

Flint and Genesee County Continuum of Care (MI-505)

FY 2026 Local Competition Project Scorecards

Renewal and new project rating tools, with design notes and threshold compliance

How these scorecards are built

These four tools score projects within their own project type. Renewals (PSH and RRH) are scored on performance data; new projects (TH and SSO) are scored on capacity and proposed design, because no performance history exists yet. Each card is built on a few shared principles:

- **Offer, do not require.** Service measures score what the project offers and attempts, not whether a participant accepts. This keeps the cards aligned with Housing First and 24 CFR 578.75(h), and it satisfies the federal request on page 70 of the NOFO that housing scorecards consider returns, employment income, and supportive service participation.
- **Income from any source counts.** The income measures credit both earned income and non-employment income such as SSI and SSDI, so projects serving people for whom work is not a realistic goal are not penalized.
- **Serving high-need people is rewarded.** Returns to homelessness was reduced from 20 points to 8 so it can no longer act as a screen-out incentive, and the priority-population and service measures now carry the weight toward serving the hardest cases well.
- **On-site and substance use treatment access is emphasized.** Service items reward on-site delivery and named access to substance use treatment and recovery supports, which also strengthens the CoC's own application (NOFO page 77).

Participant-choice protection. *No scored item on this scorecard is reduced because an individual participant declined a service, visit, or program activity. This scorecard measures what the project offers and attempts, not what participants choose to accept.*

Meeting HUD's objective-criteria and system-performance thresholds

HUD page 70 sets two tests for the local rating tool: objective criteria must be at least 50 percent of total points, and system performance measures must be at least 25 percent of total points. The table below shows the renewal cards (PSH and RRH share the same point structure).

Scored item	Points	Counts as objective	Counts as SPM
Priority population (Q5a)	10	Yes	No
Placement and retention in PH	22	Yes	Yes (SPM 7)
Returns to homelessness	8	Yes	Yes (SPM 2)
Length to housing move-in	10	Yes	No
Employment and income growth	10	Yes	Yes (SPM 4)
HMIS data quality	20	Yes	No
Cost effectiveness	5	Yes	No
Coordinated Entry participation	10	Verifiable yes/no	No
Lived experience inclusion	10	Verifiable yes/no	No
Supportive services block	20	Narrative	No
PIT count	0	n/a	n/a

System performance measures: $22 + 8 + 10 = 40$ of 125 points, or 32 percent. Above the 25 percent floor.

Objective criteria: 85 of 125 points (68 percent) from purely data-driven measures, rising to 105 of 125 (84 percent) once the two verifiable yes/no items are included. Well above the 50 percent floor.

One action required for this to hold: the three outcome families must be anchored to their actual system performance measures in the reference column. Placement and retention is SPM 7, returns is SPM 2, and employment and income is SPM 4. These are reflected in the cards above. On the RRH card in particular, the exits-to-PH row was re-anchored from APR Q23c to SPM 7. If employment and income is left tagged only to APR Q19 and not to SPM 4, the SPM share drops to 30 of 125 (24 percent), just under the floor.

New projects

TH and SSO new projects have no operating history, so they do not carry system performance measure data, and HUD does not expect them to. The threshold percentages are demonstrated through the renewal cards, where the data lives. New projects are scored on capacity to manage federal funds, cost reasonableness, applicant experience, population served, and proposed design. State this explicitly in the written rating-process narrative attached to the Consolidated Application, so that the lower SPM weight on the new cards reads as intentional rather than as a gap.

Changes from the prior draft scorecards

- Returns to homelessness reduced from 20 to 8 points on both renewal cards.
- Placement and retention trimmed from 25 to 22 points to balance the new service block.
- The 5-point yes/no services item replaced by a 20-point supportive services block (richness and on-site or substance use access, plus assertive monthly engagement).
- Service language now consistent across all four cards.
- TH service capacity changed from 40 to 20 hours per week per participant, framed as hours made available.
- TH exits-to-PH scale corrected to match its 50 percent goal (the prior draft scale was a copy from the PSH card).
- SSO movement-into-housing item trimmed from 25 to 20 to fund a new 10-point community partnerships item (law enforcement, business, elected officials).
- Cost-effectiveness data references updated to Sage APR and BLI