 8 points | 6 points | 3 points | 0 points |
|--------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 a | HUD Goal: Increase Earned Income | 54% or higher | 35 – 53% | 20 – 34% | 19% or less |
| 2 | HUD Goal: Increase Non-employment Income | 65% or higher | 50 – 64% | 35 – 49% | 34% or less |
| 3 | HUD Goal: Non-Cash Benefits | 65% or higher | 50 – 64% | 35 – 49% | 34% or less |
| 4 | HUD Goal: Health Insurance | 65% or higher | 50 – 64% | 35 – 49% | 34% or less |

| | TH & RRH Criteria | 8 points | 6 points | 3 points | 0 points |
|--------|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 b | HUD Goal: Increase Earned Income | 30% or higher | 20 - 29% | 10 – 19% | 9% or less |
| 2 | HUD Goal: Increase Non-employment Income | 65% or higher | 50 – 64% | 35 – 49% | 34% or less |
| 3 | HUD Goal: Non-Cash Benefits | 65% or higher | 50 – 64% | 35 – 49% | 34% or less |
| 4 | HUD Goal: Health Insurance | 65% or higher | 50 – 64% | 35 – 49% | 34% or less |

SECTION 6 – System Performance Measures (40 points possible)

| | Criteria | 10 pts | 8 pts | 6 pts | 4 pts | 0 point |
|---|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | Reoccurrence Rate (SPM) <i>This looks at what happens after an exit to a permanent destination.</i> | 0 - 5% | 5.1 – 10% | 10.1 – 15% | 15.1% - 20% | 20.1% + |

EXCEPTION:

For Reoccurrence Rate (SPM): If a project had no exits, the project will receive 3 points. If a project had 1 or 2 participants exit, the project will receive a minimum of 3 points. If a project had 3 or 4 participants exit, the project will receive a minimum of 2 points.

NOTE:

The report parameters will match the number of months required by HUD (ie. 6 mo, 12 mo, 18 mo, 24 mo)

| | Project Type Criteria | 10 pts | 5 pts | 0 points |
|----|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 2a | Length of Time Homeless (PSH) #1 | 55% or more of clients had 90 days or less between project entry and move-in date | 45 – 54.9% or more of clients had 90 days or less between project entry and move-in date | Less than 44.9% of clients had 90 days or less between project entry and move-in date |
| | Length of Time Homeless (PSH) #2 | 65% of clients or more had a project entry and a move-in date | 45-64.9% of clients or more had a project entry and a move-in date | Less than 44.9% of clients had a project entry and a move-in date |
| 2b | Length of Time Homeless (TH) #1 | 50% or more of clients were in the project for 12 months or less | N/A | Less than 50% of clients were in the project for 12 months or less |
| | Length of Time Homeless (TH) #2 | 25% or more of clients were in the project for 12 months or less | N/A | Less than 25% of clients were in the project for 12 months or less |
| 2c | Length of Time Homeless (RRH) #1 | 55% or more of clients had 90 days or less between | 45 – 54.9% or more of clients had 90 days or less | Less than 44.9% of clients had 90 days or less |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| | | project entry and move-in date | between project entry and move-in date | between project entry and move-in date |
| | Length of Time Homeless (RRH) #2 | 65% of clients or more had a project entry and a move-in date | 45-64.9% of clients or more had a project entry and a move-in date | Less than 44.9% of clients had a project entry and a move-in date |
| 3a | Exits to Permanent Housing (PSH: Exits to PH or remaining in PSH) | 90% or higher | 70 – 89% | 69% or less |
| 3b | Exits to Permanent Housing (RRH/TH) | 80% or higher | 60 – 79% | 59% or less |

SECTION 7 – Population (32 points possible)

| | PSH Criteria | 8 points | 6 points | 4 points | 2 points | 0 points |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Chronic Homeless (new) | 75% + | 50-74% | 25-49% | 10-24% | 9% or less |
| 2 | Stayers & leavers with 1 or more disabilities | 50% + | 35 - 50% | 20 - 34% | 10 - 19% | 9% or less |
| 3 | Entries from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation | 50% + | 35 - 50% | 20 - 34% | 10 - 19% | 9% or less |
| 4 | No income at entry | 50% + | 35 - 50% | 20 - 34% | 10 - 19% | 9% or less |

| | TH Criteria | 8 points | 6 points | 4 points | 2 points | 0 points |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Chronic Homeless (new) | 50% + | 35 - 50% | 20 - 34% | 10 - 19% | 9% or less |
| 2 | Stayers & leavers with 1 or more disabilities | 50% + | 35 - 50% | 20 - 34% | 10 - 19% | 9% or less |
| 3 | Entries from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation | 25% + | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| 4 | No income at entry | 25% + | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |

| | RRH Criteria | 8 points | 6 points | 4 points | 2 points | 0 points |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Chronic Homeless (new) | 25% + | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| 2 | Clients with 1 or more disability (new) | 25% + | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| 3 | Entries from Place Not Meant for Human Habitation | 25% + | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| 4 | No income at entry | 25% + | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |

Exceptions:

- Chronic Homeless (new): A process shall be established by which a project can demonstrate that at the time of a project opening, there were no chronic homeless persons on the coordinated entry list. If so, the project would be exempt and receive full points.

SECTION 8 - Coordinated Entry (30 points possible)

| Criteria | 10 points | 8 points | 6 points | 0 points |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Findings issued at most recent coordinated entry monitoring | None | Yes, but the findings were resolved within 30 days | Yes, findings were resolved within 31 – 60 days | Yes, findings were resolved 61+ days |
| Timely coordinated entry follow-up | 95% of agency follow-ups are completed (not expired) | 90-94% of agency follow-ups are completed (not expired) | 80-89% of agency follow-ups are completed (not expired) | 79% or less of agency follow-ups are completed (not expired) |
| Coordinated entry referrals accurately completed | 95% of agency referral data is complete and accurate | 90-94% of agency referral data is complete and accurate | 80-89% of agency referral data is complete and accurate | 79% of agency referral data is complete and accurate |

Notes:

- Coordinated entry follow-ups are required within 30 days of a coordinated entry referral. Expired follow-ups are those follow-ups not made within the 30 day time frame.
- Coordinated entry referrals are required to be complete and accurate. A referral is incomplete or inaccurate if the data negatively impacts a client's prioritization. This includes missing length of time homeless, missing disability information, missing DV status, etc.

BONUS:

A project can receive up to 6 points for their coalition's use of coordinated entry.

| | BONUS Criteria | 6 points | 4 points | 2 points | 0 points |
|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | A coalition demonstrates that agencies (not required to use CE) are referring people to the prioritization list and/or using the prioritization list to fill project openings. | 3 or more agencies or projects | 2 agencies or projects | 1 agency or projects | 0 agencies or projects |

Examples of agencies that are not required to use CE include:

- Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA), HPP Prevention projects, HPP Rapid re-housing projects, Mainstream vouchers, and other housing programs that do not use CoC or ESG funds.
- HUD-VASH, WDVA VORP, and other veteran specific programs
- police departments, school districts, public housing authorities, human services, workforce resource, hospitals, other systems of care
- emergency shelters or motel voucher programs that do not receive ESG funds or are not otherwise required to use coordinated entry

SECTION 9 – Point-in-Time (penalty points only)

| Criteria | Subtract |
|---|-----------------|
| Non-Participation by COC Funded agency in overnight Street Count during the January PIT – penalty applies to the agency only. | 10 points |
| Late submission of Final Deadline for January PIT data – this will be applied to the entire local continua. | 10 points |
| Non-Participation by COC Funded agency in overnight Street Count during the July PIT – penalty applies to the agency only. | 10 points |
| Late submission of Final Deadline for July PIT data – this will be applied to the entire local continua. | 10 points |

SECTION 10 - Tiebreaker

Once the total number of points are calculated, the number of points earned will be divided by the total possible points for that project type. The resulting percentage will be placed in descending order, highest at top and lowest at bottom. If there is a tie between projects, a tiebreaker score will be used.

The tiebreaker score will be based on cost effectiveness. The total HUD grant award amount will be divided by the number of successful outcomes. Successful outcome for all projects (other than PSH) is exiting to permanent housing. Successful outcome for PSH includes exits to permanent housing and remaining in permanent housing.

Example

A non-PSH project gets \$100,000 grant. 25 households successfully went to permanent housing. The cost per successful outcome is: \$4,000.

A PSH project gets \$100,000 grant. 5 households successfully went to permanent housing. 4 households remain in permanent housing. The cost per successful outcome is: \$11,111.

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-Explanation

This document reflects: data collected through HMIS, SAGE, and project applications along with additional scoring criteria (i.e. action plans, PIT, housing first, and coordinated entry).

RANKING

The Ranking tab is the list of renewal and new projects submitted for the FY2022 COC Competition. All projects must be listed on the Scoring Tool.

The projects are listed from highestest percentage to the lowest. Any tie is managed through cost per successful outcome. The project with the smaller cost will be ranked first.

For the WI Balance of State, the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) is \$12,574,269. The ARD is determined by HUD and posted on the Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW).

HUD determines the Tier limits. This year, Tier 1 is 95% the current ARD.

TIEBREAKER

The Tiebreaker tab is the list of renewal projects and the data from their APR regarding number of leavers, number of leavers exiting to another permanent housing destination, and if a PH program - the number of stayers as well.

For non-PSH, the cost is determined by dividing the number of successful PH exits by number of people exiting.

For PSH, the cost is determined by dividing the number of successful PH exits plus the number of stayers by the number of people exiting plus the number of people staying.

SCORING-POINTS

The Points tab shows each of the scoring areas in which projects can earn points. This tab shows the amount of points and the corresponding percentages.

EVALUATION

The Evaluation tab shows the projects and the points received in each area based on the points listed on the data tab.

For each area that a project did not receive full points there is an inserted comment.

DATA

The Data tab shows the list of projects and the data pulled from the APRs in the key areas.

The data regarding length of time homeless, reoccurrence, chronic homeless and disabilities were gathered from independent HMIS-based reports by ICA.

