

2016 CONTINUUM OF CARE NEW PROJECT REVIEW



**Community Alliance
for the
Homeless, Inc.**
www.cafth.org

Applicant	
Project	
Date of Review	Reviewer Initials

Review Component	Points Possible	Points Received
1. ORGANIZATION CAPACITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the organization provide a complete profile, list of all executive and management staff with responsibilities, and an organizational chart? Does the organization demonstrate the capacity to effectively administer Federal, state, city and private funds if awarded? 	10	
2. RELEVANT PROJECT EXPERIENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the organization have sufficient experience and capacity to be successful in the proposed project? Does the organization demonstrate experience in developing and implementing similar program systems, services, and/or residential property construction and rehabilitation? 	10	
3. PROJECT QUALITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the organization's housing type fall under Permanent Supportive Housing (dedicated exclusively to chronically homeless), Rapid Re-housing, and/or Coordinated Entry? Does the organization outline a process for ensuring that 100% of the proposed program participants come from the street or other locations not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, or safe havens? Does the organization demonstrate a reasonable plan for assisting participants in obtaining mainstream benefits, social and employment services, and other types of needed supports and services? Do the services seem appropriate to the population served? Do the supportive services that will be offered ensure successful retention or help to obtain permanent housing? Does the project propose to serve one of the 4 priority populations? Does the applicant identify a feasible/appropriate strategy to assess client satisfaction? Does the project dedicate 100% of units for CH? Do the answers to questions 13-16 indicate a Housing First Approach? Does the project address a need identified in the Mayors' Action Plan to End Homelessness? 	25	
4. DEMONSTRATED NEED <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the organization identify factors that inform the need for this project? Does the organization offer supporting documentation/evidence to support this need? 	10	

Review Component	Points Possible	Points Received
5. COMMUNITY LEVERAGE & MATCH <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the application show sufficient proof of required match? Is the match sufficient or more than sufficient? • Is the leverage amount at least 2:1? • Does the application describe the organization's process for referring participants to identified community resources and tracking results of referrals? 	15	
6. ALIGNMENT WITH HUD PRIORITIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the organization demonstrate implementation of a coordinated assessment tool and participation in the Coordinated Entry process? • Does the organization demonstrate an approach for prioritizing individuals and families with the highest vulnerability? • Does the organization maximize the use of mainstream and other community-based resources? • Does the organization use a Housing First approach? 	20	
7. BUDGET <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the budget reflect eligible costs/activities? • Is the budget reasonable? • Does the budget reflect a 25% match for all project costs? • Does the detailed project budget include the total project costs, amount of request, and all other sources of funds committed to the project? • Did the applicant provide a narrative description of costs and cost justification? 	10	
TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS APPLICANT	100	TOTAL

2016 Project Review Results

TOTAL POINTS	
BONUS POINTS	
FINAL SCORE	

BONUS POINTS

8. VOLUNTARY REALLOCATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the organization propose a voluntary reallocation of an existing CoC grant? If so, ten bonus points are available. 	<input type="checkbox"/> YES (10 Point Bonus Earned) <input type="checkbox"/> NO (NO Bonus Points Earned)
---	--

Reviewer Comments: _____
