

CoC Name: San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC
 CoC Number: CA-500
 High Score: 91.25
 Low Score: 38.5
 Median Score: 75.42
 Funding Line: 65

The below chart indicates the maximum amount of points available for each scoring category and the actual score a CoC received.

Scoring Category	Maximum Score (Points)	CoC Score (Points)
<i>CoC Housing, Services, and Structure</i>	14	13.75
<i>Homeless Needs and Data Collection</i>	26	21.25
<i>CoC Strategic Planning</i>	22	22
<i>CoC Performance</i>	32	26.75
<i>Emphasis on Housing Activities</i>	6	2.5
Total CoC Score	100	86.25

Competition Summary:

- More than \$1.628 billion was awarded to an unprecedented number of local programs.
- There was a two-tiered award process. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 renewal awards were announced on January 19, 2011 and the new awards were announced on April 28, 2011.
- A project application was required for new and renewal projects. Renewal project applicants were only required to verify basic project and budget information, select the grant term request, and certify the request of renewal. All renewal projects within these CoCs that met project quality and threshold requirements received one year of funding. New project applicants had to complete the Exhibit 2 to its entirety.
- The FY2010 application included questions regarding educational assurances that will be required under the HEARTH Act for both CoCs and project applicants. CoCs were to provide information on current efforts and policies that exist within the CoC that consider the educational needs of children and families along with long-range plans to ensure school-aged children are connected to education and educational services. Beginning in the FY2011 CoC competition, these questions will be scored. Project applicants were to indicate if they have policies and practices that are consistent with, and do not restrict the exercise of rights provided by the education subtitle of the McKinney-Vento Act and demonstrate that programs that provide housing or services to families have a staff person designated to ensure children are enrolled in school and connected to the appropriate services within the community.
- CoCs did a great job utilizing the Hold Harmless Need Reallocation that was reintroduced for the FY2010 CoC competition. A few errors were incurred on the project applications that resulted in the requested amount for new projects being reduced.

- Renewal project budgets were expected to match the HUD-approved FY2010 Grant Inventory Worksheets (GIWs). SHP budgets that requested more funding than approved on the HUD-approved GIW were reduced to bring in line with the approved ARA (Annual Renewal Amount).
- The minimum score to receive new funding projects was 65.

Points to Consider:

- Changes are made to the NOFA on an annual basis. The categories and scoring issues discussed in [this](#) debriefing apply specifically to the FY2010 competition.
- Language in the NOFA and CoC Exhibit 1 application may place more emphasis on certain sections than previous years.
- All application forms in **e-snaps** are important and should have been filled out completely and accurately in order to receive full credit for the answers. Although CoCs were able to import data from the FY2009 application in the FY2010 competition, CoCs were instructed to ensure that any information brought forward was still relevant in this competition. Questions may change from year to year and it is the responsibility of the CoC to ensure that all questions are fully addressed. SNAPS provided detailed instructions in the application and training materials on the Homeless Resource Exchange (www.hudhre.info) to ensure applicants' ability to accurately complete both exhibits.
- In FY2010, HUD continued to score CoCs on a 100 point scale. The scoring criteria changed very little from FY2009 competition to the FY2010 competition.
- CoCs that did not request new project funding did not receive a score for housing emphasis or leveraging because these were only based on eligible new project requests.
- For SHP renewal requests that exceeded the approved Annual Renewal Amount(s) (ARA), the budget line items were reduced accordingly.
- Project applicants, both SHP and S+C, that requested less funds or units than what they were eligible for received the lesser amount and will not be able to apply for the approved ARA in future competitions.
- Project applicants were required to give a project description on page one of the Exhibit 2 application. The project description should be specific and detailed for the project being proposed.
- New Exhibit 2 applications that exceeded the Final Pro Rata Need, Hold Harmless Need, or Permanent Housing Bonus amount were reduced accordingly.
- New Exhibit 2 applications that requested an amount that was completely outside their Final Pro Rata Need were rejected.
- If a project was reduced to the point where it was not enough to fund 1 unit or 1 person in the project, the reduced project was rejected.

