AGENCY: PROJECT NAME:	PROJECT TYPE: PSH/RRH/RRH-DV/Safe Haven/DV-CE/YDHP-CE/YDHP-SSO or YDHP-TH-RRH	Reviewer Initials:	TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED FOR PROJECT: $
Applicant Agency/Grantee Information	**Criteria**	**Yes/No**	**Reviewer Comments, if any**
Applicant Agency and Project is eligible Renewal (must match the CoC's Grant Inventory Worksheet).	Eligible project type as listed in NOFO; Elgible project based on grant performance period expiration date of 2027		
Application is submitted by an eligible applicant.	Applicant must be the grantee noted on the approved Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW)		
Applicant Organization is registered, current, and not debarred or suspended as reported in SAM.gov.	Screenshot showing application status or active registration with expiration date and/or SAM.gov summary document		
Application and all required attachments submitted by stated local deadline.	Submission email date and timestamp		
Required Attachments	**Criteria**	**Yes/No**	**Reviewer Comments, if any**
Organization's Conflict of Interest/Code of Conduct Policy (Must be active and on-file with HUD for renewing and exisitng grants).	Local Project Application		
Agency's safety plan (Dedicated DV Renewals Only)	Local Project Application		
APR (Annual Performance Report) for April 1, 2025 - March 30, 2026	Local Project Application		
APR for the most recent completed grant cycle submitted in SAGE.	Local Project Application		
Coordinated Entry System Participation MOU.	Local Project Application		
Proof of active SAM.gov registration (Screenshot showing application status or active registration with expiration date and SAM.gov summary document).	Local Project Application		
Missouri Certificate of Good Standing dated within the last 30 days.	Local Project Application		
Quarterly Drawdown Reports from eLOCCS for the Most Recently Completed Grant Cycle	Local Project Application		
Monitoring Documents or organization letter submitted.	Local Project Application		
Audit Documentation (single audit, completed financial audit, or 990).	Local Project Application		
Agency Project Budget.	Local Project Application		
Match letters/documentation that show ability to meet HUD requirement of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless HUD granted waiver per the NOFO/prior application.	Local Project Application		
IRS 501(C)3 designation letter, if applicable.	Local Project Application		
APPLICANT MUST MEET ALL REQUIRED THRESHOLD CRITERIA ABOVE. If the applicant may be subject to reallocation due to non-performance or spending, indicate below.			
Performance and Spending	**Criteria**	**Agree/Disagree**	**Reviewer Comments, if any**
The project had no funds available for recapture for two consecutive grant operating years directly preceding the release of the CoC NOFO/Program Competition.	Not subject to involuntary reallocation per MO 606 Policy/HUD Quarterly Spending Reports/eLOCCS/Most recent APR submitted in SAGE		
Project failed to execute performance per grant requirments.	Subject to involuntary reallocation per MO 606 Policy/Most recent APR submitted in SAGE/project application		

Component: PSH	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance.	Applicant is an access point and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point, and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings. (5 points) Applicant accepts referrals from outside the Coordinated Entry System and/or did not attend case conferencing. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025) and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Local Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		

Financial Capacity and Spending	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Project Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS, e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, with less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 with less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 with less than 5% of funds unspent.	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		

Project Performance	Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Average bed and unit utilization rate for most recently completed grant cycle.	SAGE APR Q02	95% or higher (15 points) 88-94% (10 points) 80-87% (5 points) 79% or below (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Exit Records/Exit.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	HMIS Data Quality Report for the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***earned*** income (Employment) from <u>start to annual assessment</u>.	APR Q19a1/19a2	50% or higher (15 points) 35%-49% (10 points) 21%-39% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***other*** income from <u>start to annual assessment</u>. (aka Stayers)	APR Q19a1/19a2	50% or higher (5 points) 35%-49% (3 points) 21%-39% (2 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increase **earned** (Employment) income from <u>start to exit.</u> (aka Leavers)	APR Q 19a1/19a2	50% or higher (15 points) 35%-49% (10 points) 21%-35% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from <u>start to annual assessment</u>. (aka Stayers)	APR Q20a/20b	61% or higher (10 points) 46%-60% (7 points) 31%-45% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from <u>start to exit</u>. (aka Leavers)	APR Q20a/20b	40% or higher (10 points) 25%-39% (7 points) 11%-24% (5 points) 10% or below (0 points)		
Length of time between project start date and housing move-in date.	APR Q22c	All participants less than 30 days (5 points) Any participants 30-90 days (3 points) Any participant 91-180 days (2 points) Any participant 6 months or more (180+ days) (0 points)		
Percentage of participants with a positive permanent exit destination/situation from the total column.	HMIS APR Q23c	95% or higher (15 points) 88%-94% (10 points) 81%-87% (5 points) 80% or below (0 points)		
Project Initiatives	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Proposed project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project has or will incorporate supportive service participation requirements in their program design, based on individual need in accordance with 24 CFR 578.75(h).	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Dedicated Sober Living Project.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Proposed project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project Proposed Service Area and type meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Informational Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS:			**0**	

Component: RRH	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance.	Applicant is an access point and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point, and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings. (5 Points) Applicant accepts referrals from outside the Coordinated Entry System and/or did not attend case conferencing. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025) and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 Points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Local Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		