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION

This tab further explains the scoring breakdown for the action plan review, housing first, and coordinated entry.

Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care Board Scoring Tool (FY21)

FINAL

| Rank | Applicant Name | Project Name | Type | Project Score (%) | Project Score (Pts) | Project Accept or Reject Status | Amount of Funds Requested |
|------|--|---|------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Couleecap, Inc. | Couleecap Housing First Permanent Housing Program | PSH | 89.58% | 172/192 | Accept | \$243,535 |
| 2 | Walworth County Housing Authority | Hartwell Street Apartments | PSH | 88.37% | 152/172 | Accept | \$70,810 |
| 3 | Kenosha Human Development Services | MyHOME Rapid Rehousing Project | RRH | 84.62% | 154/182 | Accept | \$160,043 |
| 4 | Community Action Coalition for South-Central Wisconsin | Project WISH | PSH | 83.91% | 146/174 | Accept | \$203,312 |
| 5 | Kenosha Human Development Services | Kenosha Permanent Housing Connections | PSH | 83.15% | 153/184 | Accept | \$419,846 |
| 6 | Couleecap, Inc. | Couleecap Housing First II PSH | PSH | 83.15% | 153/184 | Accept | \$402,141 |
| 7 | Newcap, Inc. | Brown County PSH Individuals | PSH | 82.97% | 151/182 | Accept | \$952,079 |
| 8 | North Central Community Action Program, Inc. | NCCAP Permanent Supportive Housing | PSH | 82.81% | 159/192 | Accept | \$191,217 |
| 9 | Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | Western Dairyland PSH 1 | PSH | 82.07% | 151/184 | Accept | \$278,798 |
| 10 | City of Appleton | Fox Cities HP Rapid Re-Housing Program | RRH | 80.46% | 140/174 | Accept | \$62,780 |
| 11 | West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. | West CAP Rapid Re-Housing | RRH | 79.95% | 153.5/192 | Accept | \$363,988 |
| 12 | Pillars, Inc | It Takes a Village Permanent Supportive Housing Program | PSH | 79.17% | 152/192 | Accept | \$190,890 |
| 13 | West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing | PSH | 78.53% | 144.5/184 | Accept | \$169,467 |
| 14 | City of Appleton | Fox Cities Housing Coalition RRH Program | RRH | 77.60% | 149/192 | Accept | \$191,952 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|-----|------------------|-----------|--------|-------------|
| 15 | Kenosha Human Development Services, Inc. | KYF Rapid Rehousing Project | RRH | 76.04% | 146/192 | Accept | \$145,983 |
| 16 | City of Appleton | Fox Cities Housing Coalition RRH Program Expansion | RRH | 75.82% | 138/182 | Accept | \$85,187 |
| 17 | Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | Western Dairyland PSH 3 | PSH | 75.52% | 145/192 | Accept | \$200,233 |
| 18 | House of Hope Green Bay, Inc | House of Hope Youth Rapid Re-Housing | RRH | 75.27% | 137/182 | Accept | \$179,114 |
| 19 | Newcap, Inc. | SHP Housing First | PSH | 75.27% | 137/182 | Accept | \$214,395 |
| 20 | Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, In | Welcome Home Eau Claire | RRH | 74.71% | 130/174 | Accept | \$92,740 |
| 21 | West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing II | PSH | 73.90% | 134.5/182 | Accept | \$663,286 |
| 22 | Newcap, Inc. | Brown County Youth RRH Project | RRH | 73.44% | 141/192 | Accept | \$372,370 |
| 23 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | COC WinnebagoLand Rapid Rehousing | RRH | 72.92% | 140/192 | Accept | \$125,684 |
| 24 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | ADVOCAP Fond du Lac Rapid Rehousing | RRH | 72.92% | 140/192 | Accept | \$100,608 |
| 25 | Newcap, Inc. | Brown County PSH Families | PSH | 72.56% | 119/164 | Accept | \$68,077 |
| 26 | Community Action, Inc. of Rock & Walworth Counties | CAI_PSH | PSH | 71.26% | 124/174 | Accept | \$234,206 |
| 27 | Community Action, Inc. of Rock & Walworth Counties | CAI_RRH | RRH | 70.83% | 136/192 | Accept | \$503,493 |
| 28 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | WinnebagoLand Rapid Rehousing | RRH | 69.57% | 128/184 | Accept | \$278,224 |
| 29 | Central Wisconsin Community Action Council, Inc. | Project Chance Rapid Re-Housing | RRH | 69.27% | 133/192 | Accept | \$292,804 |
| 30 | Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC RRH Project | RRH | 1st time renewal | N/A | Accept | \$2,874,122 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|------------------------|-----|--------|-------------------|
| 31 | Hebron House of Hospitality, Inc | Jeremy PSH Project | PSH | Transition Grant - New | N/A | Accept | \$118,755 |
| 32 | Lakeshore CAP Inc. of Wisconsin | Lakeshore PSH | PSH | Transition Grant - New | N/A | Accept | \$140,259 |
| 33 | Institute for Community Alliances | Wisconsin HMIS Project Renewal | HMIS | HMIS | N/A | Accept | \$371,429 |
| 34 | Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC Supportive Services for Coordinated Entry | SSO | SSO CE | N/A | Accept | \$717,935 |
| 35 | Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC Supportive Services for Coordinated Entry DV | SSO | SSO CE DV | N/A | Accept | \$176,000 |
| Total ARD (GIW) = \$12,574,269 (Tier 1 is 95%, limit: 11,945,556) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | <i>Tier 1 Total</i> | | | 11,855,762 |

| Tier 2 | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|-----|---------------------|------------|--------|--------------------|
| 36 | Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | PHASE 1 (expansion) | PSH | New - Bonus | 352.75/365 | Accept | \$234,622 |
| 37 | House of Hope Green Bay, Inc | House of Hope Youth Rapid Rehousing Project II (expansion) | RRH | New - Bonus | 319/345 | Accept | \$347,252 |
| 38 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | Winnebagoland PSH | PSH | 68.13% | 124/182 | Accept | \$137,025 |
| 39 | Community Action Coalition for South-Central Wisconsin | Jefferson County Transitional Housing Program | TH | 66.30% | 122/184 | Accept | \$168,164 |
| 40 | Northwest Wisconsin Community Services Agency Inc. | NWCSA PSH | PSH | 62.09% | 113/182 | Accept | \$125,004 |
| 41 | The Salvation Army | Permanent Supportive Housing | PSH | 61.72% | 118.5/192 | Accept | \$288,314 |
| 42 | Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC RRH Project Expansion | RRH | New - Bonus DV | N/A | Accept | \$1,243,572 |
| | | | | <i>Tier 2 Total</i> | | | \$2,543,953 |

Tier 2 = Bonus

DV Bonus: \$1,243,572

PH Bonus: \$628,713

Voluntary Relinquishment of Funds

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | | | | | \$0 |

Voluntary Reallocation of Funds - Transition Grants (new)

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|--|--|--|------------------|
| 31 | Hebron House of Hospitality, Inc | Jeremy House Safe Haven | SH | | | | \$118,755 |
| 32 | Lakeshore CAP Inc. of Wisconsin | RRH | RRH | | | | \$140,259 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | | | | | \$259,014 |

Reallocated Funds

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|--|--|--|--|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | | | | | \$0 |

NEW PROJECTS

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|------------|--------|--------------------|
| 36 | Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | PSH 1 Expansion | PSH | 96.64% | 352.75/365 | Accept | \$234,622 |
| 37 | House of Hope Green Bay, Inc | RRH Expansion | RRH | 92.46% | 319/345 | Accept | \$347,252 |
| 42 | Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC RRH Project Expansion | RRH | 4 subrecipients selected | | Accept | \$1,243,572 |
| | | TOTAL | | | | | \$1,825,446 |

022)

| Scoring Tiebreaker (if needed) |
|--------------------------------------|
| \$ 11,587.30 |
| \$ 5,057.86 |
| \$ 31,720.60 |
| \$ 17,600.73 |
| \$ 12,832.71 |
| \$ 14,062.07 |
| \$ 13,215.24 |
| \$ 14,446.23 |
| \$ 11,975.18 |
| \$ 14,531.00 |
| \$ 8,734.30 |
| \$ 7,914.70 |
| \$ 12,286.92 |
| \$ 12,232.00 |

| |
|--------------|
| \$ 18,037.88 |
| \$ 9,808.38 |
| \$ 17,340.91 |
| \$ 7,201.04 |
| \$ 8,016.62 |
| NA |
| \$ 10,213.45 |
| \$ 40,585.11 |
| \$ 6,297.26 |
| \$ 24,171.00 |
| \$ 28,510.00 |
| \$ 7,157.71 |
| \$ 13,692.26 |
| \$ 24,296.00 |
| \$ 5,581.55 |
| \$ 10,164.74 |

