



New / Expansion Project Scoring Worksheet

For new housing projects and housing expansions: TH, PSH, RRH, and eligible joint components.

Project: _____ Agency: _____
 Reviewer: _____ Review date: _____
 Component: _____ Type: **New / Expansion** (circle one)

Threshold review: PASS / FAIL Staff reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Verify eligibility, component and funding-source requirements, certifications, match, CE, HMIS/comparable database, and applicable site control before merit review.

I. Contribution to System Performance 30 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Permanent housing outcomes: measurable targets for exits to permanent housing and/or retention, as appropriate to the component; denominator, timeframe, data source and feasible implementation plan.	10	
Prevention of returns to homelessness: measurable return-rate target and follow-up period; housing stabilization, tenancy support and follow-up plan; method to identify and measure returns.	10	
Employment income outcomes: measurable target for participants with new or increased earned income; employment services and partnerships; baseline, denominator, timeframe and verification method. Separate earned income from benefits.	10	

Score credible proposed contributions and supporting evidence. New projects are not expected to have operating results of their own. Relevant comparable-program results may support feasibility but are not a prerequisite.

II. Community Need and Project Readiness 35 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Documented community need: dated CoC/local data demonstrating the service gap, population need and proposed scale.	10	
Implementation readiness: documented milestones, operating schedule, resources, site arrangements where applicable and feasible launch plan.	10	
Organizational experience and capacity: verified comparable experience and demonstrated ability to deliver the proposed activities.	5	
Staffing plan: positions, qualifications, supervision, workload and recruitment or committed staffing evidence.	5	
Supportive-service participation requirements: written participation expectations, applicable service-engagement requirements, implementation, exemptions, accommodations and survivor protections. Record whether participation is required.	5	

Sections I and II subtotal: _____ / 65

III. Organizational and Fiscal Capacity 15 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Grant administration capacity: documented procedures and relevant management experience.	3	
Financial management systems: accounting, allocation, reconciliation and reporting capability.	3	
Audit / monitoring history: findings and corrective action; use equivalent financial evidence where no audit is required.	3	
Organizational staffing capacity: verified administrative and supervisory resources for this award.	3	
Internal controls: written controls, segregation of duties and implementation evidence.	3	

IV. System Coordination 10 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Coordinated Entry: documented participation or commitment, referral workflow and enrollment coordination, as applicable.	5	
HMIS / comparable database: documented agreement or implementation commitment, staffing and data-quality plan.	3	
Mainstream resources and partnerships: documented access to benefits, treatment and other needed supports.	2	

V. Budget and Cost Reasonableness 5 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Budget and cost reasonableness: eligible and supported line items; feasible cost per household/outcome; appropriate comparisons and budget justification.	5	

VI. Equity and Access 5 points

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Equity and access: fair access, nondiscrimination, reasonable accommodations and practical responses to documented barriers.	5	

Sections I and II: ____ / 65 + Sections III to VI: ____ / 35 = TOTAL: ____ / 100

HUD criteria allocation

System-performance measures: Section I = 30/100 points.

Objective criteria: documented need (10) + implementation readiness (10) + organizational experience (5) + staffing plan (5) + organizational/fiscal capacity (15) + CE participation/commitment (5) + budget (5) = 55/100 points.

Supportive-service participation requirements: Section II, final criterion = 5 points.

Objective categories must be scored against verified facts and published evidence standards. These classifications do not add points above 100.

Recommendation

Accept / Technical corrections / Reduced funding / Not recommended

Recommended amount: \$ _____

Rationale / evidence references: _____

Reviewer signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Reviewer instructions

Ten-point system-performance rubric

Apply separately to each of the three Section I criteria. Record evidence and rationale for each subscore. Do not award points merely for mentioning an outcome.

Criterion / evidence reviewed	Max	Score
Target and measurement: clear numerical target, defined population/denominator, baseline or starting point, timeframe and data source. 3 = complete; 2 = mostly specified; 1 = vague/incomplete; 0 = absent.	3	
Delivery plan: concrete activities, responsibilities, staffing and resources tied to the outcome. 3 = complete and feasible; 2 = workable with gaps; 1 = generic; 0 = absent.	3	
Feasibility evidence: local data, committed resources, documented partnerships, relevant experience or other credible support. 2 = strong support; 1 = limited support; 0 = unsupported.	2	
Monitoring and corrective action: defined review schedule, responsible staff and response when results fall short. 2 = complete; 1 = partial; 0 = absent.	2	

Other ten-point categories

For documented need and implementation readiness: 9-10 = complete, specific and supported by verifiable evidence; 7-8 = strong evidence with minor gaps; 5-6 = adequate evidence with material gaps; 3-4 = limited evidence; 1-2 = minimal evidence; 0 = not addressed. Document why the selected point within a band is warranted.

Five-, three- and two-point categories

5-point: 5 = fully supported; 4 = strong with minor gaps; 3 = adequate; 2 = partial with significant gaps; 1 = minimal; 0 = not addressed.

3-point: 3 = fully supported; 2 = adequate but incomplete; 1 = minimal; 0 = not addressed.

2-point: 2 = fully supported; 1 = partial; 0 = not addressed.

New projects and expansions

Evaluate proposed measurable outcomes and a credible plan to achieve them. Do not invent historical results or require an operating history that a new project cannot possess. For expansions, score the incremental proposal; existing-project results may support feasibility, but are not results of the proposed expansion. Calibrate expectations to component, population and scale.

Component coverage

This worksheet makes the 1D-1 allocations explicit. Apply consistent target expectations, evidence requirements and tie-breakers across all applicants. HMIS, SSO-CE and other non-housing projects are not scored with this instrument.

Service participation

Evaluate the documented framework, applicable requirements and protections. This criterion does not impose a universal treatment mandate. Distinguish required participation from the availability of services.

Reference: HUD FY2026 CoC Application Detailed Instructions, pp. 23-24, question 1D-1. [hud.gov: FY26 CoC Application Detailed Instructions](https://www.hud.gov/sites/default/files/2025-04/FY26_CoC_Application_Detailed_Instructions.pdf)