FY2010 Point Structure:

For the FY2010 CoC Competition, HUD awarded up to 100 total points for all five scoring categories: CoC Housing, Services and Structure, Homeless Needs and Data Collection, CoC Strategic Planning, CoC Performance, and Emphasis on Housing Activities. A detailed explanation of each category is provided below to assist your continuum in its self-evaluation

Part I: CoC Housing, Services, and Structure—14 total points

This section scores CoCs based on the extent in which its application demonstrated:

- The existence of a coordinated, inclusive, and outcome-oriented community process;

- A process that includes nonprofit organizations, state and local governmental agencies, public housing agencies, housing developers and service providers, school systems, law enforcement, hospital and medical entities, funding providers, private businesses and business associations, jurisdictional ten-year planning bodies, and homeless or formerly homeless persons;
- A process in place to achieve fair and impartial project review and selection, with representation and input from diverse stakeholders;
- A well-defined and comprehensive strategy developed to address the components of a CoC system, and that the strategy has been designed to serve all homeless subpopulations in the community; and
- That a CoC has created, maintained, and built upon a community-wide inventory of housing and services for homeless families and individuals; identified the full spectrum of needs of homeless families and individuals; and coordinated efforts to fill gaps between the current inventory and existing needs.

Summary of CoC Results on Part I:

- Most CoCs (92.7%) submitted their Housing Inventory Count successfully via the Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX) website by the May 31, 2010 deadline.
- Although HUD encourages the primary decision making group to meet at least monthly, almost all CoCs met at least quarterly.
- Most CoCs did a good job of only identifying CoC Committees, Subcommittees and Workgroups that are involved in CoC-wide planning activities.
- Although there is no minimum to the number of member organizations that a CoC can identify, CoCs are scored based on the level of involvement of those organizations. Therefore, CoCs should be sure to only include those organizations that are actively involved in the CoC-wide planning process.

Part II: Homeless Needs and Data Collection—26 total points

This section scores CoCs based on the extent in which its application demonstrated:

- An understanding of the number of homeless individuals and families within the CoC and their needs, including an accurate and timely count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons. The frequency and methods used to conduct the point-in-time count of sheltered, unsheltered and subpopulations were considered;
- Progress in the implementation and operation of an HMIS, including data quality and usage, bed coverage (excluding domestic violence providers), Data Standards compliance and HMIS training; and
- AHAR participation that assessed by the number of table shells included in the FY2009 and FY2010 AHAR. It was not a requirement that CoC-wide data be used; table shell data from at least one jurisdiction within the CoC qualified as the entire CoC as participating in AHAR. The greater the number of table shells used in the FY2009 and/or FY2010 AHARs, the higher the CoC's score.

Summary of CoC Results on Part II:

- The majority of points in this section were devoted to those questions about HMIS.
- Although most CoCs indicated an HMIS implementation date prior to October 2006, most CoCs demonstrated low bed coverage on one or more of the housing types. CoCs should strive to have 50 percent or more bed coverage for each housing type within the CoC.
- Many CoCs lost points for not participating in either the FY2009 or FY2010 AHAR.
- CoCs lost points for having a high percentage of null or missing values.
- HUD did not require a point-in-time count in FY2010; the last required point-in-time count was FY2009. However, HUD does encourage CoCs to conduct annual point-in-

time counts. CoCs that did conduct a point-in-time count in FY2010 and reported the results along with narratives addressing differences from one count year to the next received additional credit.

- CoCs were asked to describe methods used to collect data on sheltered and unsheltered populations and subpopulations. Failure to address each question separately resulted in a loss of points. Responses should have demonstrated consistency with HUD's point-in-time guidelines. CoCs are reminded to read each question separately, as some questions may appear to be similar but may ask for distinct information. For example, form 2J asked specifically about the total sheltered population, form 2K asked about sheltered sub-populations, and form 2O asked about the total unsheltered population. CoCs may have cut-and-paste the same response for all three questions, which was not acceptable as the narrative had to reflect the specific question asked. Also, a number of CoCs did not indicate if there was an increase or decrease or no change in the count outcomes from the previous count (2008 to 2009 or 2009 to 2010) and/or did not describe the factors that may have resulted in the increase, decrease, or no change.