| |
|-----|
| N/A |
| N/A |
| N/A |
| N/A |
| N/A |
| N/A |
| |

| |
|--------------|
| |
| N/A |
| N/A |
| \$ 26,591.60 |
| \$ 24,023.43 |
| \$5,893.50 |
| \$6,967.20 |
| N/A |
| |

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-Tiebreaker

Applicant Info

| Agency | Type | Program Name | Total Award \$ | # Leavers to PH (TH/RRH) | Cost Per Successful Outcome |
|---------------------------|------|---|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ADVOCAP | RRH | ADVOCAP Fond du Lac Rapid Rehousing | \$96,684 | 4 | \$24,171.00 |
| ADVOCAP | RRH | Winnebagoland Rapid Rehousing | \$267,256 | 11 | \$24,296.00 |
| ADVOCAP | RRH | COC Winnebagoland Rapid Rehousing | \$119,648 | 19 | \$6,297.26 |
| CAI | RRH | CAI_RRH | \$465,537 | 34 | \$13,692.26 |
| City of Appleton | RRH | Fox Cities Housing Coalition Rapid Re-Housing | \$183,480 | 15 | \$12,232.00 |
| City of Appleton | RRH | Fox Cities Housing Coalition Rapid Re-Housing Expansion | \$78,467 | 8 | \$9,808.38 |
| City of Appleton | RRH | Fox Cities HP Rapid Re-Housing | \$58,124 | 4 | \$14,531.00 |
| CWCAC | RRH | Project Chance Rapid Rehousing | \$273,496 | 49 | \$5,581.55 |
| House of Hope - Green Bay | RRH | Youth Rapid Rehousing | \$180,026 | 25 | \$7,201.04 |
| KHDS | RRH | KYF Rapid Rehousing Project | \$144,303 | 8 | \$18,037.88 |
| KHDS | RRH | MyHOME Rapid Rehousing Project | \$158,603 | 5 | \$31,720.60 |
| Lakeshore CAP | RRH | RRH | \$132,711 | 31 | \$4,281.00 |
| Lutheran Social Services | RRH | Welcome Home Eau Claire (RRH) | \$89,476 | 0 | #DIV/0! |
| Newcap | RRH | Brown County Youth RRH Project | \$365,266 | 9 | \$40,585.11 |
| West CAP | RRH | West CAP Rapid Rehousing II | \$349,372 | 40 | \$8,734.30 |
| WI Balance of State CoC | RRH | RRH Project | \$1,026,639 | 101 | \$10,164.74 |
| Hebron House | SH | Jeremy House Safe Haven | \$118,755 | 2 | \$59,377.50 |
| CACSCW | TH | Jefferson County TH | \$168,164 | 7 | \$24,023.43 |
| | | | | | |
| Agency | Type | Program Name | Total Award \$ | # Leavers to PH + Stayers (PSH) | Cost Per Successful Outcome |
| ADVOCAP | PSH | Winnebagoland PSH | \$132,958 | 5 | \$26,591.60 |
| CACSCW | PSH | Project WISH | \$193,608 | 11 | \$17,600.73 |
| CAI | PSH | CAI_PSH | \$221,889 | 31 | \$7,157.71 |
| Coulecap | PSH | Housing First PHP | \$231,746 | 20 | \$11,587.30 |
| Coulecap | PSH | Housing First II PHP | \$379,676 | 27 | \$14,062.07 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|--|-----------|----|-------------|
| KHDS | PSH | Kenosha Permannet Housing Connections | \$397,814 | 31 | \$12,832.71 |
| Newcap | PSH | SHP Housing First | \$208,432 | 26 | \$8,016.62 |
| Newcap | PSH | Brown County PSH Individuals | \$898,636 | 68 | \$13,215.24 |
| Newcap | PSH | Brown County PSH Families | \$313,610 | 11 | \$28,510.00 |
| NCCAP | PSH | PSH | \$187,801 | 13 | \$14,446.23 |
| NWCSA | PSH | PSH | \$117,870 | 20 | \$5,893.50 |
| Pillars | PSH | It takes a Village PSH | \$182,038 | 23 | \$7,914.70 |
| The Salvation Army | PSH | Permanent Supportive Housing | \$278,688 | 40 | \$6,967.20 |
| Walworth County Housing Authority | PSH | Hartwell Street Apartments | \$70,810 | 14 | \$5,057.86 |
| West CAP | PSH | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing | \$159,730 | 13 | \$12,286.92 |
| West CAP | PSH | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing II | \$633,234 | 62 | \$10,213.45 |
| Western Dairyland | PSH | PSH 1 | \$263,454 | 22 | \$11,975.18 |
| Western Dairyland | PSH | PSH 3 | \$190,750 | 11 | \$17,340.91 |

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-Evaluation

| | | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | CACSCW | CACSCW | CAI | CAI | City of Appleton | City of Appleton | City of Appleton |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|-----|-----|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | | Fond du Lac RRH | Winn. PSH | Winn. RRH | COC Winn. RRH | Jefferson TH | PSH | RRH | PSH | Fox Cities RRH | Fox Cities RRH Exp | HP RRH |
| P T 1 & 7 | SAGE APR on time (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Board Request on time & complete (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Project App. on time (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Action Plan (8) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | Non-Part Jan. PIT (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Data Jan. PIT (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Non-Part July PIT (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Data July PIT (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| P T | Effective Use (5) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| | Unit Utilization (5) | 5 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | Data Complete (5) | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| | eLOCCS (5) | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | HF-exits (5) | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| T 6 | Follow up (10) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | Referrals (10) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| TOTAL Earned | | 138 | 122 | 126 | 138 | 120 | 144 | 134 | 122 | 143 | 132 | 134 |
| CE BONUS (up to 6) | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Penalty Points | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total earned plus BONUS | | 140 | 124 | 128 | 140 | 122 | 146 | 136 | 124 | 149 | 138 | 140 |
| TOTAL Possible | | 192 | 182 | 184 | 192 | 184 | 174 | 192 | 174 | 192 | 182 | 174 |
| Percentage Score | | 72.92% | 68.13% | 69.57% | 72.92% | 66.30% | 83.91% | 70.83% | 71.26% | 77.60% | 75.82% | 80.46% |
| 192 points | | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | CACSCW | CACSCW | CAI | CAI | City of Appleton | City of Appleton | City of Appleton |
| | | Fond du Lac RRH | Winn. PSH | Winn. RRH | COC Winn. RRH | Jefferson TH | PSH | RRH | PSH | Fox Cities RRH | Fox Cities RRH Exp | HP RRH |

| Couleecap | Couleecap | CWCAC | House of Hope | KHDS | KHDS | KHDS | LSS | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NCCAP | NWCSA |
|---------------|-----------------|-------|---------------|---------|------|-------------|-----|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
| Housing First | Housing First 2 | RRH | RRH | KYF RRH | PSH | My Home RRH | RRH | SHP Housing First PSH | Brown PSH I | Brown PSH Families | Brown Youth RRH | PSH | PSH |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | NA | 5 | 5 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------|--------|
| 10 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 10 |
| 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 166 | 147 | 131 | 135 | 142 | 149 | 150 | 130 | 135 | 149 | 117 | 139 | 157 | 113 |
| 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| 172 | 153 | 133 | 137 | 146 | 153 | 154 | 130 | 137 | 151 | 119 | 141 | 159 | 113 |
| 192 | 184 | 192 | 182 | 192 | 184 | 182 | 174 | 182 | 182 | 164 | 192 | 192 | 182 |
| 89.58% | 83.15% | 69.27% | 75.27% | 76.04% | 83.15% | 84.62% | 74.71% | 75.27% | 82.97% | 72.56% | 73.44% | 82.81% | 62.09% |
| Couleecap | Couleecap | CWCAC | House of Hope | KHDS | KHDS | KHDS | LSS | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NCCAP | NWCSA |
| Housing First | Housing First 2 | RRH | RRH | KYF RRH | PSH | My Home RRH | RRH | SHP Housing First PSH | Brown PSH I | Brown PSH Families | Brown Youth RRH | PSH | PSH |

| Pillars | The Salvation Army of St. Croix | Walworth County Housing Authority | West CAP | West CAP | West CAP | Western Dairyland EOC | Western Dairyland EOC | WI BOS |
|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| ITAV PSH | PSH | PSH | RRH II | PSH | PSH 2 | PSH 1 | PSH 3 | RRH |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 3.5 | 6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 7 | 7 | 5.8 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |

| Hebron House | Lakeshore CAP |
|--------------|---------------|
| Safe Haven | RRH |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| new | new |
| 7 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3.8 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.8 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3.8 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 0 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 10 | NA | 10 | 6 | NA |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 8 | 4 | 8 | 8 | NA | 8 | NA | 8 | 2 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| 4 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |

| | |
|----|----|
| 1 | 5 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| NA | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 8 |
| 8 | 8 |
| 10 | 0 |
| NA | 10 |
| NA | 5 |
| 0 | 0 |
| NA | 2 |
| NA | 6 |
| NA | 6 |
| NA | 6 |
| 10 | 10 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 8 | 6 | NA | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 10 | 0 | NA | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| 146 | 116.5 | 150 | 151.5 | 142.5 | 132.5 | 149 | 143 | 137.2 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 152 | 118.5 | 152 | 153.5 | 144.5 | 134.5 | 151 | 145 | 139.2 |
| 192 | 192 | 172 | 192 | 184 | 182 | 184 | 192 | 182 |
| 79.17% | 61.72% | 88.37% | 79.95% | 78.53% | 73.90% | 82.07% | 75.52% | 76.48% |
| Pillars | The Salvation Army of St. Croix | Walworth County PHA | West CAP | West CAP | West CAP | Western Dairyland EOC | Western Dairyland EOC | WI BOS |
| ITAV PSH | PSH | PSH | RRH II | PSH | PSH 2 | PSH 1 | PSH 3 | RRH |

| | |
|---------------|---------------|
| 6 | 10 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 85 | 111 |
| 2 | 2 |
| | |
| 87 | 113 |
| 130 | 192 |
| 66.92% | 58.85% |
| Hebron House | Lakeshore CAP |
| Safe Haven | RRH |

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-Scoring Points

Part 1: Timeliness & Action Plans (maximum 8 points)

| Timeliness | | |
|---------------------|---|----|
| APR (SAGE) | 0 | -2 |
| Board Request | 0 | -2 |
| Project Application | 0 | -2 |

| Action Plan | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Met all goals | set new ones | 8 |
| Met some + progress | set new ones | 6 |
| Did not meet any, continue progress | set new ones | 4 |
| Did not meet any, minimal explanation | set new ones | 2 |
| Did not meet, no explanation | set new ones | 1 |
| Did not set any goals | | 0 |

