Partners Ending Homelessness

Scoring Rubric

Partners Ending Homelessness (PEH)

FY2026 New Project Application TH, PSH, and RRH

Updated 06/29/2026

Updated 7/13/2026

Applications are due Wednesday, July 15th by 5 pm.
Single Project Applications must be submitted in a single PDF to PEH via email: jkeys@letsendhomelessness.org
Project applications must also be submitted in E-Snaps by Tuesday, August 11th by 5pm.
Scoring Rubric will be on our website
CoC Funding - Partners Ending Homelessness

Agency and Project Information

Organization Name:	
Project Name:	

Contact Person **Phone Number** **Email**	

Amount Requesting	**Projected Number of People Served 2 CFR 200.404**
$	

Project/Component Type (check correct box)	
Transitional Housing (TH)	☐
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	☐
Rapid ReHousing (RRH)	☐

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

Expansion Project for the above checked	☐

<u>**Threshold Requirements: (3 parts)**</u> **All projects are required to meet or agree with threshold requirements to be considered for funding.**	
The agency has reviewed all HUD priorities outlined on pages 106-108 of the NOFO and agrees to abide by them.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
The agency also agrees to abide by the following four additional questions outlined in the same area of the NOFO on page 108:	
Awards under this NOFO will not be used to engage in illegal racial discrimination, including racial preferences.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards under this NOFO will not be distributed in a way that violates or otherwise is used to interfere with constitutional protections guaranteed for speech and religious beliefs and the free exercise of religion.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Awards made under this NOFO will not be used to fund any project, service provider, or organization that operates illegal drug injection sites of "safe consumption sites" in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856, knowingly permit the use or distribution of illicit drugs on property under their control in violation of 21 U.S.C. 856(a)(2), or knowingly distribute drug paraphernalia in violation of 21 USC 863. This is not a requirement that program participants must be sober in order to receive assistance, participate in treatment in order to receive assistance, or be evicted or exited from assistance for a first-time violation of a drug-related program policy or lease requirement.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree
Pursuant to 2 CFR 200.332(b)(2), all agreements or contracts made with subrecipients under this NOFO must contain the same terms and conditions as those in the grant agreement issued by HUD. Any conflicting terms and conditions must be approved by HUD.	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

Additional CoC Threshold Questions:	
Applicant is a non-profit organization, including a faith-based organization, with active 501(c)3 status, a public housing authority, a local government organization, or another eligible entity as specified in the NOFO. (Please see page 9 of the NOFO for a detailed listing of eligible applicants.)	☐ Yes ☐ No
If applying **for TH** (rental assistance) are you a local government, state government, or PHA, or partnering with one of these three entities to administer rental assistance funds.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to uphold protections of VAWA (§ 5.2005 VAWA protections) including: confidentiality protections, use of emergency transfer plans, and regular staff training regarding VAWA.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to use our Continuum's Homeless Management Information System-HMIS (or comparable database if Domestic Violence-DV)	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to engage in technical assistance with PEH, when needed, and monthly program meetings to review data errors, case management documentation, services, utilization, spend down, and outcomes.	☐ Yes ☐ No
PEH Membership: The applicant has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PEH or is submitting an MOU with this application. (Templates will be posted on the PEH website.)	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant agrees to using the Coordinated Entry System to fill 100% of beds	☐ Yes ☐ No
Applicant has attached the management letter from the agency's most recent fiscal audit demonstrating that the agency is in good standing.	☐ Yes ☐ No
Does the agency participate in the local Point In Time	☐ Yes ☐ No

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

(PIT) Count?	
If no, to the above, will the agency participate in the future if funded by sending the following number of volunteers according to the percentage of funding received by the CoC: 30%-20%= 6 volunteers, 19%-15%=5 volunteers, 14%-10%=4 volunteers, 9%-5%=3 volunteers; and 4% or below =2 volunteers	☐ Yes ☐ No
Does this program have a bathroom and kitchen in each unit? If not, do you have or will you request a waiver from HUD? (Please see page 36)	☐ Agree ☐ Disagree

If the answer is no to any of the above questions, please explain below, on the next page. (limit to 250 words)

If the agency does not meet threshold requirements, stop scoring. Agency is not eligible for CoC funding.

