

## **Instructions:**

- 1) Fill out the tool in its entirety -
  - a. pull 4 current files and 1 closed file
  - b. utilize APR report from HMIS (not the version submitted by program)
  - c. See FMR tab for 2016 Fair Market Rent Rates
  - d. See <http://www.hudhre.info/index.cfm?do=viewShpDeskguide> for info related to adequate documentation and homeless eligibility
  
- 2) Use the comments section corresponding to the question to note actual percentages/performance measures and/or deficits
  
- 3) Score the tool (NOTE: any 'NO' responses in the requisite section are red flags. No project with a 'NO' response can score higher than a projects with all 'YES' responses)



## Finger Lakes Housing Consortium CoC Monitoring Tool

Name of Grantee:	Date:
------------------	-------

Name(s) of Reviewer(s):
-------------------------

SUMMARY	Score:	
<b>TOTAL SCORE:</b>		<b>Out of 210 possible.</b>
A. Requisites		Out of 100 possible.
B. Housing		Out of 20 possible.
C. Participants		Out of 30 possible.
D. Performance Measures		Out of 25 possible.
E. Other		Out of 35 possible.

A. Requisites:	Point Range:	Score:	Comments:
A(1) For projects using leasing funds, does the agency refrain from using these funds to lease units or structures owned by the project sponsor, the grantee, or their parent organization?	Yes or N/A - 20 pts No - 0 pts		
A(2) Do the reviewed client files adequately document that the individuals or families were homeless prior to entry? (ie, by attaching evidence to the HHC Verification Form)?	Yes - 20 pts No - 0 pts		
A(3) For PH projects only, do the client files reviewed adequately document the homeless individuals' disabilities (ie, psycho/social survey and release forms)?	Yes or N/A - 20 pts No - 0 pts		
A(4) Is the grantee serving the target population stated in the Exhibit 2/Project Application (per the APR)?	Yes - 20 pts No - 0 pts		
A(5) For TH projects only, do the entry-exit dates shown in the participant files indicate that the participants did not exceed the 24-month limitation of stay?	Yes or N/A - 20 pts No - 0 pts		
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			

B. Housing:	Point Range:	Score:	Comments:
B(1) For inspected units, were the habitability standards met and was there evidence that the appropriate entity inspects the units annually (HQS Form)?	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		

B(2) For leasing funds, are the rent amounts within the current Fair Market Rent rates (which includes utilities) for the area?	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
B(3) For projects using rental assistance, do the rent amounts meet rent reasonableness criteria (HUD/Section 8 form(s) in file)?	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
B(4) Are the rents being charged accurately calculated ( $\leq 30\%$ of income) and re-examined annually with supporting documentation found in the client files?	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			
<b>C. Participants:</b>			
	<b>Point Range:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
C(1) If contracted to serve chronically homeless, is the grantee serving the number of chronically homeless stated in Project Application? (Documentation of chronic homelessness must be in client file)	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
C(2) If not contracted to serve chronically homeless, are there policies/procedures in place to ensure that turnover beds are being prioritized for the chronically homeless?	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
C(3) Does the grantee have procedures for the termination of client participation and due process?	Yes - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
C(4) Does the grantee provide supportive services	Yes - 5 pts Some - 3 pts No - 0 pts		
C(5) Does the grantee conduct on-going assessments of the participants' supportive services needs? (Review service plans and documentation of referrals for services)	Yes - 5 pts No or N/A - 0 pts		
C(6) Bed utilization rate/persons served (compare project application to APR)	91-100% - 5 81-90% - 4 71-80% - 3 61-70% - 2 51-60% - 1 <u><math>\leq 50\%</math></u> - 0		
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			
<b>D. Performance Measures:</b>			
	<b>Point Range:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Comments:</b>

D(1) % of program participants remaining in permanent housing for more than 6 months (or exiting to permanent housing for TH)	91-100% - 5 81-90% - 4 71-80% - 3 61-70% - 2 51-60% - 1 <50% - 0		
D(2) % of program participants receiving earned income	≥31% - 5 26-30% - 4 21-25% - 3 16-20% - 2 11-15% - 1 ≤10% - 0		
D(3) % of program participants receiving income from any source	≥31% - 5 26-30% - 4 21-25% - 3 16-20% - 2 11-15% - 1 ≤10% - 0		
D(4) % of program participants coming from the street or other locations not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, safe havens, or transitional housing (if originally from the streets, emergency shelters, or safe havens)	95-100% - 5 90-94% - 4 85-89% - 3 80-84% - 2 75-79% - 1 <75% - 0		
D(5) HMIS Report Card Grade	95-100% - 5 89-94% - 4 83-88% - 3 77-82% - 2 71-76% - 1 ≤70% - 0		
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			
<b>E. Other:</b>			
	<b>Point Range:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
E(1) Does the program have a designated staff person to ensure that children are enrolled in school and connected to appropriate services? (Name the individual in the comment box)	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
E(2) Were there any findings/concerns at a HUD monitoring visit within the past year?	No or N/A - 5 pts Yes - 0 pts		
E(3) Did the program resolve all concerns from the previous year's HHC monitoring visit?	Yes or N/A - 5 pts No - 0 pts		

E(4) What percentage of CoC funds did the program spend in their last full operating year? (Compare APR to funding amount)	91-100% - 5 81-90% - 4 71-80% - 3 61-70% - 2 51-60% - 1 <50% - 0		
E(5) Was the APR submitted on time? (within 90 days of program end)	Yes - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
E(6) Is the core data on the submitted APR accurate compared to data listed in the APR pulled from HMIS (Is the # of persons served w/in 1 person and is the outcome data all within 5%)?	Yes - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
E(7) Does the program provide person-centered services and accommodations? (Client needs to sign-off on goals)	Yes - 5 pts No - 0 pts		
<b>SUBTOTAL:</b>			
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>Max 210 points</b>	

11 Aug 2016 PMB

<b>Final FY 2016 FMRs By Unit Bedrooms</b>				
<b>ONTARIO COUNTY</b>				
<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One- Bedroom</u>	<b>Two- Bedroom</b>	<u>Three- Bedroom</u>	<u>Four- Bedroom</u>
\$575	\$702	\$863	\$1,071	\$1,183

<b>SENECA COUNTY</b>				
<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One- Bedroom</u>	<b>Two- Bedroom</b>	<u>Three- Bedroom</u>	<u>Four- Bedroom</u>
\$507	\$612	\$716	\$1,014	\$1,250

<b>WAYNE COUNTY</b>				
<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One- Bedroom</u>	<b>Two- Bedroom</b>	<u>Three- Bedroom</u>	<u>Four- Bedroom</u>
\$575	\$702	\$863	\$1,071	\$1,183

<b>YATES COUNTY</b>				
<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>One- Bedroom</u>	<b>Two- Bedroom</b>	<u>Three- Bedroom</u>	<u>Four- Bedroom</u>
\$432	\$579	\$691	\$898	\$1,001

Extracted 8/11/2016 from [https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr/fmr\\_il\\_history/select\\_Geography.odn](https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr/fmr_il_history/select_Geography.odn)