Part 2: Objective Criteria: Program Performance-Operations (maximum 50 points)

| Operations | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Effective Use of Federal Funds | 95-100% | 90-94.9% | 85-89.9% | NA | NA |
| Unit Utilitization | 96-100% | 90-95% | 80-89% | NA | NA |
| Data Completeness | 0 - 1.0% | 1.1 - 2% | 2.1 - 3% | 3.1 - 4% | >4.1% |
| eLOCCS Drawdown | 1 x/quarter | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Housing First | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Exits to Homelessness | 95-100% | 90-94% | 80-89% | 70-79% | 69% or less |
| Reasons for Exit | 95-100% | 90-94% | 80-89% | 70-79% | 69% or less |
| Monitoring - access | fully compliant | mostly compliant | somewhat compliant | somewhat non-compliant | mostly non-compliant |
| Monitoring - participant | fully compliant | mostly compliant | somewhat compliant | somewhat non-compliant | mostly non-compliant |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Monitoring - leasing/rental | fully compliant | mostly compliant | somewhat compliant | somewhat non-compliant | mostly non-compliant |
| Monitoring - services | fully compliant | mostly compliant | somewhat compliant | somewhat non-compliant | mostly non-compliant |

Part 3: Objective Criteria: Program Performance (Maximum 32 points)

| PSH Projects | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
|--------------------------------|------|--------|--------|-------------|
| Increase Earned Income | 54%+ | 35-53% | 20-34% | 19% or less |
| Increase Non-employment income | 65%+ | 50-64% | 35-49% | 34% or less |
| Connect to Non-cash benefits | 65%+ | 50-64% | 35-49% | 34% or less |
| Connect to health insurance | 65%+ | 50-64% | 35-49% | 34% or less |
| TH & RRH Projects | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Increase Earned Income | 30%+ | 20-29% | 10-19% | 9% or less |
| Increase Non-employment income | 65%+ | 50-64% | 35-49% | 34% or less |
| Connect to Non-cash benefits | 65%+ | 50-64% | 35-49% | 34% or less |
| Connect to health insurance | 65%+ | 50-64% | 35-49% | 34% or less |

**Housing Stability, Cash & non-Cash income are both program performance measures but also are system performance measures.*

Part 4: System Performance Measures (Maximum 40 points)

| Reoccurrence | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
|--|------|----------|---------------|----------|--------|
| SPM Report | 0-5% | 5.1-10% | 10.1-15% | 15.1-20% | 20.1%+ |
| LOTH - Project Type | 10 | 5 | 0 | | |
| LOTH PSH #1 (90 days or less) | 55%+ | 45-54.9% | 44.9% or less | | |
| LOTH PSH #2 (has move in) | 65%+ | 45-64.9% | 44.9% or less | | |
| LOTH TH #1 (12 mo or less) | 50%+ | NA | Less than 50% | | |
| LOTH TH #2 (12 mo or less) | 25%+ | NA | Less than 25% | | |
| LOTH RRH #1 (90 days or less) | 55%+ | 45-54.9% | 44.9% or less | | |
| LOTH RRH #2 (has move in) | 65%+ | 45-64.9% | 44.9% or less | | |
| Housing Stability | 10 | 5 | 0 | | |
| Housing Stability PSH (exit + remaining) | 90%+ | 70-89% | 69% or less | | |
| Housing Stability TH & RRH (exits) | 80%+ | 60-79% | 59% or less | | |

**LOTH = length of time homeless*

| Part 5: Type of Population (Maximum 32 points) | | | | | |
|---|------|--------|--------|--------|------------|
| PSH Projects | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Chronic homeless | 75%+ | 50-74% | 25-49% | 10-24% | 9% or less |
| disabilities | 50%+ | 35-50% | 20-34% | 10-19% | 9% or less |
| place not meant HH | 50%+ | 35-50% | 20-34% | 10-19% | 9% or less |
| no income at entry | 50%+ | 35-50% | 20-34% | 10-19% | 9% or less |
| TH Projects | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Chronic homeless | 50%+ | 35-50% | 20-34% | 10-19% | 9% or less |
| disabilities | 50%+ | 35-50% | 20-34% | 10-19% | 9% or less |
| place not meant HH | 25%+ | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| no income at entry | 25%+ | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| RRH Projects | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Chronic homeless | 25%+ | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| disabilities | 25%+ | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| place not meant HH | 25%+ | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |
| no income at entry | 25%+ | 20-24% | 10-19% | 1-9% | 0% |

Specific severe barriers included: length of time homeless (SPM), no income (obj), disability-SA (obj), unsheltered (obj), coordinated entry-vulnerability score(addt'l)

| Part 6: Coordinated Entry (Maximum 30 points) | | | | |
|--|------|---------|------------|-------------|
| Coordinated Entry (CE) | 10 | 8 | 6 | 0 |
| Findings | none | yes >30 | 31-60 days | 61+ |
| Timely FU | 95% | 90-94% | 80-89% | 79% or less |

| Total Points Possible = 192 pts | | |
|--|----|-------|
| Objective Criteria = | 69 | 35.9% |
| Timely Submission-eLoccs (5), Unit Utilization (5), Effective use of funds (5), performance-data completeness (5), Housing first (25), type of population-chronicity (8), adult w/disability (8), no income at entry (8), enter from unsheltered (8) | | |
| System performance = | 61 | 31.8% |
| housing stability-exit & retention (10), increase job growth-income & nonearned (16), reoccurrence (10), LOTH by project type (20), housing first-exits to PH (5) | | |
| Additional = | 54 | 28.1% |
| Action Plans (8), non-cash benefits (8), health insurance (8), CE (30) | | |

| BONUS | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
|--------------|----|---|---|---|
| Use of CE | 3+ | 2 | 1 | 0 |

| Tiebreaker: Cost Effectiveness | |
|--|--|
| Total HUD awarded divided by # successful outcomes | |
| Successful = exits to PH (or retention for PSH) | |

| Part 7: Point-in-Time (Penalty Points Only) | |
|--|-----|
| Non-participation Jan. | -10 |
| Late Submission - Jan. | -10 |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----|--------|--------|-------------|
| Referrals | 95% | 90-94% | 80-89% | 79% or less |
|-----------|-----|--------|--------|-------------|

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Non-participation July | -10 |
| Late Submission - July | -10 |

HUD required 33% - cost
eff, timely draws,
utilization rate, perf
data, type pop, type
housing

HUD required 20% -
system performance
criteria - exits to PH,
retention of PH, LOTH,
returns

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-Data

Part 1: Timeliness & Action Plan

| Agency Name | Project Name | APR Grant Year | APR Deadline | HUD APR - SAGE Submitted | Accepted by HUD Milw. FO | Board Req. | Proj. App. | Action Plan | Total award | Total Spent | Unspent Funds |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|--|------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP Fond du Lac Rapid Rehousing | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.30.22 | 9.29.21 | 10.7.21 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$96,684.00 | \$86,724.19 | \$9,959.81 |
| ADVOCAP | WinnebagoLand PSH | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 3.31.22 | 4.22.22 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$132,958.00 | \$94,893.85 | \$38,064.15 |
| ADVOCAP | WinnebagoLand Rapid Rehousing | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 3.31.22 | 4.22.22 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$267,256.00 | \$194,095.06 | \$73,160.94 |
| ADVOCAP | COC WinnebagoLand Rapid Rehousing | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 3.31.22 | rej 4/11, s 4/22, rej 4/22, s 4/22, rej 6/30, s 8/19, A 8/19 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$119,648.00 | \$111,025.42 | \$8,622.58 |
| CACSCW | Jefferson County TH | 5/1 - 4/30 | 7.31.22 | 7.27.22 | 7.28.22 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$168,164.00 | \$122,444.00 | \$45,720.00 |
| CACSCW | Project WISH | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.29.21 | 11.23.21 | 12.14.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$193,608.00 | \$188,025.00 | \$5,583.00 |
| CAI | CAI_RRH | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 3.31.22 | 4.20.22 | yes | yes | 6.0 | \$465,537.00 | \$318,569.84 | \$146,967.16 |
| CAI | CAI_PSH | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.29.21 | 11.15.21 | 12.2.21 | yes | yes | 6.0 | \$221,889.00 | \$216,957.27 | \$4,931.73 |
| City of Appleton | Fox Cities Housing Coalition Rapid Re-Housing | 10/1 - 9/30 | 12.31.21 | 10.27.21 | 10.29.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$183,480.00 | \$183,480.00 | \$0.00 |
| City of Appleton | Fox Cities Housing Coalition Rapid Re-Housing Expansion | 10/1 - 9/30 | 12.31.21 | 10.27.21 | 11.3.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$78,467.00 | \$73,332.00 | \$5,135.00 |
| City of Appleton | Fox Cities HP Rapid Re-Housing | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 1.21.22 | 1.27.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$58,124.00 | \$57,490.00 | \$634.00 |
| Couleecap | Housing First PHP | 10/1 - 9/30 | 12.31.21 | 12.21.21 | 12.22.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$231,746.00 | \$231,746.00 | \$0.00 |
| Couleecap | Housing First II PHP | 10/1 - 9/30 | 12.31.21 | 12.21.21 | 12.22.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$379,676.00 | \$379,676.00 | \$0.00 |
| CWCAC | Project Chance Rapid Rehousing | 8/1 - 7/31 | 10.29.21 | 9.28.21 | 10.7.21 | yes | no | 7.0 | \$273,496.00 | \$248,319.00 | \$25,177.00 |
| House of Hope - Green Bay | Youth Rapid Rehousing | 8/1 - 7/31 | 10.29.22 | 8.5.22 | 8.19.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$180,026.00 | \$180,026.00 | \$0.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| KHDS | KYF Rapid Rehousing Project | 7/1 - 6/30 | 9.28.22 | 8.11.2022 | pending as of 8.24.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$144,303.00 | \$142,480.00 | \$1,823.00 |
| KHDS | Kenosha Permannet Housing Connections | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 2.28.22 | 3.11.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$397,814.00 | \$397,814.00 | \$0.00 |
| KHDS | MyHOME Rapid Rehousing Project | 3/1 - 2/28 | 5.31.22 | 5.26.22 | 6.27.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$158,603.00 | \$157,954.00 | \$649.00 |
| Lutheran Social Services | Welcome Home Eau Claire (RRH) | 7/1 - 6/30 | 9.28.21 | 1.18.22 | 3.9.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$89,476.00 | \$71,084.68 | \$18,391.32 |
| Newcap | SHP Housing First | 4/1 - 3/31 | 6.30.22 | 5.12.22 | 5.25.22 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$208,432.00 | \$208,432.00 | \$0.00 |
| Newcap | Brown County PSH Individuals | 1/1 - 12/31 | 3.31.22 | 3.31.22 | 4.8.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$898,636.00 | \$898,636.00 | \$0.00 |
| Newcap | Brown County PSH Families | 12/1 - 11/30 | 2.28.22 | 2.22.22 | 5.18.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$313,610.00 | \$313,576.74 | \$33.26 |
| Newcap | Brown County Youth RRH Project | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.29.21 | 11.9.21 | 12.2.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$365,266.00 | \$365,266.00 | \$0.00 |
| NCCAP | PSH | 7/1 - 6/30 | 9.28.22 | 8.15.22 | 8.19.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$187,801.00 | \$187,801.00 | \$0.00 |
| NWCSA | PSH | 10/1 - 9/30 | 12.31.21 | 12.9.21 | 12.20.21 | yes | yes | 5.0 | \$117,870.00 | \$84,461.00 | \$33,409.00 |
| Pillars | It takes a Village PSH | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.29.21 | 11.16.21 | 12.2.21 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$182,038.00 | \$182,038.00 | \$0.00 |
| The Salvation Army | Permanent Supportive Housing | 4/1 - 3/31 | 6.30.22 | 6.29.22 | rej 7/26, sub 7/27, A 8/8/22 | yes | no | 3.5 | \$278,688.00 | \$262,114.00 | \$16,574.00 |
| Walworth County Housing Authority | Hartwell Street Apartments | 7/1 - 6/30 | 9.28.22 | 8.10.22 | pending as of 8.24.22 | yes | yes | 6.0 | \$70,810.00 | \$70,810.00 | \$0.00 |
| West CAP | West CAP Rapid Rehousing II | 7/1 - 6/30 | 9.28.21 | 9.27.21 | 10.7.21 | yes | yes | 3.5 | \$349,372.00 | \$349,372.00 | \$0.00 |
| West CAP | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing | 7/1 - 6/30 | 9.28.21 | 9.27.21 | 10.7.21 | yes | yes | 3.5 | \$159,730.00 | \$133,815.48 | \$25,914.52 |
| West CAP | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing II | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.29.21 | 10.26.21 | 10.29.21 | yes | yes | 3.5 | \$633,234.00 | \$556,711.25 | \$76,522.75 |
| Western Dairyland | PSH 1 | 12/1 - 11/30 | 2.28.22 | 2.24.22 | 3.2.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$263,454.00 | \$250,800.18 | \$12,653.82 |
| Western Dairyland | PSH 3 | 11/1 - 10/31 | 1.29.22 | 1.26.22 | 1.27.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$190,750.00 | \$175,219.17 | \$15,530.83 |
| WI Balance of State CoC | RRH Project | 10/1 - 9/30 | 12.30.21 | 12.21.21 | 12.22.21 | yes | yes | 5.8 | \$1,026,639.00 | \$993,696.02 | \$32,942.98 |
| No longer Renewals: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lakeshore CAP | RRH | 9/1 - 8/31 | 11.29.21 | 10.28.21 | 11.3.21 | yes | yes | 6.0 | \$132,711.00 | \$108,588.00 | \$24,123.00 |
| Hebron House | Jeremy House Safe Haven | 11/1 - 10/31 | 1.31.22 | 1.31.22 | 2.3.22 | yes | yes | 7.0 | \$118,755.00 | \$118,755.00 | \$0.00 |