Populations Served

Specialty Populations Served: (See pages 81-83 of the NOFO)	☐ **Children and youth (3 pts)** ☐ **Families (2 pts)** ☐ **Veterans (2 pts)** ☐ **Survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (2 pts)** ☐ **Justice System Re-entry (2 pts)** ☐ **High utilizers of healthcare systems (2 pts)** ☐ **Aging and elderly (2 pts)** ☐ **Chronically homeless (CH) (2 pts)**
Please describe the agency's unique ability to serve the above population(s) and share any relevant data to support your response. (Please limit to 250 words.) (5 pts)	

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

Partners Ending Homelessness

4-5 Points: Demonstrates a history of serving this population. Discussed the population and the ability to best serve this population with the funding. Request Provides Multiple data points to support response. **2-3 points: Limited description with the limited data provided.** **0-1 points: Population served description is not clear or fully thought out. No data is provided.**

Will you have any units in your project that require program participant engagement in substance abuse treatment services as a condition of continued participation in the program? (p 78) (5 pts) If yes, how many units?	☐ **Yes + number of units >0 =5** ☐ **No =0**

<u>Narrative Questions *All* New Applicants:</u>

Current, or Past Performance: 5 Points	If your agency currently receives, or has received Continuum of Care (CoC) funding in the past, have any of your programs fallen into Tier 2 or been reallocated? If yes, please describe why, and what changes have you implemented or plan to implement to ensure that this project meets the minimum HUD and CoC requirements?
5 points: Fully answers all parts of the question. Clearly states whether any projects were Tier 2 or reallocated, provides a transparent explanation of why, details specific corrective actions already implemented or planned, and demonstrates how the project will meet HUD and CoC performance and compliance requirements. O**r the agency has not received CoC funding in the past.** **4 points: Answers all parts of the question with good detail but lacks some specificity, supporting evidence, or measurable outcomes.** **3 points: Addresses the question but provides only general explanations or broad improvement plans. Some required details are missing.** **2 points: Partially answers the question. Reasons or improvement plans are incomplete, vague, or not clearly tied to HUD/CoC requirements.** **1 point: Minimally addresses the question, omits key information, or provides an unclear or unsupported response.** **0 points: Does not answer the question, leaves it blank, or provides information unrelated to the question.**	
Program Design: 5 points	Describe how the type of housing proposed, including number and configuration of units, where applicable, for the needs of the program participants. Please outline whether the project will be site-based or scattered-site. (please limit to 250 words)

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

5 points: Clearly describes the proposed housing type, the number and configuration of units (if applicable), and whether the project is site-based or scattered-site. Demonstrates a strong connection between the housing model and the needs of the target population, with sufficient detail to show the design is appropriate and effective. **4 points: Addresses all required elements and explains how the housing generally meets participant needs but provides less detail or a less compelling rationale.** **3 points: Includes most required information but lacks specificity about the housing configuration, project type, or how the housing meets participant needs.** **2 points: Provides only a basic description of the housing model and omits one or more required elements (e.g., unit configuration or site-based vs. scattered-site) or provides little explanation of participant needs.** **1 point: Gives minimal information, is unclear, or does not adequately describe the housing or its appropriateness for participants.** **0 points: No response, or the response does not address the question.**	
Supportive Services: 10 points	Describe how the project will assess participants' service needs and develop individualized service plans with them that provide tailored supportive services (except for eligible exemptions-over age 62, or defined in 24CFR8.3, or defined in 24CFR578.3) that are necessary to assist program participants to successfully obtain and retain permanent housing that fits their needs (such as transportation, safety planning, enhance case management) and are necessary to assist program participants to obtain and maintain long term housing stability (min 2 years post exit) successfully exiting homelessness. • Include how service plans will identify services, providers, frequency of service delivery, participant goals, strategies, and target dates related to health and wellness, housing stability, employment, financial stability, and self-sufficiency. If not on-site, provide the partnerships and corresponding MOUs for providing this care. • **For TH Project Only:** How will your project ensure at least 20 hours per week of engagement in services, activities, education, training, volunteering, or employment. • **Expansion PSH, RRH only:** If this is a PSH, or RRH expansion project also include how the project will expand supportive services to participants, including on-site supportive services where appropriate. (Please limit to 500 words)
10 points: Provides a comprehensive, well-organized description of the assessment process and individualized service planning. Clearly explains how participant needs are assessed, how service plans are developed collaboratively, and how plans include services, providers, frequency, participant goals, strategies, and target dates across health and wellness, housing stability, employment, financial stability, and self-sufficiency. Describes supportive services that promote housing retention and long-term stability (including post-exit supports, if	