Financial Capacity and Spending	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS, e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, with less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 with less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 with less than 5% of funds unspent. .	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		
Project Performance	**Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Average bed and unit utilization rate for most recently completed grant cycle.	SAGE APR Q02	95% or higher (15 points) 88-94% (10 points) 80-87% (5 points) 79% or below (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Exit Records/Exit.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	HMIS Data Quality Report for the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***earned*** income (Employment) from <u>start to annual assessment</u>.	APR Q19a1/19a2	61% or higher (15 points) 45%-60% (10 points) 21%-44% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***other*** income from <u>start to annual assessment</u>. (aka Stayers)	APR Q19a1/19a2	45% or higher (5 points) 35%-45% (3 points) 21%-39% (2 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increase **earned** (Employment) income from <u>start to exit.</u> (aka Leavers)	APR Q 19a1/19a2	61% or higher (15 points) 45%-60% (10 points) 21%-44% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from <u>start to annual assessment</u>. (aka Stayers)	APR Q20a/20b	45% or higher (10 points) 35%-45% (7 points) 21%-39% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from <u>start to exit</u>. (aka Leavers)	APR Q20a/20b	45% or higher (10 points) 35%-45% (7 points) 21%-39% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Length of time between project start date and housing move-in date.	APR Q22c	All participants less than 30 days (5 points) Any participants 30-90 days (3 points) Any participant 91-180 days (2 points) Any participant 6 months or more (180+ days) (0 points)		
Percentage of participants with a positive permanent exit destination/situation from the total column.	HMIS APR Q23c	95% or higher (15 points) 88%-94% (10 points) 81%-87% (5 points) 80% or below (0 points)		
Project Initiatives	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Proposed project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project has or will incorporate supportive service participation requirements in their program design, based on individual need in accordance with 24 CFR 578.75(h).	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Dedicated Sober Living Project.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Proposed project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project Proposed Service Area and type meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Informational Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS:			**0**	

Component: RRH-DV	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance.	Applicant is an access point and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point, and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings. (5 points) Applicant accepts referrals from outside the Coordinated Entry System and/or did not attend case conferencing. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025) and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		

Financial Capacity and Spending	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS, e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, with less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 with less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 with less than 5% of funds unspent. .	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		
Project Performance	**Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	Reviewer Comments
Average bed and unit utilization rate for most recently completed grant cycle.	SAGE APR Q02	95% or higher (15 points) 88-94% (10 points) 80-87% (5 points) 79% or below (0 points)		
Time from Record Entry (Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry and at Exit Records/Exit)	Comparable Database APR Q6e	All participants entered at start and exit: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant entered at start and exit: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant entered 7 or more days at start and exit (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	Data Quality Report for the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increase **earned** (Employment) income from start to exit. (aka Leavers)	APR Q 19a1/19a2	61% or higher (15 points) 45%-60% (10 points) 21%-44% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from start to exit. (aka Leavers)	APR Q20a/20b	45% or higher (10 points) 35%-45% (7 points) 21%-39% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Length of time between project start date and housing move-in date.	APR Q22c	All participants less than 30 days (5 points) Any participants 30-90 days (3 points) Any participant 91-180 days (2 points) Any participant 6 months or more (180+ days) (0 points)		
Percentage of participants with a positive permanent exit destination/situation from the total column.	Comparable Database APR Q23c	95% or higher (15 points) 88%-94% (10 points) 81%-87% (5 points) 80% or below (0 points)		

