San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership

Interagency Council on Homelessness
Administrative Office
303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026
Office: (909) 386-8297

FROM: Tom Hernandez, Chief of Homeless Services

SUBJECT: Homeless Emergency Assistance Program (HEAP) Scoring Criteria Regional Modifications to be used as the Scoring Instrument for the Homeless Housing and Assistance Program (HHAP)

DATE: July 22, 2020

RECOMMENDATION

Review and Revise the HEAP Scoring Criteria as a Regional Guideline to be used for the HHAP Request for Applications Regional Scoring Instrument.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Office of Homeless Services is preparing the Request for Applications (RFA) final release for early August. OHS is incorporating the recommendations from each Regional Steering Committee for their prioritization of funding for their region.

OHS has yet to develop a scoring instrument and would like to provide the HEAP scoring guidelines from 2018 to each region for their review and to revise so that it can be used for the 2020 HHAP scoring criteria.

Once each Regional Steering Committee has provided an updated or modified scoring instrument, the OHS will release each regions guideline along with the RFA. Each region will have flexibility in determining point distribution and threshold requirements.

San Bernardino County Continuum of Care 2018-HEAP Project Scoring Guideline

The Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) received projects will be reviewed by the San Bernardino County Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) Grant Review Committee. All projects will be reviewed and scored by the ICH Grant Review Committee for recommendation to the full Council based on the following:

- The extent to which the proposed project meets the CoC's HEAP Project Eligibility threshold.
- The extent to which the proposed project addresses the eligible population: persons who are literally homeless or imminent risk of homelessness.
- The extent to which the proposed project furthers the countywide efforts to address homelessness.
- The applicant's ability to immediately resolve an individual or family's housing crisis.
- The applicant's readiness to immediately perform and administer the proposed homeless efforts through this funding source.
- The extent to which the proposed project supplements and does not supplant current programs.
- The extent to which the proposed project is oriented with State of California, Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency data reporting requirements.
- Requirements as noted in the HEAP Request for Applications (RFA) and HEAP Application Form http://wp.sbcounty.gov/dbh/sbchp/coc-heap/.

A. Housing First Emphasis (25 points)

- The extent to which applicant conforms to California and the CoC's Housing First policy.
- Housing Emphasis-The extent to which applicant is a Housing First organization. Housing First practices include rapid placement and stabilization for housing permanency and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions.

B. Project Focus (25 points)

- The extent to which the project is for eligible services.
- The extent to which the project improves the current homeless services system.
- The applicant's ability to focus on long-term sustainable results, if wanting to maintain the project past the funding period.
- The extent to which the project addresses the fundamental underlying issues of homelessness rather than only addressing its symptoms.
- The extent to which measurable outcomes will be tracked and reported.

C. Experience and Capacity (25 points)

- The applicant's experience and capacity in providing similar services, the length and type of experience it has working with the homeless, the quality of programs/services it provides, and the experience level of key staff.
- The applicant's ability to adequately describe the target population and address the requirements set out in the CoC HEAP RFA.

D. Budget Detail (10 points)

- The applicant's proposed budget costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.
- Fifty percent of project funds will be obligated by 12/31/19.
- One hundred percent of project funds will be expended by 5/30/21.

E. Collaboration (15 points)

- The applicant's ability to collaborate with other agencies and/or municipalities.

F. Bonus Points (5 points)

- The applicant demonstrates multijurisdictional collaboration.

San Bernardino County Continuum of Care 2018-HEAP Project Scoring Rubric

Name of Agency Project:	
Reviewer Number:	

Applications received for the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) will be reviewed by the San Bernardino County Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) Grant Review Committee. All proposed projects will be reviewed and scored by the ICH Grant Review Committee for recommendation to the full Council based on the following:

- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project meets the CoC's HEAP Project Eligibility threshold.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project addresses the eligible population: persons who are literally homeless or imminent risk of homelessness.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project furthers the countywide efforts to address homelessness.
- ✓ The applicant's ability to immediately resolve an individual or family's housing crisis.
- ✓ The applicant's readiness to immediately perform and administer the proposed homeless efforts through this funding source.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project supplements and does not supplant current programs.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project is oriented with State of California, Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency data reporting requirements.
- ✓ Requirements as noted in the HEAP Request for Applications (RFA) and HEAP Application Form
- ✓ http://wp.sbcounty.gov/dbh/sbchp/coc-heap/.

A. Housing First Emphasis (25 points)

(**15 pts** [15 Excellent] [10-14 Good] [5-9 Fair] [1-4 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])

Excellent:	Housing First emphasis is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the Housing First model. Description is clearly based on the tenets of the Housing First model.
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the Housing First emphasis.
Fair:	Housing First emphasis is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will ensure Housing First services.
Poor:	Housing First emphasis is vague and poorly described. Housing First emphasis appears to have been an afterthought.
Unacceptable:	Housing First emphasis is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of applying the tenets of the Housing First model.