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

applicable). Clearly identifies community partnerships and MOUs for off-site services. For TH projects, fully explains how participants will engage in at least 20 hours per week of qualifying activities. **8-9 points: Addresses all major components with good detail. Service planning is individualized and participant-centered, but some elements (e.g., measurable goals, provider details, MOUs, post-exit supports, or TH engagement requirements) could be more specific.** **6–7 points: Addresses most required elements but lacks detail or specificity in one or more key areas. Individualized planning is described generally, but implementation, partnerships, or measurable outcomes are not fully developed.** **4–5 points: Provides a basic description of assessments and services but omits several required components or provides only vague explanations. Limited discussion of individualized planning, partnerships, or long-term housing stability.** **2–3 points: Responds to only a few elements of the question. Service planning is minimally described, lacks participant-centered detail, and does not demonstrate a clear approach to achieving housing stability.** **1 point: Minimal response that provides little evidence of a structured assessment or service planning process.** **0 points: No response or the response does not address the question.**	
Supportive Services Continued: 5 points	Demonstrate that this project requires participation in supportive services per 24 CFR 578.75(h), including supporting agreement language, and ensuring VAWA protections under 24 CFR 5.2005(b)(1) are upheld.
5 points: Clearly outlines the supportive services participation, includes VAWA language, and has attached a copy (copies) of the participant agreement. **3-4 points: Outlines services, includes VAWA language, but provides less detail or a less compelling argument** **1-2 points: Gives minimal to basic information, lacks specificity or is not a compelling argument** **0-points: No response, or the response does not address the question.**	
Community and HUD Federal Need: 5 points	Using local data on homelessness, how does this project support PEH's and HUD's goal of ending homelessness for all persons? Please include the agency's unique ability to serve the population and share any relevant data to support your response. (please limit to 250 words)

4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates how this project will support the goal of ending homelessness and uses specific data that supports their explanation. Agency shows why they are uniquely qualified to serve the population with specific evidence. **2-3 points: Describes a link between the project and the goal of ending homelessness but connection is weak and data is limited. The agency may be able to serve the population well but does not have strong evidence.** **0-1 points: Does not demonstrate how this project will support the goal of ending homelessness. Does not providence evidence that the agency is qualified to serve the population.**	
Cost Effectiveness: 10 points	Demonstrate the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable according to 2CFR200.404.
10 points: Fully demonstrates cost reasonableness under 2 CFR 200.404. Clearly calculates the average cost per household and provides strong, transparent justification tied to program design, service intensity, staffing, and participant needs. Uses relevant comparisons (e.g., similar CoC projects, local market rates, housing/service costs, or prior performance data). Clearly shows costs are necessary, eligible, and efficient. **8-9 points: Provides clear cost calculation and solid justification for reasonableness. May include some comparative or contextual data, but not fully comprehensive or deeply detailed. Strong alignment with allowable and necessary costs.** **6-7 points: Includes the average cost per household and a general explanation of reasonableness. Some connection to program design or service needs is present but limited supporting data or benchmarking.** **4-5 points: Mentions cost per household but provides weak or generic justification. Limited explanation of why costs are reasonable under federal standards. Minimal context or supporting rationale.** **2-3 points: Cost information is unclear, incomplete, or not meaningfully justified. Little to no connection to 2 CFR 200.404 reasonableness standard.** **1 point: Provides minimal cost information and does not demonstrate any understanding of cost reasonableness requirements.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question at all.**	
Knowledge shared from persons who were homeless in the past: 5 points	How does your program currently involve people who were formerly homeless (i.e., employment/volunteer opportunities, peer support, mentorship, members of Board/Advisory Committees, etc.)? (please limit to 250 words)