DV Supplemental	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CONFIDENTIALITY of SERVICES: Project described agency's confidentiality policies that protect survivors' personally identifying information (PII) in compliance with VAWA, FVPSA, VOCA, and HUD requirements, including how informed consent is obtained, how staff are trained on this issue, how data is secured and shared, and how these policies are implemented with other agency partnerships.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly details confidentiality policies, how informed consent is obtained, staff training on confidentiality, and data sharing with other agencies, while demonstrating accurate knowledge of federal laws requiring confidentiality of survivors. To obtain 10 points, applicant must clearly state all five requests for information: policy, informed consent, staff training, data sharing, knowledge of federal laws. (10 points) Applicant moderately details confidentiality policies, how informed consent is obtained, staff training on confidentiality, and data sharing with other agencies and/or applicant does not demonstrate accurate knowledge of federal laws requiring confidentiality of survivors. Reviewer is not clear how confidentiality policies are implemented for survivor safety. (5 points) Applicant provides limited description of confidentiality policies, how informed consent is obtained, staff training on confidentiality, and data sharing with other agencies, while demonstrating accurate knowledge of federal laws requiring confidentiality of survivors. If applicant fails to address any one of these, the score will be ZERO: confidentiality policies, informed consent, staff training, data sharing, and knowledge of federal laws. (0 points)		
DATA SAFETY: Did non-primary victim service provider describe agency's policies and procedures to inform survivors about the benefits and risks of entering information into a HMIS database. Include the following: Who may access their PII, how survivors may withdraw consent at any time, and options to keep their information confidential, including a locked HMIS file. For primary victim service providers, Applicant described agency's policies and procedures to inform survivors about the benefits and risks of entering information into a comparable database. Include the following: Who may access their PII, how survivors may withdraw consent at any time, and options to keep their information confidential, including anonymous reporting.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly describes their data policies in regard to database entry, access of their personally identifying information, informed consent and how that is withdrawn, and options to keep survivor information confidential and unshared. Applicant is clear how survivors are informed of applicant policies and procedures. To obtain 10 points, applicant must address each component type of data: database utilized, agency policies for entering survivor data, protection of personally identifying information, informed consent, withdrawing consent, and options to prevent sharing of survivor information. (10 points) Applicant moderately describes their data policies in regard to database entry, access of their personally identifying information, informed consent and how that is withdrawn, and options to keep survivor information confidential and unshared. Reviewer is not clear about how data is entered, utilized, protected and unshared by the applicant and/or applicant does not clearly identify how survivors are informed of applicant policies and procedures. (5 points) Applicant provides limited description of their data policies in regard to database entry, access of their personally identifying information, informed consent and how that is withdrawn, and options to keep survivor information confidential and unshared. If applicant fails to address any one of these, the score will be ZERO: database utilized, agency policies for entering survivor data, protection of personally identifying information, informed consent, withdrawing consent, and options to prevent sharing of survivor information. (0 points)		
Project described how agency assists survivors to identify potential safety risks and include how safety planning is evaluated and the outcomes for the prior 12 months. **Plans should include, if applicable:** **Information sharing policies that include de-identification for any client data that may be collected for Coordinated Entry efforts **Comparable database use for all programs where the target population is survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. **Comparable database should include the ability to generate aggregate CAPER reports for the reporting of System Performance Measures within the data sharing policies for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. **Support available to adjust safety plans	Local Project Application, Agency Safety Plan	Applicant thoroughly describes how the applicant safety plans with survivors, how information is de-identified for Coordinated Entry, details comparable database or HMIS protections, and applicant states ability to generate APRs. Applicant has submitted a plan to collect safety outcome measures that is clear, understandable, and acceptable in victim service agency protocols. (5 points) Applicant moderately describes how the applicant safety plans with survivors, how information is de-identified for Coordinated Entry, details comparable database or HMIS protections , and applicant states ability to generate APRs. Reviewer understands but is not clear about how the agency implements or modifies safety plans and/or how information is de-identified in Coordinated Entry and/or how comparable databases or HMIS protections are provided and/or agency does not state their ability to generate APRs and/or applicant fails to submit safety outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect safety outcome measures. (3 points) Applicant provides limited description of how the applicant safety plans with survivors, how information is de-identified for Coordinated Entry, details comparable database or HMIS protections, and applicant states ability to generate APRs. Reviewer does not understands how the agency implements or modifies safety plans and/or how information is de-identified in Coordinated Entry and/or how comparable databases or HMIS protections are provided and/or agency does not state their ability to generate APRs and/or applicant fails to submit safety outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect safety outcome measures. (0 points)		
Project identified how agency helps connect survivors to available community resources, including how are relevant referrals provided, how survivors are assisted in accessing mainstream benefits, and how accessing community resources are evaluated and the outcomes for the prior 12 months.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly describes how the applicant connects survivors to community resources, including referals and mainstream benefits. Applicant has submitted a plan to collect community resources outcome measures that is clear, understandable, and acceptable in victim service agency protocols. (5 points) Applicant moderately describes how the applicant connects survivors to community resources, including referrals and mainstream benefits. Reviewer understands but is not clear about how the applicant connects survivors to available community resources and/or applicant does not address how survivors are accessing mainstream benefits and/or applicant fails to submit community resources outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect community resources outcome measures. (3 points) Applicant provides limited description of how the applicant connects survivors to community resources, including referrals and mainstream benefits. Reviewer does not understands how the applicant connects survivors to available community resources and/or applicant does not address how survivors are accessing mainstream benefits and/or applicant fails to submit community resources outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect community resources outcome measures. (0 points)		
Project described agency's current or planned involvement in the Coordinated Entry System, specifically to the non-HMIS list and safety protocols of the CoC including how agency upholds survivor confidentiality when working with other system partners and within case conferencing.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly describes involvement with Coordinated Entry, has strong understanding how the non-HMIS list operates, and details clearly how applicant upholds survivor confidentiality within case conferencing and CoC system partners. (5 points) Applicant moderately describes involvement with Coordinated Entry, has some understanding how the non-HMIS list operates, and does not clearly state how the applicant upholds survivor confidentiality within case conferencing and CoC system partners. (3 points) Applicant provides limited description of involvement with Coordinated Entry, has little to no understanding how the non-HMIS list operates, and/or does not clearly state how the applicant upholds survivor confidentiality within case conferencing and CoC system partners. (0 points)		

Project Initiatives	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Proposed project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project has or will incorporate supportive service participation requirements in their program design, based on individual need in accordance with 24 CFR 578.75(h).	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Dedicated Sober Living Project.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Proposed project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project Proposed Service Area and type meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Informational Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS:			**0**	

Component: Safe Haven	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance.	Applicant is an access point and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point, and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings. (5 points) Applicant accepts referrals from outside the Coordinated Entry System and/or did not attend case conferencing. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025) and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		

Financial Capacity and Spending	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS, e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, with less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 with less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 with less than 5% of funds unspent.	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		
Project Performance	**Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Average bed and unit utilization rate for most recently completed grant cycle.	SAGE APR Q02	95% or higher (15 points) 88-94% (10 points) 80-87% (5 points) 79% or below (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Exit Records/Exit.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	HMIS Data Quality ReportHMIS Data Quality Report for the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***earned*** income (Employment) from start to annual assessment.	APR Q19a1/19a2	50% or higher (15 points) 35%-49% (10 points) 21%-39% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***other*** income from start to annual assessment. (aka Stayers)	APR Q19a1/19a2	50% or higher (5 points) 35%-49% (3 points) 21%-39% (2 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increase **earned** (Employment) income from start to exit. (aka Leavers)	APR Q 19a1/19a2	50% or higher (15 points) 35%-49% (10 points) 21%-35% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from start to annual assessment. (aka Stayers)	APR Q20a/20b	61% or higher (10 points) 46%-60% (7 points) 31%-45% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from start to exit. (aka Leavers)	APR Q20a/20b	40% or higher (10 points) 25%-39% (7 points) 11%-24% (5 points) 10% or below (0 points)		
Length of time between project start date and housing move-in date.	APR Q22c	All participants less than 30 days (5 points) Any participants 30-90 days (3 points) Any participant 91-180 days (2 points) Any participant 6 months or more (180+ days) (0 points)		
Percentage of participants with a positive permanent exit destination/situation from the total column.	HMIS APR Q23c	70% or higher (15 points) 69%-55% (10 points) 54%-40% (5 points) 40% or below (0 points)		
Project Initiatives	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Proposed project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project has or will incorporate supportive service participation requirements in their program design, based on individual need in accordance with 24 CFR 578.75(h).	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Dedicated Sober Living Project.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Proposed project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project Proposed Service Area and type meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Informational Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS:			**0**	