California's Housing First Legislation: In 2016, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 1380 (Mitchell). It required all housing programs to adopt the Housing First model[1]. The Legislation defined Housing First as:

- Tenant screening and selection practices promote accepting applicants regardless of their sobriety or use of substances, completion of treatment, or participation in services.
- Applicants are not rejected on the basis of poor credit or financial history, poor or lack of rental history, criminal convictions unrelated to tenancy, or behaviors that indicate a lack of "housing readiness."
- Housing providers accept referrals directly from shelters, street outreach, drop-in centers, and other parts of crisis response systems frequented by vulnerable people experiencing homelessness.
- Supportive services emphasize engagement and problem solving over therapeutic goals and service plans that are highly tenant-driven without predetermined goals.
- Participation in services or program compliance is not a condition of housing tenancy.
- Tenants have a lease and all the rights and responsibilities of tenancy.
- The use of alcohol or drugs in and of itself, without other lease violations, is not a reason for eviction.
- Funding promotes tenant selection plans for supportive housing that prioritize eligible tenants based on criteria other than "first-come-first-serve," including, but not limited to, the duration or chronicity of homelessness, vulnerability to early mortality, or high utilization of crisis services.
- Case managers and service coordinators are trained in and actively employ evidence-based practices for engagement, including motivational interviewing and client-centered counseling.
- Services are informed by a harm-reduction philosophy that recognizes drug and alcohol use and addiction as a part of tenants' lives, where tenants are engaged in nonjudgmental communication regarding drug and alcohol use, and where tenants are offered education regarding how to avoid risky behaviors and engage in safer practices, as well as connected to evidence-based treatment if the tenant so chooses.
- The project and specific apartment may include special physical features that accommodate disabilities, reduce harm, and promote health and community and independence among tenants.

[1]Codified as California Welfare & Institutions Code § 8255.

		Points
☐ The extent to which applicant conforms to California and the CoC's Housing First policy.	**15 points**	

(**10 pts** [10 Excellent] [7-9 Good] [4-7 Fair] [1-3 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])

Excellent: Housing First practices are thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as housing preconditions. Description is clearly based on the tenets of the Housing First model.
Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the Housing First practices.
Fair: Housing First practices are stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will ensure Housing First practices.
Poor: Housing First practices are vague and poorly described. The practice of Housing First appears to have been an afterthought.
Unacceptable: Housing First practices are not stated. The description does not have any evidence of applying the tenets of the Housing First model.

		Points
☐ Housing First practices include rapid placement and stabilization for housing permanency and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions.	**10 points**	
Comments:	**Total**	

B. Project Focus (25 points)

(**5 pts** [5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])

Excellent: Project focus is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the purpose of the program. Description indicates a well-planned project focus.
Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the project focus.
Fair: Project focus is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will be providing services through this funding.
Poor: Project focus is vague and poorly described. Description of the project appears to have been an afterthought.
Unacceptable: Project focus is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear project intent.

		Points
☐ The extent to which the project is for eligible services.	**5 points**	
☐ The extent to which the project improves the current homeless services system.	**5 points**	
☐ The applicant's ability to focus on long-term sustainable results.	**5 points**	
☐ The extent to which the project addresses the fundamental underlying issues of homelessness rather than only addressing its symptoms.	**5 points**	
☐ The extent to which measurable outcomes will be tracked and reported.	**5 points**	
Comments:	**Total**	

C. Experience and Capacity (25 points)		
(**5 pts** [5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])		
Excellent: Project experience/capacity/innovation is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the organization's ability to administer the program. Good: Similar to above, but could provide more detail about the organization's experience/capacity/innovation. Fair: Project experience/capacity/innovation is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding the organization's ability to administer the program. Poor: Project experience/capacity/innovation is vague and poorly described. Unacceptable: Project experience/capacity/innovation is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear experience/capacity/innovation in administering the program.		
		Points
☐ The jurisdiction's and/or agency's experience in providing services to the public.	**5 points**	
☐ The jurisdiction's and/or agency's capacity in providing services to the public.	**5 points**	
☐ The jurisdiction's and/or agency's innovation in providing services to the public.	**5 points**	
☐ The applicant's experience level of key staff.	**5 points**	
☐ The applicant's ability to adequately describe the target population and address the requirements set out in the CoC HEAP RFA.	**5 points**	
Comments:	**Total**	

D. Budget Detail (10 points)		
(**5 pts** [5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])		
Excellent: Project budget is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to extent of expenditures. Description indicates a well-planned budget. Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the budget costs. Fair: Project budget is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will expend the funding. Poor: Project budget is vague and poorly described. Budget appears to have been an afterthought. Unacceptable: Project budget is not stated. The description of the budget costs unrealistic.		
		Points
☐ The applicant's proposed budget costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.	**5 points**	
(**2.5 pts** [2.5 Excellent] [2 Good] [1.5 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 unacceptable])		
Excellent: Project funding obligation is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the date of expenditures. Good: Similar to above, but could provide more detail about the funding obligation. Fair: Project funding obligation is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will obligate the funds. Poor: Project funding obligation is vague and poorly described. Unacceptable: Project funding obligation is not stated.		
		Points
☐ Fifty percent of project funds will be obligated by 12/31/19.	**2.5 points**	
☐ One hundred percent of project funds will be expended by 5/30/21.	**2.5 points**	
Comments:	**Total**	

E. Collaboration (15 points)		
(**15 pts** [15 Excellent] [10-14 Good] [5-9 Fair] [1-4 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])		
Excellent: Project collaboration is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to extent of collaborative partners. Description indicates a well-planned collaborative project. Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the project collaboration and partners. Fair: Project collaboration is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will collaborate with its partners. Poor: Project collaboration is vague and poorly described. Collaboration appears to have been an afterthought. Unacceptable: Project collaboration is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear collaboration with other agencies or municipalities.		
		Points
☐ Applicant's evidence of its ability to collaborate with other agencies and/or municipalities.	**15 points**	
Comments:	**Total**	

F. Bonus (5 points)		**Points**
☐ • Only to applicants that demonstrate multijurisdictional collaboration.	**5 points**	

Total Points Awarded _____