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

4-5 points: Clearly demonstrates meaningful involvement of people who were formerly homeless. Explains how contributions from people who were formerly homeless have been intentionally applied to improve the program. **2-3 points: Shows some involvement of people who were formerly homeless but involvement is limited. Fails to show that input from people who were formerly homeless was practically implemented.** **0-1 points: Has not had any people who were formerly homeless involved or people who were formerly homeless were involved in the past but are no longer given opportunities to contribute.**	
Minimizing Trauma Provision: 5 points	Describe how your program minimizes the trauma associated with homelessness. This could include trauma informed care services and ensuring participant safety in programs, especially for youth and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. (please limit to 250 words)
4-5 points: Agency demonstrates the ability to minimize trauma as described in the question above. **2-3 points: Agency has plans, and can produce evidence of a plan, to ensure the program will minimize trauma as described in the question above.** **0-1 points: Agency does not have the ability to provide this level of care and does not have a plan in place to provide this level of care.**	

The following 3 questions are project type specific. Complete only those that apply to this project application.

PSH Projects only:

For PSH applicants how will the project ensure that it is serving homeless individuals or families with a disability in accordance with 24 CFR 578.37(a)(1)(i) (5 points)
5 points: Clearly describes a compliant, well-defined process to ensure all participants meet both homelessness eligibility and disability documentation requirements under 24 CFR 578.37(a)(1)(i). Includes specific screening procedures at intake, use of HMIS or coordinated entry verification (homeless verification only), required disability documentation, assigns staff roles responsible for eligibility review, and ongoing compliance monitoring. Demonstrates strong understanding of HUD eligibility rules and prevents ineligible admissions. **4 points: Describes eligibility screening and disability verification processes that are generally compliant. Covers key elements (homeless verification, disability documentation, intake procedures), but may lack detail on documentation standards, staff oversight, or ongoing monitoring.** **3 points: Provides a basic description of intake and eligibility checks, including homelessness and disability, but processes are general or incomplete. Limited detail on documentation requirements or compliance safeguards.** **2 points: Mentions eligibility requirements but provides vague or unclear procedures for verifying homelessness or disability. Weak or missing explanation of documentation standards or compliance controls.**

1 point: Minimal response that does not meaningfully explain how eligibility will be verified or how compliance with the regulation will be ensured.

0 points: No response or does not address the question.

RRH Projects only:

For RRH projects: Please describe how the provision of tenant-based rental assistance (TBRA) will help individuals and families achieve and maintain self-sufficiency within 24 months. (5 points)
5 points: Clearly explains how TBRA supports rapid housing stability and long-term self-sufficiency within 24 months. Describes a structured approach to subsidy reduction or transition (if applicable), coordinated supportive services, and individualized goal planning (e.g., employment, income growth). Demonstrates how participants will increase income, reduce reliance on assistance, and maintain housing independently. Includes specific service strategies, timelines, and measurable outcomes tied to self-sufficiency, *(7/13/2026 Update) PSH and TH applicants* receive 10 points. **4 points: Describes how TBRA promotes housing stability and self-sufficiency, with some discussion of supportive services and participant goals. May lack detailed timelines, measurable outcomes, or clear transition planning.** **3 points: Provides a general explanation of how TBRA helps participants maintain housing and work toward independence, but limited detail on structure, services, or the 24-month self-sufficiency expectation.** **2 points: Mentions housing assistance and self-sufficiency but does not clearly explain how TBRA leads to independence within 24 months. Weak or missing discussion of services or outcomes.** **1 point: Minimal response with little connection between TBRA and self-sufficiency goals.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**

TH and RRH Projects only:

TH and RRH: Please describe the success of your agency's current housing program(s) in helping homeless individuals and families exit homelessness within 24 months or describe how your agency plans to ensure that individuals and families exit homelessness within 24 months. (please limit to 250 words) (5 points)
5 points: Clearly demonstrates strong performance or a well-defined plan to achieve exits from homelessness within 24 months. If describing current programs, includes specific outcomes (e.g., housing placement rates, average time to housing, retention rates, or exit destinations). If describing future approach, provides a structured strategy with clear timelines, best practice, and measurable performance targets. Shows strong alignment between services, case management, and housing outcomes. **4 points: Provides a clear description of program success or strategy with some outcome data or performance indicators. May lack depth in metrics, specificity in timelines, or detailed explanation of how success is achieved.** **3 points: Offers a general description of housing program success or planned approach. Limited or no concrete performance data, and strategy for achieving 24-month exits is broad or partially developed.**