Component: DV-CE and YHDP-CE	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance, and Project APR	Applicant is an access point and/or works within the Coordinated Entry System framework, as applicable, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point and/or works within the Coordinated Entry System framework, as applicable, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings. (5 points) Applicant worksoutside the Coordinated Entry System frameworkand/or did not attend case conferencing. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025) and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		

Financial Capacity and Spending	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, with less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 with less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 with less than 5% of funds unspent.	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		

Project Performance	Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry.	HMIS Data Quality ReportHMIS Data Quality Report for the performance period	All participants: 0-3 days day (10 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (5 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Exit Records/Exit.	HMIS Data Quality ReportHMIS Data Quality Report for the performance period	All participants: 0-3 days day (10 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (5 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Percentage of overall data error/issue rate (accuracy).	APR Q6a	0-5% (10 points) 6-10% (5 points) 11-20% (3 points) 21% or more (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	HMIS Data Quality Report for the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		

YHDP Only: Supplemental	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Project demonstrates Positive Youth Development (PYD) and trauma-informed care.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the program integrates both Positive Youth Development (PYD) and trauma-informed care into all aspects of service delivery. The response includes specific examples of youth engagement, strengths-based approaches, participant choice, cultural responsiveness, staff training, policies, and practices that promote safety, trust, empowerment, and positive youth outcomes. (13) points) The application demonstrates a basic understanding of PYD and trauma-informed care but provides limited detail on how these approaches are incorporated into program operations. The response is general in nature and lacks specific examples or implementation strategies. (6 points) The application does not adequately describe how the program incorporates Positive Youth Development or trauma-informed care, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little understanding of these approaches. (0 Points)		
Project incorporates youth choice, voice, and self-determination.	Local Project Application	The application clearly demonstrates that the program provides comprehensive, developmentally appropriate case management and services tailored to the age, maturity, and individual needs of participants. The response includes specific examples of individualized service planning, life skills development, education and employment support, behavioral health services, independent living skills, family engagement (when appropriate), and ongoing assessment to ensure services evolve as participants' needs change. (13 Points) The application provides a general description of case management and services but offers limited information on how services are developmentally appropriate or individualized. The response lacks specific examples or implementation details. (6 points) The application does not adequately describe how the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little understanding of developmentally appropriate service delivery. (0 Points)		
Project provided developmentally appropriate case management and services.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the program delivers developmentally appropriate, individualized case management and services. The response demonstrates that services are tailored to participants' age, developmental stage, and unique needs, and includes specific examples such as life skills training, education and employment support, behavioral health services, independent living skills, goal planning, and regular reassessment of participant needs. (20 points) The application demonstrates that the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services. The response includes several examples of individualized supports and explains how services are adapted to participant needs but lacks the depth or specificity required for full points. (10 point) The application does not adequately describe how the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services. The response is missing, incomplete, or does not demonstrate that services are individualized or appropriate for participants' developmental needs. (0 Points)		
Project is effective in connecting participants to educational opportunities, including high school completion, GED programs, vocational training, certifications, or post-secondary education.	Local Project Application	The application demonstrates that the project consistently and effectively connects participants to a wide range of educational opportunities. The response includes specific examples, measurable outcomes, and established partnerships that support high school completion, GED attainment, vocational training, industry-recognized certifications, post-secondary education, or other educational advancement. The project actively monitors participant progress and documents successful educational outcomes. (15 points) The application identifies educational opportunities available to participants but provides limited information on how participants are connected to those services or the effectiveness of those efforts. The response lacks specific examples, partnerships, or measurable outcomes. (7 points) The application does not adequately describe how the project connects participants to educational opportunities, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little evidence of educational support or participant outcomes. (0 points)		
Project is effective in engaging youth and young adults in meaningful services, activities, and supports that promote personal growth and successful outcomes.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the project actively engages youth and young adults through meaningful, individualized services and activities. The response demonstrates a youth-centered approach that promotes personal growth, leadership, life skills, education, employment, housing stability, community involvement, and overall well-being. The application includes specific examples of participant engagement, opportunities for youth voice and choice, and measurable outcomes. (15 points) The application describes some services and activities available to youth and young adults but provides limited information on how participants are meaningfully engaged or how those activities contribute to positive outcomes. The response lacks specific examples or evidence of effectiveness. (7 points) The application does not adequately describe how the project engages youth and young adults in meaningful services, activities, or supports. The response is missing, incomplete, or does not demonstrate a clear strategy for promoting personal growth and successful outcomes. (0 points)		