Part 2: Objective Criteria: Program Performance-Operations

| % of Grant Return | % of Grant Spent | Unit Ut. Av. | Total # people | Total x 15 | # DC errors | DC Error % | eLOCCS Draw | H1st - Exits to non-H situations | H1st - Reasons for Exit | Monitor - Access | Monitor - Client | Monitor - Leasing or rental | Monitor - Services | Total Clients | Total Adults |
|-------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| 10.30% | 89.70% | >100% | 28 | 420 | 1 | 0.24% | no | 95.24% | 4.76% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 14 |
| 28.63% | 71.37% | 66.00% | 8 | 120 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 60.00% | 0.00% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| 27.37% | 72.63% | 85.00% | 75 | 1125 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 69.23% | 15.38% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 75 | 24 |
| 7.21% | 92.79% | 100.00% | 30 | 450 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 92.31% | 12.82% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 30 | 11 |
| 27.19% | 72.81% | 55.00% | 17 | 255 | 2 | 0.78% | yes | 100.00% | 22.22% | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 17 | 11 |
| 2.88% | 97.12% | 100.00% | 12 | 180 | 7 | 3.89% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 12 |
| 31.57% | 68.43% | 65.00% | 126 | 1890 | 35 | 1.85% | yes | 100.00% | 12.50% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 126 | 60 |
| 2.22% | 97.78% | 62.00% | 32 | 480 | 2 | 0.42% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 32 | 19 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | >100 | 54 | 810 | 4 | 0.49% | yes | 80.00% | 10.00% | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 54 | 24 |
| 6.54% | 93.46% | >100 | 31 | 465 | 4 | 0.86% | yes | 100.00% | 57.14% | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 31 | 16 |
| 1.09% | 98.91% | >100% | 12 | 180 | 3 | 1.67% | | 100.00% | 33.33% | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 9 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 93.00% | 22 | 330 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 22 | 22 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 95.00% | 31 | 465 | 1 | 0.22% | yes | 20.00% | 0.00% | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 31 | 30 |
| 9.21% | 90.79% | 81.00% | 78 | 1170 | 0 | 0.00% | no | 100.00% | 97.38% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 78 | 39 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 98.00% | 66 | 990 | 26 | 2.63% | yes | 100.00% | 58.62% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 66 | 32 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------|-----|------|----|-------|-----|---------|--------|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|----|
| 1.26% | 98.74% | 89.00% | 24 | 360 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 100.00% | 28.57% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 23 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | >100 | 32 | 480 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 100.00% | 60.00% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 32 | 32 |
| 0.41% | 99.59% | >100% | 18 | 270 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 87.50% | 50.00% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 18 | 18 |
| 20.55% | 79.45% | 44.00% | 7 | 105 | 4 | 3.81% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 85.00% | 32 | 480 | 2 | 0.42% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 32 | 25 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | >100% | 78 | 1170 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 100.00% | 80.00% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 78 | 77 |
| 0.01% | 99.99% | 100.00% | 11 | 165 | 3 | 1.82% | yes | NA | NA | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 4 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | >100% | 73 | 1095 | 4 | 0.37% | yes | 97.62% | 59.52% | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 73 | 34 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 93.00% | 13 | 195 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 100.00% | 50.00% | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 13 |
| 28.34% | 71.66% | 48.00% | 22 | 330 | 9 | 2.73% | yes | 87.50% | 68.75% | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 22 | 13 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 92.00% | 27 | 405 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 87.50% | 40.00% | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 27 | 27 |
| 5.95% | 94.05% | 70.00% | 54 | 810 | 8 | 0.99% | yes | 100.00% | 57.14% | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 54 | 41 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 91.00% | 15 | 225 | 1 | 0.44% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 15 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 83.00% | 99 | 1485 | 4 | 0.27% | yes | 91.04% | 4.29% | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 99 | 55 |
| 16.22% | 83.78% | 90.00% | 14 | 210 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 100.00% | 0.00% | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 14 | 13 |
| 12.08% | 87.92% | 90.00% | 69 | 1035 | 3 | 0.29% | yes | 69.57% | 17.39% | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 69 | 48 |
| 4.80% | 95.20% | >100% | 25 | 375 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 75.00% | 50.00% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 25 | 19 |
| 8.14% | 91.86% | 99.00% | 14 | 210 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 66.67% | 66.67% | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 14 | 14 |
| 3.21% | 96.79% | 93.89% | 252 | 3780 | 88 | 2.33% | yes | 94.52% | 64.38% | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4 | 3.8 | 252 | 93 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------|--------|----|------|---|-------|-----|--------|--------|---|---|----|---|----|----|
| 18.18% | 81.82% | 70.00% | 91 | 1365 | 4 | 0.29% | yes | 73.85% | 95.38% | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 91 | 44 |
| 0.00% | 100.00% | 91.00% | 11 | 165 | 0 | 0.00% | yes | 37.50% | 0.00% | 4 | 3 | NA | 4 | 11 | 11 |