Part III: CoC Strategic Planning—22 total points

The extent to which a CoC's application demonstrated:

- The existence of, and alignment with, a performance-based 10-year strategy for ending chronic homelessness that establishes specific action steps to achieve the five objectives indicated in the NOFA;
- The Continuum's progress in working with the appropriate local government entity to develop and implement a discharge policy for persons leaving publicly-funded institutions or systems of care;
- The Continuum's coordination with HPRP and other ARRA-funded programs as well as how CoCs are addressing the homeless veteran population.
- How CoCs coordinate with education agencies to ensure children in homeless families receive the same educational opportunities as other children.
- The demonstration of leveraging funds requested under the FY2010 NOFA with other resources, including private, other public and mainstream services and housing programs for proposed projects and ongoing efforts.

Summary of CoC Results on Part III:

- Overall, failure to read and follow all instructions and training materials that were provided for this competition resulted in a loss of points in each section of Part III.
- For the CoC Strategic Planning Objectives, many CoCs responded to the narrative questions by restating the objective. CoCs should have provided their local planning objectives, along with timeframes, indicating the steps created to reach each stated. Objectives 2, 3, and 4 address only HUD CoC-funded projects.
- Despite examples on the Exhibit 1 Detailed Instructions, many CoCs miscalculated their "Proposed Numeric Achievements" for each benchmark. CoCs were expected to show cumulative increases for Objectives 1 through 4 and cumulative decreases for Objective 5.
- In this competition, many CoCs improved their overall discharge planning narrative scores by providing a clear description of the policies and procedures that were either being developed or already in place. However, many CoCs failed to clearly identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that ensure persons being discharged from publicly-funded institutions are not being discharged into homeless situations. Finally, many CoCs did not provide specific examples of "Where" persons move to upon discharge (e.g., non-McKinney-Vento funded housing).

- Most CoCs indicated a high level of coordination with other planning efforts, specifically with the local HPRP initiative and other ARRA-funded initiatives in their areas. However, in many cases, the narrative responses did not fully detail how the CoC was collaborating with these other initiatives.
- Most CoCs were able to describe their current efforts to combat homelessness among veterans providing specific information about the organization who work with this population, how the effort is consistent with the CoC strategic plan, specific goals and future plans.

Part IV: CoC Performance—32 total points

For this section, CoC Performance was measured based on the CoC's progress in reducing homelessness, including chronic homelessness, as follows:

- The CoC completed the action steps proposed in the FY2009 competition and met or exceeded proposed achievements;
- The CoC has increased the number of permanent housing beds for the chronically homeless and made progress toward eliminating chronic homelessness;
- CoC-funded transitional housing program participants' success in obtaining permanent housing per the most recent Annual Performances Report (APR);
- CoC-funded permanent housing program participants success in maintaining housing per the most recent Annual Performance Report (APR) for all projects within the CoC;
- The extent in which project participants in CoC-funded, non-HMIS, programs successfully became employed and gained access to mainstream programs;
- SHP New Construction and Rehabilitation projects within the CoC have policies and practices in place to hire, or have hired, low- and very-low income employees and subcontractors under Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; and,
- Projects within the CoC incorporate energy-efficiency measures in the design, construction, rehabilitation, and operation of housing or community facilities.

Summary of CoC Results on Part IV:

- For achievements, CoCs were scored based on how they performed in comparison to the proposed achievements indicated in their 2009 application and the extent in which they met HUD's objectives. CoCs that did not submit an application in the FY2009 competition were not expected to have data in this section. CoCs that did not meet proposed numeric achievements were able to provide an explanation as to why goals were not met. However, there were a number of CoCs that either failed to provide an explanation or the response was not sufficient for addressing why the FY2009 achievements were not achieved.
- Most CoCs did well in addressing participation and enrollment in mainstream programs.

Part V: Emphasis on Housing Activities —6 total points

Emphasis on Housing Activities was only scored on eligible new project requests; this included those new projects created under the Hold Harmless Reallocation process.

- Points were awarded based on the relationship between new funds requested for housing activities and new funds requested for supportive service activities.
- Housing activities included all approvable requests for funds for rental assistance and approvable requests for acquisition, rehabilitation, construction, leasing and operations when used in connection with housing.
- HMIS costs and administrative costs were excluded from this calculation.