DV Only: Supplemental	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CONFIDENTIALITY of SERVICES: Project described agency's confidentiality policies that protect survivors' personally identifying information (PII) in compliance with VAWA, FVPSA, VOCA, and HUD requirements, including how informed consent is obtained, how staff are trained on this issue, how data is secured and shared, and how these policies are implemented with other agency partnerships.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly details confidentiality policies, how informed consent is obtained, staff training on confidentiality, and data sharing with other agencies, while demonstrating accurate knowledge of federal laws requiring confidentiality of survivors. To obtain 13 points, applicant must clearly state all five requests for information: policy, informed consent, staff training, data sharing, knowledge of federal laws. (13 points) Applicant moderately details confidentiality policies, how informed consent is obtained, staff training on confidentiality, and data sharing with other agencies and/or applicant does not demonstrate accurate knowledge of federal laws requiring confidentiality of survivors. Reviewer is not clear how confidentiality policies are implemented for survivor safety. (6 points) Applicant provides limited description of confidentiality policies, how informed consent is obtained, staff training on confidentiality, and data sharing with other agencies, while demonstrating accurate knowledge of federal laws requiring confidentiality of survivors. If applicant fails to address any one of these, the score will be ZERO: confidentiality policies, informed consent, staff training, data sharing, and knowledge of federal laws. (0 points)		
DATA SAFETY: Did non-primary victim service provider describe agency's policies and procedures to inform survivors about the benefits and risks of entering information into a HMIS database. Include the following: Who may access their PII, how survivors may withdraw consent at any time, and options to keep their information confidential, including a locked HMIS file.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly describes their data policies in regard to database entry, access of their personally identifying information, informed consent and how that is withdrawn, and options to keep survivor information confidential and unshared. Applicant is clear how survivors are informed of applicant policies and procedures. To obtain 13 points, applicant must address each component type of data: database utilized, agency policies for entering survivor data, protection of personally identifying information, informed consent, withdrawing consent, and options to prevent sharing of survivor information. (13 points) Applicant moderately describes their data policies in regard to database entry, access of their personally identifying information, informed consent and how that is withdrawn, and options to keep survivor information confidential and unshared. Reviewer is not clear about how data is entered, utilized, protected and unshared by the applicant and/or applicant does not clearly identify how survivors are informed of applicant policies and procedures. (6 points) Applicant provides limited description of their data policies in regard to database entry, access of their personally identifying information, informed consent and how that is withdrawn, and options to keep survivor information confidential and unshared. If applicant fails to address any one of these, the score will be ZERO: state database utilized, agency policies for entering survivor data, protection of personally identifying information, informed consent, withdrawing consent, and options to prevent sharing of survivor information. (0 points)		
Project described how agency assists survivors to identify potential safety risks and include how safety planning is evaluated and the outcomes for the prior 12 months. **Plans should include, if applicable:** **Information sharing policies that include de-identification for any client data that may be collected for Coordinated Entry efforts **Comparable database use for all programs where the target population is survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. **Comparable database should include the ability to generate aggregate CAPER reports for the reporting of System Performance Measures within the data sharing policies for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. **Support available to adjust safety plans	Local Project Application, Agency Safety Plan	Applicant thoroughly describes how the applicant safety plans with survivors, how information is de-identified for Coordinated Entry, details comparable database or HMIS protections, and applicant states ability to generate APRs. Applicant has submitted a plan to collect safety outcome measures that is clear, understandable, and acceptable in victim service agency protocols. (20 points) Applicant moderately describes how the applicant safety plans with survivors, how information is de-identified for Coordinated Entry, details comparable database or HMIS protections , and applicant states ability to generate APRs. Reviewer understands but is not clear about how the agency implements or modifies safety plans and/or how information is de-identified in Coordinated Entry and/or how comparable databases or HMIS protections are provided and/or agency does not state their ability to generate APRs and/or applicant fails to submit safety outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect safety outcome measures. (10 points) Applicant provides limited description of how the applicant safety plans with survivors, how information is de-identified for Coordinated Entry, details comparable database or HMIS protections, and applicant states ability to generate APRs. Reviewer does not understands how the agency implements or modifies safety plans and/or how information is de-identified in Coordinated Entry and/or how comparable databases or HMIS protections are provided and/or agency does not state their ability to generate APRs and/or applicant fails to submit safety outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect safety outcome measures. (0 points)		
Project identified how agency helps connect survivors to available community resources, including how are relevant referrals provided, how survivors are assisted in accessing mainstream benefits, and how accessing community resources are evaluated and the outcomes for the prior 12 months.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly describes how the applicant connects survivors to community resources, including referals and mainstream benefits. Applicant has submitted a plan to collect community resources outcome measures that is clear, understandable, and acceptable in victim service agency protocols. (15 points) Applicant moderately describes how the applicant connects survivors to community resources, including referrals and mainstream benefits. Reviewer understands but is not clear about how the applicant connects survivors to available community resources and/or applicant does not address how survivors are accessing mainstream benefits and/or applicant fails to submit community resources outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect community resources outcome measures. (7 points) Applicant provides limited description of how the applicant connects survivors to community resources, including referrals and mainstream benefits. Reviewer does not understands how the applicant connects survivors to available community resources and/or applicant does not address how survivors are accessing mainstream benefits and/or applicant fails to submit community resources outcome measures and/or applicant fails to submit plan to collect community resources outcome measures. (0 points)		
Project described agency's current or planned involvement in the Coordinated Entry System, specifically to the non-HMIS list and safety protocols of the CoC including how agency upholds survivor confidentiality when working with other system partners and within case conferencing.	Local Project Application	Applicant thoroughly describes involvement with Coordinated Entry, has strong understanding how the non-HMIS list operates, and details clearly how applicant upholds survivor confidentiality within case conferencing and CoC system partners. (15 points) Applicant moderately describes involvement with Coordinated Entry, has some understanding how the non-HMIS list operates, and does not clearly state how the applicant upholds survivor confidentiality within case conferencing and CoC system partners. (7 points) Applicant provides limited description of involvement with Coordinated Entry, has little to no understanding how the non-HMIS list operates, and/or does not clearly state how the applicant upholds survivor confidentiality within case conferencing and CoC system partners. (0 points)		