Part 3: Objective Criteria: Program Performance

| Leavers | Adult Leavers | Leavers minus Deceased | Exit to PH Destination | PSH - Stayers | Math | Housing Stability % | Earned | Total | Increase Cash Income % | Non-earned | Total | Increase Non-Cash Income % | Non-Cash Benefits | Total |
|---------|---------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------|--------|-------|------------------------|------------|-------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| 13 | 7 | 13 | 4 | | | 30.77% | 0 | 10 | 0.00% | 2 | 10 | 20.00% | 14 | 14 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 out of 8 | 65.50% | 0 | 8 | 0.00% | 3 | 8 | 37.50% | 8 | 8 |
| 34 | 14 | 34 | 11 | | | 32.35% | 4 | 20 | 20.00% | 3 | 20 | 15.00% | 20 | 24 |
| 19 | 6 | 19 | 19 | | | 100.00% | 3 | 9 | 33.33% | 2 | 9 | 22.22% | 7 | 11 |
| 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | | | 87.50% | 1 | 7 | 14.29% | 2 | 7 | 28.57% | 11 | 11 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 11 out of 12 | 91.67% | 0 | 5 | 0.00% | 2 | 5 | 40.00% | 9 | 12 |
| 40 | 17 | 40 | 34 | | | 85.00% | 4 | 16 | 25.00% | 2 | 16 | 12.50% | 38 | 60 |
| 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 26 | 31 out of 32 | 96.88% | 0 | 14 | 0.00% | 4 | 14 | 28.57% | 17 | 19 |
| 28 | 14 | 28 | 15 | | | 53.57% | 1 | 20 | 5.00% | 3 | 20 | 15.00% | 17 | 23 |
| 14 | 8 | 13 | 8 | | | 57.14% | 3 | 11 | 27.27% | 2 | 11 | 18.18% | 10 | 16 |
| 8 | 7 | 8 | 4 | | | 50.00% | 3 | 8 | 37.50% | 0 | 8 | 0.00% | 7 | 9 |
| 7 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 20 out of 20 | 100.00% | 1 | 16 | 6.25% | 5 | 16 | 31.25% | 15 | 22 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 26 | 27 out of 31 | 87.10% | 2 | 24 | 8.33% | 7 | 24 | 29.17% | 27 | 30 |
| 53 | 29 | 53 | 49 | | | 92.45% | 7 | 31 | 22.58% | 8 | 31 | 25.81% | 45 | 47 |
| 32 | 17 | 32 | 25 | | | 78.13% | 2 | 21 | 9.52% | 1 | 21 | 4.76% | 21 | 32 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|-----|----|--------------|---------|----|----|--------|----|----|--------|----|----|
| 10 | 9 | 10 | 8 | | | 80.00% | 2 | 12 | 16.67% | 2 | 12 | 16.67% | 15 | 23 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 23 | 31 out of 32 | 96.88% | 1 | 29 | 3.45% | 5 | 29 | 17.24% | 29 | 32 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | | | 71.43% | 3 | 15 | 20.00% | 0 | 15 | 0.00% | 18 | 18 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | | | 0.00% | 1 | 5 | 20.00% | 0 | 5 | 0.00% | 5 | 7 |
| 7 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 25 | 26 out of 30 | 86.67% | 0 | 20 | 0.00% | 8 | 20 | 40.00% | 19 | 25 |
| 15 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 63 | 68 out of 71 | 95.77% | 3 | 70 | 4.29% | 19 | 70 | 27.14% | 59 | 77 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 11 out of 11 | 100.00% | 1 | 2 | 50.00% | 0 | 2 | 0.00% | 2 | 4 |
| 18 | 9 | 17 | 9 | | | 50.00% | 3 | 31 | 9.68% | 7 | 31 | 22.58% | 30 | 34 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 13 out of 13 | 100.00% | 2 | 10 | 20.00% | 3 | 10 | 30.00% | 8 | 13 |
| 14 | 6 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 20 out of 22 | 90.91% | 0 | 6 | 0.00% | 1 | 6 | 16.67% | 10 | 13 |
| 8 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 19 | 23 out of 24 | 95.83% | 1 | 19 | 5.26% | 7 | 19 | 36.84% | 20 | 27 |
| 25 | 16 | 23 | 11 | 31 | 42 out of 54 | 77.78% | 3 | 18 | 16.67% | 2 | 18 | 11.11% | 36 | 41 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 14 out of 15 | 93.33% | 0 | 13 | 0.00% | 11 | 13 | 84.62% | 13 | 15 |
| 67 | 39 | 67 | 40 | | | 59.70% | 8 | 46 | 17.39% | 9 | 46 | 19.57% | 43 | 55 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 13 out of 14 | 92.86% | 3 | 12 | 25.00% | 5 | 12 | 41.67% | 13 | 13 |
| 16 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 53 | 62 out of 68 | 91.78% | 0 | 35 | 0.00% | 11 | 35 | 31.43% | 38 | 48 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 22 out of 25 | 88.00% | 4 | 16 | 25.00% | 6 | 16 | 37.50% | 17 | 19 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 11 out of 13 | 84.62% | 1 | 12 | 8.33% | 3 | 12 | 25.00% | 9 | 14 |
| 126 | 51 | 124 | 101 | | | 80.16% | 15 | 62 | 24.19% | 20 | 55 | 36.36% | 64 | 93 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|--|--|--------|---|----|--------|---|----|--------|----|----|
| 58 | 27 | 58 | 31 | | | 53.45% | 5 | 29 | 17.24% | 2 | 29 | 6.90% | 39 | 44 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | | | 50.00% | 2 | 7 | 28.57% | 1 | 7 | 14.29% | 6 | 11 |

Part 4: System Performance

| NC % | Has health insurance | Total | HI % | Reoccur SPM - Total Exits | Reoccur SPM - # returns | Reoccur SPM % | TH total | # < 1 Year | % < 1 year | Total Enrolled | Moved Into Housing | with in 90 days | % moved into housing | % moved in w/in 90 days | | |
|---------|----------------------|-------|---------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------|------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 100.00% | 14 | 17 | 82.35% | 24 | 1 | 4.17% | | | | 28 | 16 | 16 | 57.14% | 100.00% | | |
| 100.00% | 8 | 8 | 100.00% | NA | | #VALUE! | | | | 9 | 6 | 6 | 66.67% | 100.00% | | |
| 83.33% | 55 | 56 | 98.21% | 15 | 3 | 20.00% | | | | 31 | 29 | 29 | 93.55% | 100.00% | | |
| 63.64% | 26 | 27 | 96.30% | 48 | 7 | 14.58% | | | | 79 | 48 | 48 | 60.76% | 100.00% | | |
| 100.00% | 9 | 12 | 75.00% | 10 | 3 | 30.00% | | | | 21 | 4 | 19.05% | | | | |
| 75.00% | 5 | 5 | 100.00% | NA | | #VALUE! | | | | 12 | 12 | 11 | 100.00% | 91.67% | | |
| 63.33% | 104 | 126 | 82.54% | 34 | 7 | 20.59% | | | | 131 | 114 | 84 | 87.02% | 73.68% | | |
| 89.47% | 26 | 29 | 89.66% | NA | | #VALUE! | | | | 32 | 32 | 31 | 100.00% | 96.88% | | |
| 73.91% | 41 | 44 | 93.18% | 9 | 0 | 0.00% | | | | 61 | 54 | 53 | 88.52% | 86.89% | | |
| 62.50% | 16 | 17 | 94.12% | NA | | #VALUE! | | | | 25 | 21 | 18 | 84.00% | 72.00% | | |
| 77.78% | 9 | 10 | 90.00% | NA | | #VALUE! | | | | 11 | 10 | 9 | 90.91% | 90.00% | | |
| 68.18% | 16 | 16 | 100.00% | 3 | 0 | 0.00% | | | | 22 | 22 | 21 | 100.00% | 95.45% | | |
| 90.00% | 25 | 25 | 100.00% | 22 | 3 | 13.64% | | | | 31 | 31 | 26 | 100.00% | 83.87% | | |
| 95.74% | 51 | 56 | 91.07% | 84 | 10 | 11.90% | | | | 73 | 72 | 66 | 98.63% | 91.67% | | |
| 65.63% | 38 | 42 | 90.48% | NA | | #VALUE! | | | | 73 | 48 | 46 | 65.75% | 95.83% | | |

| Part 5: Population | | | | Part 6: Coordinated Entry | | | | Part 7: PIT | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| % Chronic Clients | % Disabled | % Living Situation | % No Income | Findings | Timely Follow Up | Accurate Referrals | BONUS - # agencies not required | Part. In Jan. 2022 | Submit Jan. PIT data | Part. In July 2022 | Submit July PIT data |
| 33.33% | 28.57% | 32.14% | 42.86% | yes >30 | 90% | 83% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 100.00% | 55.56% | 11.11% | yes >30 | 90% | 83% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 35.48% | 12.90% | 25.81% | yes >30 | 90% | 83% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 10.00% | 21.52% | 7.59% | 18.99% | yes >30 | 90% | 83% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| | 61.90% | 28.57% | 38.10% | yes >30 | 93% | 96% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 100.00% | 41.67% | 66.67% | yes >30 | 93% | 96% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 45.83% | 33.59% | 38.93% | 19.85% | yes >30 | 65% | 87% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 65.63% | 25.00% | 21.88% | yes >30 | 65% | 87% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 60.00% | 44.26% | 11.48% | 36.07% | yes >30 | 93.33% | 93.67% | 3.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 33.33% | 64.00% | 0.00% | 24.00% | yes >30 | 93.33% | 93.67% | 3.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 54.55% | 18.18% | 36.36% | yes >30 | 90% | 98% | 3.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 100.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | none | 100% | 99% | 3.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 96.77% | 38.71% | 54.84% | none | 100% | 99% | 3.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 0.00% | 26.03% | 15.07% | 23.29% | yes >30 | 38% | 78% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 20.00% | 31.51% | 16.44% | 47.95% | none | 80% | 75% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 0.00% | 87.50% | 20.83% | 37.50% | yes >30 | 82% | 93% | 2.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 100.00% | 46.88% | 50.00% | yes >30 | 82% | 93% | 2.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 90.00% | 35.00% | 50.00% | yes >30 | 82% | 93% | 2.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 100.00% | 66.67% | 40.00% | yes >30 | 100% | 100% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 71.88% | 37.50% | 18.75% | yes >30 | 86% | 86% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 98.73% | 50.63% | 45.57% | yes >30 | 86% | 86% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 33.33% | 0.00% | 50.00% | yes >30 | 86% | 86% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 20.00% | 32.39% | 16.90% | 50.70% | yes >30 | 86% | 86% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 93.33% | 66.67% | 40.00% | none | 100% | 71% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 50.00% | 4.55% | 18.18% | yes >30 | 98% | 84% | 0.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 100.00% | 28.57% | 21.43% | yes >30 | 90% | 98% | 3.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 33.33% | 70.27% | 10.81% | 37.84% | yes >30 | 80% | 63% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 100.00% | 50.00% | 57.14% | yes >30 | NA | NA | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 33.33% | 37.93% | 32.18% | 25.29% | yes >30 | 89% | 97% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 91.67% | 33.33% | 25.00% | yes >30 | 89% | 97% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 63.77% | 31.88% | 18.84% | yes >30 | 89% | 97% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| NA | 79.17% | 45.83% | 45.83% | yes >30 | 92% | 93% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 100.00% | 100.00% | 42.86% | 35.71% | yes >30 | 92% | 93% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 6.67% | 18.24% | 7.43% | 43.24% | yes >30 | 91.33% | 89% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6.67% | 23.16% | 21.05% | 22.11% | none | 100% | 77% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| | | | | none | 84% | 77% | 1.00 | yes | yes | yes | yes |