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

2 points: Mentions housing assistance or goals but provides little evidence of success or a weak/unclear plan for ensuring 24-month exits. **1 point: Minimal response with little connection to housing outcomes or 24-month exit requirement.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**

Performance Measures *All* Applicants:

Data Quality: 2 points	Describe your commitment to timely data submission and data quality in coordination with the Continuum of Care (CoC).
2 points: Clearly demonstrates a strong commitment to timely and accurate HMIS/data submission in coordination with the CoC. Describes specific procedures for data entry timelines (e.g., real-time or within required CoC standards), data quality monitoring (e.g., routine audits, validation reports, error correction processes), staff roles responsible for data entry and oversight, and participation in CoC data quality initiatives or training. **1 point: Indicates general commitment to timely data submission and data quality, but provides limited detail on procedures, timelines, or accountability. Mentions HMIS or CoC coordination but lacks specifics on how data quality is ensured or maintained.** **0 points: No meaningful response or does not address timely data submission or data quality in relation to the CoC/HMIS requirements.**	
Data Quality Continued: 5 points	Describe your plan to ensure minimal to no exits with unknown destinations.
5 points: Provides a clear, proactive, and structured plan to minimize unknown exits. Describes specific case management practices such as ongoing housing navigation, frequent participant contact, pre-exit planning, and warm handoffs to receiving programs or housing destinations. Includes procedures for tracking participants prior to exit, verifying destinations through follow-up, and HMIS data quality checks. Demonstrates strong coordination with landlords, CoC partners, and housing resources to ensure known, stable exits. **4 points: Describes a solid plan with case management and exit planning practices that reduce unknown destinations. May lack some detail on verification processes, data quality monitoring, or coordination with partners.** **3 points: Provides a general explanation of efforts to reduce unknown exits, such as case management or follow-up, but lacks clear procedures or accountability mechanisms.**	

2 points: Mentions intent to reduce unknown exits but provides vague or minimal description of how this will be achieved. Little detail on tracking, follow-up, or system coordination. **1 point: Minimal response with little connection to exit planning or destination tracking.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**	
Employment & Income Growth: 10 points	Describe how a minimum of 25% of clients will obtain employment income to maximize their ability to live independently. (please limit to 250 words)
10 points: Provides a clear, realistic, and well-supported strategy showing how at least 25% of clients will obtain employment income. Includes specific employment services (job readiness, vocational training, job placement, partnerships with workforce agencies/employers, supported employment), individualized employment planning, and clear timelines. Demonstrates strong understanding of barriers (transportation, skills, health) and how they will be addressed. Includes measurable outcomes, tracking methods, and coordination with partners. Shows a credible pathway to achieving or exceeding the 25% benchmark. **8-9 points: Clearly describes employment strategies and partnerships and makes a strong case for meeting the 25% target. Includes multiple supportive services and some detail on implementation, but may lack full specificity on metrics, timelines, or monitoring.** **6-7 points: Describes employment support services and a general plan to help clients gain income, but the strategy is not fully detailed or the connection to achieving 25% is somewhat assumed rather than demonstrated.** **4-5 points: Mentions employment assistance but provides a weak or general explanation. Limited detail on how services will result in at least 25% employment income outcomes.** **2-3 points: Minimal description of employment supports with little explanation of how clients will obtain income or how the 25% goal will be achieved.** **1 point: Barely addresses employment outcomes or lacks any meaningful strategy.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**	
Supplemental Resources: 5 points	Describe how your agency plans to supplement this project with resources from other public or private sources, such as mainstream health, social, and employment programs, such as Medicare, Medicaid, SSI, and SNAP?
5 points: Clearly describes a well-developed and proactive strategy to connect participants with mainstream and community resources. Includes specific programs (e.g., Medicaid, SSI/SSDI, SNAP, TANF, workforce programs), and	