Project Initiatives	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Information Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS (Max 245 per CE project type for YHDP or DV):			**0**	

Component: YHDP-SSO Projects	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance, and Project APR	Applicant is an access point and/or works within the Coordinated Entry System framework, as applicable, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings and YYA meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point and/or works within the Coordinated Entry System framework, as applicable, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings and YYA meetings. (5 points) Applicant works outside the Coordinated Entry System frameworkand/or did not attend case conferencing or YYA meetings. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025)and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		

Financial Capacity and Spending	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, with less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 with less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 with less than 5% of funds unspent.	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the SSO project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		
Project Performance	**Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Project Data Timeliness at Exit Records/Exit.	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant 7 or more days (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	HMIS Data Quality Report from the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increased ***other*** income from <u>start to exit</u>. (aka Leavers)	APR Q19a1/19a2	50% or higher (5 points) 35%-49% (3 points) 21%-39% (2 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increase **earned** (Employment) income from <u>start to exit.</u> (aka Leavers)	APR Q 19a1/19a2	50% or higher (15 points) 35%-49% (10 points) 21%-35% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from <u>start to exit</u>. (aka Leavers)	APR Q20a/20b	40% or higher (10 points) 25%-39% (7 points) 11%-24% (5 points) 10% or below (0 points)		
Length of time between project start date and housing move-in date.	APR Q22c	All participants less than 30 days (5 points) Any participants 30-90 days (3 points) Any participant 91-180 days (2 points) Any participant 6 months or more (180+ days) (0 points)		
Percentage of participants with a positive permanent exit destination/situation from the total column.	HMIS APR Q23c	70% or higher (15 points) 69%-55% (10 points) 54%-40% (5 points) 40% or below (0 points)		

YHDP Supplemental	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Project demonstrates Positive Youth Development (PYD) and trauma-informed care.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the program integrates both Positive Youth Development (PYD) and trauma-informed care into all aspects of service delivery. The response includes specific examples of youth engagement, strengths-based approaches, participant choice, cultural responsiveness, staff training, policies, and practices that promote safety, trust, empowerment, and positive youth outcomes. (8 points) The application demonstrates a basic understanding of PYD and trauma-informed care but provides limited detail on how these approaches are incorporated into program operations. The response is general in nature and lacks specific examples or implementation strategies. (4 points) The application does not adequately describe how the program incorporates Positive Youth Development or trauma-informed care, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little understanding of these approaches. (0 Points)		
Project incorporates youth choice, voice, and self-determination.	Local Project Application	The application clearly demonstrates that the program provides comprehensive, developmentally appropriate case management and services tailored to the age, maturity, and individual needs of participants. The response includes specific examples of individualized service planning, life skills development, education and employment support, behavioral health services, independent living skills, family engagement (when appropriate), and ongoing assessment to ensure services evolve as participants' needs change. (10 Points) The application provides a general description of case management and services but offers limited information on how services are developmentally appropriate or individualized. The response lacks specific examples or implementation details. (5 points) The application does not adequately describe how the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little understanding of developmentally appropriate service delivery. (0 Points)		
Project provided developmentally appropriate case management and services.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the program delivers developmentally appropriate, individualized case management and services. The response demonstrates that services are tailored to participants' age, developmental stage, and unique needs, and includes specific examples such as life skills training, education and employment support, behavioral health services, independent living skills, goal planning, and regular reassessment of participant needs. (10 points) The application demonstrates that the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services. The response includes several examples of individualized supports and explains how services are adapted to participant needs but lacks the depth or specificity required for full points. (5 point) The application does not adequately describe how the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services. The response is missing, incomplete, or does not demonstrate that services are individualized or appropriate for participants' developmental needs. (0 Points)		
Project is effective in connecting participants to educational opportunities, including high school completion, GED programs, vocational training, certifications, or post-secondary education.	Local Project Application	The application demonstrates that the project consistently and effectively connects participants to a wide range of educational opportunities. The response includes specific examples, measurable outcomes, and established partnerships that support high school completion, GED attainment, vocational training, industry-recognized certifications, post-secondary education, or other educational advancement. The project actively monitors participant progress and documents successful educational outcomes. (10 points) The application identifies educational opportunities available to participants but provides limited information on how participants are connected to those services or the effectiveness of those efforts. The response lacks specific examples, partnerships, or measurable outcomes. (5 points) The application does not adequately describe how the project connects participants to educational opportunities, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little evidence of educational support or participant outcomes. (0 points)		
Project is effective in engaging youth and young adults in meaningful services, activities, and supports that promote personal growth and successful outcomes.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the project actively engages youth and young adults through meaningful, individualized services and activities. The response demonstrates a youth-centered approach that promotes personal growth, leadership, life skills, education, employment, housing stability, community involvement, and overall well-being. The application includes specific examples of participant engagement, opportunities for youth voice and choice, and measurable outcomes. (8 points) The application describes some services and activities available to youth and young adults but provides limited information on how participants are meaningfully engaged or how those activities contribute to positive outcomes. The response lacks specific examples or evidence of effectiveness. (4 points) The application does not adequately describe how the project engages youth and young adults in meaningful services, activities, or supports. The response is missing, incomplete, or does not demonstrate a clear strategy for promoting personal growth and successful outcomes. (0 points)		
Project Initiatives	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Informational Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS:			**0**	