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-Additional Explanation

| Action Plan Scoring | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Criteria Threshold | Description |
| 8 pts | Coalition set goals, fully met those goals, and created new goals |
| 6 pts | Coalition set goals, fully met some goals and made progress on other goals, and created new goals or expanded clearly on original unmet goals |
| 4 pts | Coalition set goals, did not meet any goals, but provided explanation as to why, is continuing to work on these, and has set other goals and/or expanded the unmet ones |
| 2 pts | coalition set goals, did not meet any goals, provided minimal explanation and does not plan to continue addressing or meeting these goals, has set new goals. |
| 1 pt | Coalition set goals, did not meet any goals, did not provide any explanation or identify a reason, has set new goals |
| 0 pts | Coalition did not set goals and/or has not set new goals |

| Housing First - HMIS Reports | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Exits to homelessness | % of households that exited to a non-homeless situation |
| Reasons for exit | % of households that meet the housing first criteria. This includes reasons other than non-payment of rent, non-compliance with program rules, or disagreement with rules/persons |

| Coordinated Entry | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Findings Issued | Scoring is based on whether or not the organization had findings and when they did, how long did it take to resolve them |
| Timely Follow Up | Scoring is based on whether the agency's follow ups are completed (not expired) |
| Accurate Referrals | Scoring is based on whether the agency's referral data is complete and accurate |

| Coordinated Entry Bonus Points |
|---|
| A coalition receives bonus points if agencies that are not required to use CE are referring people to the prioritization list and/or using the list to fill project openings. |
| Housing Program examples include: TBRA, HPP prevention, HPP rapid rehousing, mainstream vouchers, other housing programs |
| Vet examples: VASH, VORP, other veteran specific programs |
| Additional: police department, school districts, PHA, human services, workforce resource, hospitals, other systems of care; other shelter or motel voucher programs that do not receive ESG or required to use CE |

Housing First - Monitoring Assessment

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Access to housing | Projects are low-barrier at entry. Households are not denied for access within the housing first guidelines. Participant-centered intake process. Compliant with equal access policy. |
| Participant input | Staff are educating participants on housing first and tenants are informed of their full rights and responsibilities as tenants. Agencies and staff are creating formal opportunities for participant input and feedback about the project. |
| Leasing or Rental Assistance | Housing is considered permanent. Participant choice in unit location. Full tenant rights, including but not limited to no clauses that would be different than any other tenant; tenants are educated on their lease; eviction avoidance |
| Services | Participant choice in services. Participant-centered planning, case plan development and goals. Services continually offered even if temporary change in housing status (i.e. short stay in institution). Services offered up to 6 months after exit. Effective services are offered and staff are trained in effective strategies known to increase stability and form trusting relationships (i.e. harm reduction, motivational interviewing, trauma-informed approaches, strengths-based). |

Board Approved Policy Decisions & Exceptions

HMIS grant will be placed on Tier 1, at the bottom of the scorable projects. SSO CE (DV and non) will be placed on Tier 1, after the HMIS grant.

New projects created with reallocated relinquished funds will be placed after the renewable projects on Tier 1. BONUS projects (with HUD Priority) will be placed on the top of Tier 2. BONUS projects (without HUD Priority) will be placed on the bottom of Tier 2.

To be used in scoring, the APR submission must be accepted by HUD in SAGE. If there is an issue, confirmed by the HUD Milwaukee Field Office, the agency must notify the CoC Director. Limited, case-by-case, exceptions may be made.

New and first year renewals shall be exempt from scoring in the category of "Effective Use of Federal Funds" and "Unit Utilization" and will receive full points for each of those criteria.

If an agency cannot access eLOCCS due to contractual issues with HUD, the agency is responsible to provide evidence of this situation to the CoC Director. If sufficient proof is provided, the agency will be exempt from the category of "eLOCCS Drawdown Rates" and receive full points.

For reoccurrence rate (SPM): if a project has no exits, the project will receive 3 points. If a project had 1 or 2 participants exit, the project will receive a minimum of 3 points. If a project had 3-4 participants exit, the project will receive a minimum of 2 points.

For chronic homeless: if a project can demonstrate that there were no chronic homeless persons on the CE list, they project would be exempt and receive full points.

CoC Project Scoring Tool 2022-FINAL-No Data Collected

These grants are not scored but renewable. These grants are placed on the Tier per Board Decision.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Institute for Community Alliances | Wisconsin HMIS Project Renewal |
| Wisconsin Balance of State CoC | Supportive Services Only - Coordinated Entry |
| Wisconsin Balance of State CoC | Supportive Services Only - Coordinated Entry DV |

*start 10/1

| Requirements for All Projects | Which CoC Funded Grant? | Point in Time January 2022 | Point in Time July 2022 | eLOCCS |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| WI Balance of State CoC | SSO, SSO DV, DV RRH | X | X | X |
| Institute for Community Alliances | HMIS | X | X | X |
| Brown - Newcap | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X | |
| Brown - Golden House | DV RRH | X | X | |
| Brown - House of Hope | YHDP*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| Central - Renewal Unlimited | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X | |
| Central - CWCAC | YHDP* | X | X | |
| Coulee - Couleecap | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X | |
| Coulee - New Horizon | DV RRH* | NA | NA | |
| Coulee - YWCA La Crosse | YHDP*, YHDP SSO* | NA | NA | |
| Dairyland - Bolton Refuge | DV RRH* | NA | X | |
| Dairyland - EC County HHS | YHDP SSO* | NA | NA | |
| Dairyland - Western Dairyland | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP* | X | X | |
| East Central - TSA Stevens Point | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X | |
| East Central - Boys & Girls Club | YHDP SSO* | NA | NA | |
| Jefferson - CACSCW | SSO, SSO DV | X | X | |
| Fox Cities- City of Appleton | SSO | X | X | |
| Kenosha - KHDS | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP*, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| Kenosha - Women & Children | DV RRH | X | X | |
| Lakeshore - In Courage | DV RRH* | NA | X | |
| Lakeshore - LCAP | SSO, SSO DV | X | X | |
| North Central - NCCAP | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| NE - Newcap | SSO, SSO DV, DV RRH, YHDP*, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| NWISH - Newcap | SSO, SSO DV, DV RRH, YHDP*, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| NW - NWCSA | SSO, SSO DV, DV RRH, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| Ozaukee - FP Ozaukee Cty | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| Rock Walworth - ECHO | YHDP*, YHDP SSO* | X | X | |
| Rock Walworth - Family Services | DV RRH* | NA | NA | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|----|----|
| Rock Walworth - CAI | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X |
| Rural North - TSA Burnett | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP*, YHDP SSO CE*, YHDP SSO* | X | X |
| Southwest - SWCAP | SSO, SSO DV | X | X |
| Washington - FP Washington Cty | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X |
| Washington - Youth & Family Project | YHDP SSO* | NA | NA |
| Waukesha - HAC | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X |
| Waukesha - Hebron House | YHDP*, YHDP SSO* | X | X |
| West Central - West CAP | SSO, SSO DV, YHDP SSO CE* | X | X |
| Winnebagoland - ADVOCAP | SSO, SSO DV, DV RRH | X | X |
| Winnebagoland - Solution Center | DV RRH* | NA | NA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Project Evaluation Scores | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | ADVOCAP | CACSCW | CACSCW | CAI | CAI |
| | ADVOCAP Fond du Lac Rapid Rehousing | Winnebagoand PSH | Winnebagoand Rapid Rehousing | COC Winnebagoand Rapid Rehousing | Jefferson County Transitional Housing Program | Project WISH | CAI_RRH | CAI_PSH |
| Total earned plus BONUS | 140 | 124 | 128 | 140 | 122 | 146 | 136 | 124 |
| TOTAL Possible | 192 | 182 | 184 | 192 | 184 | 174 | 192 | 174 |
| Percentage Score | 72.92% | 68.13% | 69.57% | 72.92% | 66.30% | 83.91% | 70.83% | 71.26% |

