Alameda County Local Application Process
For the 2017 HUD Continuum of Care NOFA
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Questions received during Bidder's Conference 8/11/2017:

1. Is the Summary from Monday available for people who could not attend today's meeting or locate it in their package?
   A. Yes, all documents from the 8/7/2017 community meeting are on EOH website.

2. Where is the feature for uploading a prior e-snap application? At the start of the new application?
   A. This year, renewal projects will have the opportunity to submit project application in *e-snaps* with no changes. Instructions for determining if this is an appropriate action for your project, and steps on how to do it, will be embedded in the *e-snaps* application instructions online – which have not yet been released by HUD.   Any questions concerning *e-snaps* or that application process should be submitted to Riley Wilkerson at Riley.Wilkerson@acgov.org, at Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development.

3. What was the NOFA Committee's response to the request to change the data ranges on data reports for populations served and performance?
   A. The NOFA Committee recommended to keep the data range on data reports for populations and performance as required by HUD for the system as a whole. However, there will be an opportunity to provide optional narratives for HUD Priorities (Page 11) and Performance Outcomes (Page 22) to more accurately reflect current practices and prioritization of programs outside of that period.

4. If there are successful appeals, will projects at bottom of Tier 1 be bumped into Tier 2?
   A. Yes, that is possible. The new Appeals process (Page 3) allows projects to appeal if they believe the 1) application was not evaluated according to the published local NOFA process AND/OR, 2) was evaluated in a way that violates federal regulations AND 3) The adjustment of scores has the possibility of changing in which Tier an Applicant project is ranked – this includes any Project who meet Criteria #1 and/or #2, and its initial Rating and Ranking score appears very close to the end of Tier 1, and can be moved down to Tier 2 as a result of scoring post appeals.

5. Are the attachments the same as ones submitted in last year's application?
   A: No. For the list of Required Documents under the 2017 Local Application, see Page 5.

6. Too many documents related to leases in Housing First Documents checklist's items, and project Applicants cannot edit them now. Should Housing First be explained in the Narrative?
   A: Under the Housing First (HF) section, Projects can earn up to 4 points by responding to the three (3) Narrative HF Questions (Page 12) using the Housing First Checklist as guidance. In addition, projects can earn additional points (up to 6) based on evidence in specific documents that advance HF principles (HF Scoring, Page 30). Those projects

who submitted documents in advance for HF Technical Assistance, can re-submit them with changes with this Application.

7. Applicant has no control over residents admitted into the buildings they serve, the housing partners would have to agree to be part of DedicatedPLUS?
   A. The goal is to serve high need populations, and all partners in a project should be aligned with this goal. Applicant can elect to speak to that in the optional narrative.

8. Sites are 100% HOPWA, can DedicatedPLUS be applied to that?
   A: Yes. Coordinated Entry will only send those persons that meet both the HOPWA and DedicatedPLUS criteria to fill any vacancies.

9. Housing First (Page 12) should be narrative questions for Existing and Proposed? The Scoring Chart for Housing First equals a total of 9 points, but should be a total of 10 (4+2+2+2).
   A: These items have been corrected in the Local Application on Page 12.

10. Where do PSH who exited to other PSH fall?
    A: Those are successful exits and do not have a negative impact on outcome D. exits to homelessness.

11. City Audit review had a finding, but does not relate to the grant/fiscal management.
    A: This issue needs to be address in the narrative section under Fiscal Management on Page 27.

12. How are the new optional narrative(s) reflected in the scoring sheet?
    A: If the Applicant adds the new optional narratives to the Local Application (HUD Priorities, Page 11, and Performance Outcomes, Page 22) and provides documentation to support it, scorers may award up to the full points value for that specific target population or performance outcome(s). Writing an optional narrative, however, is not a guarantee of an increased score. The specific scoring for each section with these Optional Narratives have been added to the Application's Points for Rating and Ranking of Renewal Projects under Criterion 2. HUD Priorities (Page 29) and under Criterion 3. Performance Outcomes (Page 30), and they have been highlighted in yellow.

13. Why are families using the APR and not the EOH HUD Target Population Report?
    A: The service of families in RRH can be determined through the APR, and the EOH HUD Target Population Report is not needed for that project type and population.

14. Why youth-target services are worth a max of 6pts but families get 8pts?
    A: Last year, RRH for families received extra points since HUD was prioritizing families over singles, and we had no existing transitional-age youth (TAY) RRH. We have overlooked this issue, and the NOFA Committee has proposed to assign **8 points** to any existing RRH to families, individuals and/or TAY, and keep **6 points** for proposed RRH or Joint TH and PH-RRH for families, individuals and/or TAY. These changes have been highlighted in yellow on Page 29 under Criterion 2. HUD Priorities.

15. What projects must provide evidence of site control?

A: Evidence of Site-Control is required only for Agencies that are direct grantees and operators of **site-based projects**. Scattered site PSH and RRH are exempted. If you are a jurisdictional Lead Agency and contract out the delivery of services to sub-grantees, you may submit evidence of sub-grantees site control (if available) or certify by letter that your sub-grantees have site control for site-based housing and services, to be verified during future monitoring visits.

16. If an Applicant self-declares as a DedicatedPLUS project, and no participants can be found to meet the specific DedicatedPLUS eligibility criteria, is there a risk projects will leave units empty – if they can only be filled with DedicatedPLUS eligible participants?

    A: EOH has submitted an AAQ to HUD to clarify this question and is waiting for an answer.

17. For projects using Optional Narrative under Performance Outcomes, including the effects of a negative housing exit that has a disproportionate effect in scoring, what documentation should they submit to back up the inaccurate representation of the outcome?

    A: Applicants should submit a clear description of the negative exit and a summary of efforts on the part of the Project to prevent the eviction and remediate the specific situation, including any re-housing efforts. Any documentation that backs up the summary will suffice, without violating tenants/program participants confidentiality. In addition, as stated under the Optional Narrative section, Projects must attach back up documentation such as APRs from other time periods if they want reviewers to consider performance from a different period.

18. Is there a narrative section where we can explain how Coordinated Entry slowed the refilling of Transitional Housing? Will the score be impacted?

    A: A narrative box has been added (and highlighted in yellow) under 4.d Capacity and Utilization (Page 26) to explain if an existing Project was utilized at less than 80% for the program year. Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-utilization may be awarded some points under this section – as determined by the application scorers. In addition, a check box has been inserted on Page 31 and highlighted in yellow.