Component: YHDP TH-RRH	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
CoC Participation	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Participation in Coordinated Entry	Report from HMIS (Side Door Report), Regional CE Leads, and case conferencing attendance.	Applicant is an access point and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends at least 60% of case conferencing meetings. (10 Points) Applicant is an access point, and only accepts referrals from the Coordinated Entry System, and attends less than 60% of case conferencing meetings. (5 points) Applicant accepts referrals from outside the Coordinated Entry System and/or did not attend case conferencing. (0 points)		
CoC Meeting Attendance	Certification of attendance. CoC meeting records.	Organization staff attended 100% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (10 points) Organization staff attended 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (5 Points) Organization staff did not attend 75% of meetings of the last four meetings of the full Mo BoS CoC membership. (0 Points)		
Point-in-Time Count Participation	Certification of participation in the most recent unsheltered (2025) and 2026 Mo BoS CoC PIT Count from the PIT Committee.	Elected Regional PIT Coordinator. (6 points) PIT County lead as recorded by the Regional PIT Coordinator. (4 Points) Organization staff participated in any other way for the PIT count including volunteers. (2 Points) Organization's staff did not participate in the PIT Count. (0 Points)		
CoC Planning and Operation Activities	Agency narratives from Local Project Application/General CoC Activities, Section C; BoS meeting minutes.	The agency demonstrates extensive participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. This requires leadership roles, active participation on multiple committees, subcommittees, or workgroups, engagement in regional or statewide initiatives beyond its local service area, and meaningful contributions that strengthen the CoC. (10 points) The agency demonstrates consistent participation in Missouri BoS CoC activities, including regular attendance at membership meetings, participation on at least one committee or workgroup, and involvement in regional or statewide initiatives. (5 points) The agency does not demonstrate participation in Missouri BoS CoC-wide activities. The narrative response lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate a commitment in the CoC beyond minimal participation to receive funding and is not evidenced by CoC records/minutes. (0 Points)		
Compliance and Grants Management	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Did the organization have any HUD monitoring or OIG audit findings for any HUD grants (including ESG) in the last two years.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps application	Recipient has been monitored by either HUD or OIG within the last two years and there have been no findings identified or no monitoring has been completed. (10 Points) Recipient had one HUD or OIG finding from monitoring conducted within the last two years and/or has had findings in the last monitoring conducted (5 points) Recipient has two or more HUD/OIG findings open or sanctions have been imposed (0 points)		
Did the applicant submit all requested documentation and supporting materials for the MO 606 March 2025 Housing Assessment by the established deadline?	Local Project Application	Yes (10 points) No (0 Points)		
Did the applicant submit all required documentation for the MO 606 project's risk assessment and monitoring by the established deadline of May 22, 2026?	Project Application: local application/monitoring review	Yes (10 points) No (0 points)		
Project documented match requirement/amount of at least 25% of total budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps application	The project documents eligible match equal to or greater than 25% of the total project budget (excluding leasing funds) unless granted HUD waiver of match percentage. Documentation is complete, accurate, and demonstrates that all match sources meet HUD requirements. (10 points) The project identifies sufficient match to meet the 25% requirement (excluding leasing funds), but the documentation is incomplete, contains minor deficiencies, or requires clarification before it can be verified. (5 points) The project does not document the required 25% match (excluding leasing funds), or the submitted documentation is insufficient to verify compliance with HUD match requirements. (0 points)		
Financial Capacity and Spending	**Source**	**Points Available**	**Points Awarded**	**Reviewer Comments**
Agency draws funds at least quarterly for current renewal project.	Agency provided screenshot from Budget page and Voucher page in eLOCCS. Local Application may explain mitigating factors (no access to e-LOCCS, e.g.)	Yes (10 points and, if applicable, mitigation determined by reviewer) No (0 points)		
Agency had funds available for recapture for the most recent expired grant term for this project. Projects ARD is under $350,000, no less than 10% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is between $351,000 and $999,999 no less than 15% of funds unspent. Projects ARD that is equal to or above $1,000,000 no less than 5% of funds unspent.	HUD Spending Report, APR	No (10 points) Yes (0 points)		
Did the applicant agency timely submit an audit as required under 2 CFR § 200.501 for recipients of federal funds, if applicable (e.g. single audit) and/or received a recommendation/corrective action in a management letter on its current accounting practices or did not conduct any audit of agency financials.	Local Project Application	Recipient has been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable, and/or has not received a finding and/or received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (10 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.50), if applicable, and/or has received a finding or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices. (5 points) Recipient has not been timely in its submission of the audits required under 2 CFR § 200.501, if applicable and has received more than one finding, material weaknesses and/or deficiency identified and/or has received a recommendation in a management letter based on its current accounting practices or does not conduct any level of financial audit. (0 points)		
Project demonstrated the average cost per household served for the project is reasonable. (A review of whether the proposed project cost is reasonable based on the project type, population served, staffing model, services provided, number of households or participants served, and expected outcomes.)	Local Project Application and Agency Budget	Budget is complete, clearly organized by eligible cost category, and aligns with the proposed project scope and HUD requirements. (15 points) Budget is provided but lacks detail, clarity, or alignment with eligible cost categories. (7 points) Total funding request and/or budget breakdown is missing, unclear and/or not reasonable for project. (0 points)		