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607

explains how staff will assist with enrollment, eligibility determination, referrals, and ongoing access. Demonstrates strong coordination with external agencies and may include MOUs or formal partnerships. Shows how leveraging these resources reduces CoC funding reliance and improves housing stability and self-sufficiency. **4 points: Describes a solid plan to connect participants to mainstream benefits and services, with some detail on referral processes or partnerships. May lack specificity on implementation steps or coordination mechanisms.** **3 points: Provides a general description of referrals to mainstream services but limited detail on how enrollment or ongoing access will be ensured. Weak explanation of coordination or system integration.** **2 points: Mentions mainstream resources but provides minimal explanation of how participants will be connected or supported in accessing them.** **1 point: Minimal response with little meaningful description of leveraging external resources.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**	
Returns to Homelessness: 10 points	How will this project ensure that clients will not return to homelessness within two years after project exit? (please limit to 250 words)
10 points: Provides a comprehensive, best practice post-exit stabilization plan demonstrating strong likelihood of preventing returns to homelessness within two years. Clearly describes structured aftercare supports (e.g., follow-up case management, engagement, check-ins, landlord mediation, benefits maintenance, and crisis intervention). Includes clear timelines and frequency of post-exit contact, risk monitoring, and re-housing strategies if instability occurs. Shows strong coordination with community partners and systems of care. Includes measurable outcomes, tracking methods in HMIS, and demonstrates understanding of key risk factors for homelessness recurrence. **8-9 points: Provides a solid post-exit support strategy with regular follow-up and supportive services. Clearly addresses prevention of returns to homelessness, but may lack full detail on monitoring systems, frequency of contact, or contingency planning for housing instability.** **6-7 points: Describes general post-exit supports and some follow-up efforts. Shows intent to prevent returns to homelessness, but lacks specificity in structure, timelines, or accountability mechanisms.** **4-5 points: Mentions aftercare or follow-up services but provides a weak or general plan. Limited explanation of how returns to homelessness will actually be prevented or tracked.** **2-3 points: Minimal description of post-exit support. Little connection between services provided and preventing returns to homelessness within two years.** **1 point: Fails to meaningfully address post-exit stability or repeat homelessness prevention.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**	

TH and RRH Project Applicants Only:

10 points	**TH and RRH Only:** Does your agency currently, or has it previously operated a TH, RRH, or other homeless project where at least 50% of participants exited to a positive destination within 24 months and at least 50% exit with employment income as reflected in HMIS? Or is there a plan to ensure these same outcomes? Please describe: (250-word limit)
10 points: Clearly demonstrates strong historical performance meeting or exceeding both benchmarks (≥50% positive exits within 24 months and ≥50% employment income exits) with HMIS data or credible performance reporting. If no history, provides a detailed, realistic, and best practice plan to achieve these outcomes. Includes specific strategies such as housing stabilization services, employment supports, partnerships (workforce agencies, employers), coordinated entry alignment, and strong case management. Clearly explains tracking methods, performance monitoring, and continuous improvement. *(7/13/2026 Update) PSH applicants receive 10 points)* **8-9 points: Shows strong performance history or a well-developed plan likely to meet both benchmarks. Includes relevant strategies and some data or metrics, but may lack full HMIS specificity, depth of benchmarking, or detailed monitoring systems.** **6-7 points: Provides either partial performance evidence or a general plan. Mentions key strategies for housing and employment outcomes but lacks strong data, specificity, or clear assurance of meeting both benchmarks.** **4-5 points: Provides minimal performance information or a basic plan. Limited connection to achieving both required thresholds. Weak detail on employment and housing exit strategies or performance tracking.** **2-3 points: Response is vague, lacks credible performance data, and does not clearly explain how outcomes will be achieved. Minimal understanding of required benchmarks.** **1 point: Does not meaningfully address performance history or outcomes plan.** **0 points: No response or does not address the question.**	

For Reviewer Use Only

Applicant Budget submitted is feasible, cost effective, and allowable. (5 points)	☐ **Yes= 5 points** ☐ **No= 0 points**

277 Alexander St, Suite 208-210, Rochester, NY 14607