The Listing: Percentage Scores from Highest to Lowest

FINAL

| Rank | Applicant Name | Project Name | Type | Project Score (%) | Project Score (Pts) | Project Accept or Reject Status | Amount of Funds Requested | Scoring Tiebreaker (if needed) |
|------|--|--|------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Coulecap, Inc. | Coulecap Housing First Permanent Housing Program | PSH | 89.58% | 172/192 | Accept | \$243,535 | \$ 11,587.30 |
| 2 | Walworth County Housing Authority | Hartwell Street Apartments | PSH | 88.37% | 152/172 | Accept | \$70,810 | \$ 5,057.86 |
| 3 | Kenosha Human Development Services | MyHOME Rapid Rehousing Project | RRH | 84.62% | 154/182 | Accept | \$160,043 | \$ 31,720.60 |
| 4 | Community Action Coalition for South-Central Wisconsin | Project WISH | PSH | 83.91% | 146/174 | Accept | \$203,312 | \$ 17,600.73 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|-----|---------------|-----------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 5 | Kenosha Human Development Services | Kenosha Permanent Housing Connections | PSH | 83.15% | 153/184 | Accept | \$419,846 | \$ 12,832.71 |
| 6 | Couleecap, Inc. | Couleecap Housing First II PSH | PSH | 83.15% | 153/184 | Accept | \$402,141 | \$ 14,062.07 |
| 7 | Newcap, Inc. | Brown County PSH Individuals | PSH | 82.97% | 151/182 | Accept | \$952,079 | \$ 13,215.24 |
| 8 | North Central Community Action Program, Inc. | NCCAP Permanent Supportive Housing | PSH | 82.81% | 159/192 | Accept | \$191,217 | \$ 14,446.23 |
| 9 | Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | Western Dairyland PSH 1 | PSH | 82.07% | 151/184 | Accept | \$278,798 | \$ 11,975.18 |
| 10 | City of Appleton | Fox Cities HP Rapid Re-Housing Program | RRH | 80.46% | 140/174 | Accept | \$62,780 | \$ 14,531.00 |
| 11 | West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. | West CAP Rapid Re-Housing | RRH | 79.95% | 153.5/192 | Accept | \$363,988 | \$ 8,734.30 |
| 12 | Pillars, Inc | It Takes a Village Permanent Supportive Housing Program | PSH | 79.17% | 152/192 | Accept | \$190,890 | \$ 7,914.70 |
| 13 | West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing | PSH | 78.53% | 144.5/184 | Accept | \$169,467 | \$ 12,286.92 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|-----|---------------|-----------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 14 | City of Appleton | Fox Cities Housing Coalition RRH Program | RRH | 77.60% | 149/192 | Accept | \$191,952 | \$ 12,232.00 |
| 15 | Kenosha Human Development Services, Inc. | KYF Rapid Rehousing Project | RRH | 76.04% | 146/192 | Accept | \$145,983 | \$ 18,037.88 |
| 16 | City of Appleton | Fox Cities Housing Coalition RRH Program Expansion | RRH | 75.82% | 138/182 | Accept | \$85,187 | \$ 9,808.38 |
| 17 | Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | Western Dairyland PSH 3 | PSH | 75.52% | 145/192 | Accept | \$200,233 | \$ 17,340.91 |
| 18 | House of Hope Green Bay, Inc | House of Hope Youth Rapid Re-Housing | RRH | 75.27% | 137/182 | Accept | \$179,114 | \$ 7,201.04 |
| 19 | Newcap, Inc. | SHP Housing First | PSH | 75.27% | 137/182 | Accept | \$214,395 | \$ 8,016.62 |
| 20 | Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, Inc | Welcome Home Eau Claire | RRH | 74.71% | 130/174 | Accept | \$92,740 | NA |
| 21 | West Central Wisconsin Community Action Agency, Inc. | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing II | PSH | 73.90% | 134.5/182 | Accept | \$663,286 | \$ 10,213.45 |
| 22 | Newcap, Inc. | Brown County Youth RRH Project | RRH | 73.44% | 141/192 | Accept | \$372,370 | \$ 40,585.11 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|-----|---------------|-----------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| 23 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | COC Winnebagola and Rapid Rehousing | RRH | 72.92% | 140/192 | Accept | \$125,684 | \$ 6,297.26 |
| 24 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | ADVOCAP Fond du Lac Rapid Rehousing | RRH | 72.92% | 140/192 | Accept | \$100,608 | \$ 24,171.00 |
| 25 | Newcap, Inc. | Brown County PSH Families | PSH | 72.56% | 119/164 | Accept | \$68,077 | \$ 28,510.00 |
| 26 | Community Action, Inc. of Rock & Walworth Counties | CAI_PSH | PSH | 71.26% | 124/174 | Accept | \$234,206 | \$ 7,157.71 |
| 27 | Community Action, Inc. of Rock & Walworth Counties | CAI_RRH | RRH | 70.83% | 136/192 | Accept | \$503,493 | \$ 13,692.26 |
| 28 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | Winnebagola and Rapid Rehousing | RRH | 69.57% | 128/184 | Accept | \$278,224 | \$ 24,296.00 |
| 29 | Central Wisconsin Community Action Council, Inc. | Project Chance Rapid Re-Housing | RRH | 69.27% | 133/192 | Accept | \$292,804 | \$ 5,581.55 |
| 30 | ADVOCAP, Inc. | Winnebagola and PSH | PSH | 68.13% | 124/182 | Accept | \$137,025 | \$ 26,591.60 |
| 31 | Community Action Coalition for South-Central Wisconsin | Jefferson County Transitional Housing Program | TH | 66.30% | 122/184 | Accept | \$168,164 | \$ 24,023.43 |
| 32 | Northwest Wisconsin Community Services Agency Inc. | NWCSA PSH | PSH | 62.09% | 113/182 | Accept | \$125,004 | \$5,893.50 |
| 33 | The Salvation Army | Permanent Supportive Housing | PSH | 61.72% | 118.5/192 | Accept | \$288,314 | \$6,967.20 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| City of Appleton | City of Appleton | City of Appleton | Couleecap | Couleecap | CWCAC | House of Hope | KHDS | KHDS | KHDS |
| Fox Cities Housing Coalition RRH Program | Fox Cities Housing Coalition RRH Program Expansion | Fox Cities HP Rapid Re-Housing Program | Couleecap Housing First Permanent Housing Program | Couleecap Housing First II PSH | Project Chance Rapid Re-Housing | House of Hope Youth Rapid Re-Housing | KYF Rapid Rehousing Project | Kenosha Permanent Housing Connections | MyHOME Rapid Rehousing Project |
| 149 | 138 | 140 | 172 | 153 | 133 | 137 | 146 | 153 | 154 |
| 192 | 182 | 174 | 192 | 184 | 192 | 182 | 192 | 184 | 182 |
| 77.60% | 75.82% | 80.46% | 89.58% | 83.15% | 69.27% | 75.27% | 76.04% | 83.15% | 84.62% |

| Permanent Housing BONUS Funds - Application Scoring | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|----------------|
| Applicant Name | Project Type | Reviewer #1 | Reviewer #2 | Reviewer #3 | Reviewer #4 | TOTAL | Total possible |
| House of Hope Green Bay, Inc | RRH | 324 | 307 | 326 | NA | 957.0 | 345 |
| Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | PSH | 365 | 352 | 346 | 348 | 1411.0 | 365 |

| DV BONUS Funds - Application Scoring | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|----------------|-----------|
| Applicant Name | Reviewer #1 | Reviewer #2 | Reviewer #3 | Reviewer #4 | TOTAL | Total possible | Total x 4 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|------|
| Embrace Services, Inc. | 424 | 438 | 395 | 407 | 1664.0 | 440 | 1760 |
| Family Support Center | 418 | 418 | 353.5 | 392 | 1581.5 | 440 | 1760 |
| Turning-point | 417 | 411 | 369 | 389 | 1586.0 | 440 | 1760 |
| Wise Women Gathering Place | 397 | 426 | 350 | 397 | 1570.0 | 440 | 1760 |

| Projects Placed on Scoring Tool Based on Policy | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Applicant Name | Project Name | Type | Project Score (%) | Project Score (Pts) | Project Accept or Reject Status | Amount of Funds Requested |
| Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC RRH Project | RRH | <i>1st time renewal</i> | N/A | Accept | \$2,874,122 |
| Hebron House of Hospitality, Inc | Jeremy PSH Project | PSH | <i>Transition Grant - New</i> | N/A | Accept | \$118,755 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|-------------------------------|------------|--------|-------------|
| Lakeshore CAP Inc. of Wisconsin | Lakeshore PSH | PSH | <i>Transition Grant - New</i> | N/A | Accept | \$140,259 |
| Institute for Community Alliances | Wisconsin HMIS Project Renewal | HMIS | <i>HMIS</i> | N/A | Accept | \$371,429 |
| Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC Supportive Services for Coordinated Entry | SSO | <i>SSO CE</i> | N/A | Accept | \$717,935 |
| Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC Supportive Services for Coordinated Entry DV | SSO | <i>SSO CE DV</i> | N/A | Accept | \$176,000 |
| Western Dairyland Economic Opportunity Council, Inc. | PHASE 1 (expansion) | PSH | 96.64% | 352.75/365 | Accept | \$234,622 |
| House of Hope Green Bay, Inc | House of Hope Youth Rapid Rehousing Project II (expansion) | RRH | New - Bonus | 319/345 | Accept | \$347,252 |
| Wisconsin Balance of State Continuum of Care, Inc. | WIBOSCOC RRH Project Expansion | RRH | New - Bonus DV | N/A | Accept | \$1,243,572 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| LSS | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NEWCAP | NCCAP | NWCSA | Pillars | The Salvation Army of St. Croix | Walworth County Housing Authority |
| Welcome Home Eau Claire | SHP Housing First | Brown County PSH Individuals | Brown County PSH Families | Brown County Youth RRH Project | NCCAP Permanent Supportive Housing | NWCSA PSH | It Takes a Village Permanent Supportive Housing Program | Permanent Supportive Housing | Hartwell Street Apartments |
| 130 | 137 | 151 | 119 | 141 | 159 | 113 | 152 | 118.5 | 152 |
| 174 | 182 | 182 | 164 | 192 | 192 | 182 | 192 | 192 | 172 |
| 74.71% | 75.27% | 82.97% | 72.56% | 73.44% | 82.81% | 62.09% | 79.17% | 61.72% | 88.37% |

| Total x 5 | Mean | % | RANK | Amount Awarded | Project Name |
|-----------|-------|--------|------|----------------|--|
| 1035 | 191.4 | 92.46% | 2 | \$ 347,252 | House of Hope Youth Rapid Rehousing Project II (expansion) |
| 1460 | 282.2 | 96.64% | 1 | \$ 234,622 | PHASE 1 (expansion) |

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-------------|
| Mean | % | RANK |
|-------------|----------|-------------|

| | | |
|---------|--------|---|
| 416 | 94.55% | 1 |
| 395.375 | 89.86% | 3 |
| 396.5 | 90.11% | 2 |
| 392.5 | 89.20% | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------|---------------|
| West CAP | West CAP | West CAP | Western Dairyland EOC | Western Dairyland EOC | WI BOS | | Hebron House | Lakeshore CAP |
| West CAP Rapid Re-Housing | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing | West CAP Permanent Supportive Housing II | Western Dairyland PSH 1 | Western Dairyland PSH 3 | WIBOSCOC RRH Project | | Safe Haven | RRH |
| 153.5 | 144.5 | 134.5 | 151 | 145 | 139.2 | | 87 | 113 |
| 192 | 184 | 182 | 184 | 192 | 182 | | 130 | 192 |
| 79.95% | 78.53% | 73.90% | 82.07% | 75.52% | 76.48% | | 66.92% | 58.85% |