Project Performance	Source: SAGE APR and/or HMIS APR April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026 and Data Quality Report	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Average bed and unit utilization rate for most recently completed grant cycle.	SAGE APR Q02	95% or higher (15 points) 88-94% (10 points) 80-87% (5 points) 79% or below (0 points)		
Time from Record Entry (Project Data Timeliness at Start Records/Entry and at Exit Records/Exit)	HMIS APR Q6e	All participants entered at start and exit: 0-3 days day (5 points) Any participant entered at start and exit: 4-6 days (3 points) Any participant entered 7 or more days at start and exit (0 points)		
Overall Data Quality	HMIS Data Quality Report from the performance period	Data Quality Grade A (10 points) B (5 points) C (3 points) D-F (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who retained, gained or increase **earned** (Employment) income from <u>start to exit.</u> (aka Leavers)	APR Q 19a1/19a2	50% or higher (15 points) 35%-49% (10 points) 21%-35% (5 points) 20% or below (0 points)		
Percentage of adults who obtained or increased Non-Cash Benefits from <u>start to exit</u>. (aka Leavers)	APR Q20a/20b	40% or higher (10 points) 25%-39% (7 points) 11%-24% (5 points) 10% or below (0 points)		
Length of time between project start date and housing move-in date.	APR Q22c	All participants less than 30 days (5 points) Any participants 30-90 days (3 points) Any participant 91-180 days (2 points) Any participant 6 months or more (180+ days) (0 points)		
Percentage of participants with a positive permanent exit destination/situation from the total column.	HMIS APR Q23c	70% or higher (15 points) 69%-55% (10 points) 54%-40% (5 points) 40% or below (0 points)		

YHDP Supplemental	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Project demonstrates Positive Youth Development (PYD) and trauma-informed care.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the program integrates both Positive Youth Development (PYD) and trauma-informed care into all aspects of service delivery. The response includes specific examples of youth engagement, strengths-based approaches, participant choice, cultural responsiveness, staff training, policies, and practices that promote safety, trust, empowerment, and positive youth outcomes. (4) points) The application demonstrates a basic understanding of PYD and trauma-informed care but provides limited detail on how these approaches are incorporated into program operations. The response is general in nature and lacks specific examples or implementation strategies. (2 points) The application does not adequately describe how the program incorporates Positive Youth Development or trauma-informed care, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little understanding of these approaches. (0 Points)		
Project incorporates youth choice, voice, and self-determination.	Local Project Application	The application clearly demonstrates that the program provides comprehensive, developmentally appropriate case management and services tailored to the age, maturity, and individual needs of participants. The response includes specific examples of individualized service planning, life skills development, education and employment support, behavioral health services, independent living skills, family engagement (when appropriate), and ongoing assessment to ensure services evolve as participants' needs change. (6 Points) The application provides a general description of case management and services but offers limited information on how services are developmentally appropriate or individualized. The response lacks specific examples or implementation details. (4 points) The application does not adequately describe how the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little understanding of developmentally appropriate service delivery. (0 Points)		
Project provided developmentally appropriate case management and services.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the program delivers developmentally appropriate, individualized case management and services. The response demonstrates that services are tailored to participants' age, developmental stage, and unique needs, and includes specific examples such as life skills training, education and employment support, behavioral health services, independent living skills, goal planning, and regular reassessment of participant needs. (10 points) The application demonstrates that the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services. The response includes several examples of individualized supports and explains how services are adapted to participant needs but lacks the depth or specificity required for full points. (5 point) The application does not adequately describe how the program provides developmentally appropriate case management and services. The response is missing, incomplete, or does not demonstrate that services are individualized or appropriate for participants' developmental needs. (0 Points)		
Project is effective in connecting participants to educational opportunities, including high school completion, GED programs, vocational training, certifications, or post-secondary education.	Local Project Application	The application demonstrates that the project consistently and effectively connects participants to a wide range of educational opportunities. The response includes specific examples, measurable outcomes, and established partnerships that support high school completion, GED attainment, vocational training, industry-recognized certifications, post-secondary education, or other educational advancement. The project actively monitors participant progress and documents successful educational outcomes. (10 points) The application identifies educational opportunities available to participants but provides limited information on how participants are connected to those services or the effectiveness of those efforts. The response lacks specific examples, partnerships, or measurable outcomes. (5 points) The application does not adequately describe how the project connects participants to educational opportunities, or the response is missing, incomplete, or demonstrates little evidence of educational support or participant outcomes. (0 points)		
Project is effective in engaging youth and young adults in meaningful services, activities, and supports that promote personal growth and successful outcomes.	Local Project Application	The application provides a comprehensive description of how the project actively engages youth and young adults through meaningful, individualized services and activities. The response demonstrates a youth-centered approach that promotes personal growth, leadership, life skills, education, employment, housing stability, community involvement, and overall well-being. The application includes specific examples of participant engagement, opportunities for youth voice and choice, and measurable outcomes. (5 points) The application describes some services and activities available to youth and young adults but provides limited information on how participants are meaningfully engaged or how those activities contribute to positive outcomes. The response lacks specific examples or evidence of effectiveness. (3 points) The application does not adequately describe how the project engages youth and young adults in meaningful services, activities, or supports. The response is missing, incomplete, or does not demonstrate a clear strategy for promoting personal growth and successful outcomes. (0 points)		

Project Initiatives	Source	Points Available	Points Awarded	Reviewer Comments
Proposed project is within a HUD defined Opportunity Zone.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application and form HUD 2996	3 Points		
Project has or will incorporate supportive service participation requirements in their program design, based on individual need in accordance with 24 CFR 578.75(h).	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Dedicated Sober Living Project.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	3 Points		
Proposed project serves a priority sub-population(s) as identified in the NOFO.	Local Project Application and/or e-snaps Application	5 Points		
Project Proposed Service Area and type meets the needs, priorities, and service gaps of the CoC.	Local Project Application/e-snaps Application/MO BoS needs and gaps/CoC priorities	Informational Only / Tie Breaker	0	
TOTAL POINTS:			**0**	