Before Starting the CoC Application

The CoC Consolidated Application is made up of three parts: the CoC Application, the Project Listing, and the Project Applications. The Collaborative Applicant is responsible for submitting two of these sections. In order for the CoC Consolidated Application to be considered complete, each of these two sections REQUIRES SUBMISSION:

- CoC Application
- Project Listing

Please Note:

- Review the FY2013 CoC Program NOFA in its entirety for specific application and program requirements.
- Use the CoC Application Detailed Instructions while completing the application in e-snaps. The detailed instructions are designed to assist applicants as they complete the application forms in e-snaps.
- As a reminder, CoCs are not able to import data from the 2012 application due to significant changes to the CoC Application questions. All parts of the application must be fully completed.
- All questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and must be completed in order to submit the application.

For Detailed Instructions click here.
1A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Identification

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

1A-1 CoC Name and Number: CA-502 - Oakland/Alameda County CoC
1A-2 Collaborative Applicant Name: Alameda County
1A-3 CoC Designation: CA
1B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Operations

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

1B-1 How often does the CoC conduct meetings of the full CoC membership? Quarterly

1B-2 How often does the CoC invite new members to join the CoC through a publicly available invitation? Quarterly

1B-3 Does the CoC include membership of a homeless or formerly homeless person? Yes

1B-4 For members who are homeless or formerly homeless, what role do they play in the CoC membership? Select all that apply.
   Advisor, Volunteer, Community Advocate

1B-5 Does the CoC’s governance charter incorporate written policies and procedures for each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.1 Written agendas of CoC meetings?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.2 Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.3 Process for Monitoring Outcomes of ESG Recipients?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.4 CoC policies and procedures?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.5 Written process for board selection?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.6 Code of conduct for board members that includes a recusal process?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B-5.7 Written standards for administering assistance?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1C. Continuum of Care (CoC) Committees

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

1C-1 Provide information for up to five of the most active CoC-wide planning committees, subcommittees, and/or workgroups, including a brief description of the role and the frequency of meetings. Collaborative Applicants should only list committees, subcommittees and/or workgroups that are directly involved in CoC-wide planning, and not the regular delivery of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Group</th>
<th>Role of Group (limit 750 characters)</th>
<th>Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Names of Individuals and/or Organizations Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C-1.1</strong> Leadership Board</td>
<td>Provides oversight to 10-year plan implementation, including the development of the annual action plans, establishes committees and workgroups, and approves their membership. Oversees the system redesign work required by the HEARTH Act, including but not limited to development of coordinated intake and assessment, governance policies, and standards for program eligibility and priority.</td>
<td>Bi-Monthly</td>
<td>30 persons representing County and City departments of housing, human services and health care, law enforcement, homeless service providers, housing developers, consumers, business leaders, and advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C-1.2</strong> Performance Management</td>
<td>Provides HMIS oversight and planning, measurement of achievement on local and HUD-established performance outcomes, PIT Count analysis and planning, and the housing inventory. Ensures publication of the annual Outcomes Performance Progress Report, other evaluation reports and system analyses.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>ESG and CoC grantees, other homeless services and housing providers, local government departments, HMIS lead agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C-1.3</strong> NOFA Committee</td>
<td>Responsible for establishing local rating and ranking criteria and project review and selection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>5-7 members appointed annually. Included two consumers, a county employee from a non-recipient department, an employee of a non-recipient city, a business leader, and a director of a non-recipient community based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C-1.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C-1.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1C-2 Describe how the CoC considers the full range of opinions from individuals or organizations with knowledge of homelessness or an interest in preventing and ending homelessness in the geographic area when establishing the CoC-wide committees, subcommittees, and workgroups.

(limit 750 characters)

The CoC holds regular meetings, open to any interested stakeholders, average attendance =75 persons, announced via a 2,000+ person email list, with agenda included. Attendees give feedback on all significant efforts to address homelessness, especially CoC-wide planning, including whether to establish a committee/workgroup and what its membership should be. Input is often also sought through electronic surveys. This input goes to the Leadership Board who establishes committees, defines their scope of work, parameters for membership (always includes formerly/currently homeless persons), and the selection process. The process is published electronically and typically includes an open invitation to apply with a written expression of interest. Applicants are approved by the Board, its Executive Committee, or occasionally delegated to staff.
1D. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review, Ranking, and Selection

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

1D-1 Describe the specific ranking and selection process the CoC uses to make decisions regarding project application review and selection, based on objective criteria. Written documentation of this process must be attached to the application along with evidence of making the information publicly available. (limit 750 characters)

The CoC Board established an unbiased committee to set scoring criteria, score projects, and determine the final Priority List. Criteria & applications were released at 12/10/13 bidders’ conference and on CoC website, due 1/3/14. All applicants got written notice 1/17/14 of their status in package, rank, project score, and an explanation if project would not be included in the HUD submission. Ranking also posted to website. Criteria included: project type, extent of housing chronically homeless/providing RRH, populations served, use of housing first, performance on HUD outcomes, grant spending, data quality, leverage, quality assurance, and completeness. 83 points were self scored & CoC staff verified, while 17 were scored by reviewers. 3 reviewers scored each project. Lowest ranking renewals were reallocated to new permanent housing.

1D-2 Describe how the CoC reviews and ranks projects using periodically collected data reported by projects, conducts analysis to determine each project’s effectiveness that results in participants rapid return to permanent housing, and takes into account the severity of barriers faced by project participants. Description should include the specific data elements and metrics that are reviewed to do this analysis. (limit 1000 characters)

The NOFA Committee used data from HMIS to measure performance outcomes and data quality. All projects were asked to submit back up documentation from 10/1/2012 through 9/30/13 in the form of APR question 27 for housing retention, and 26a2 and 26b2 for obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits; the local outcomes report for exits with permanent housing and income; the Service Point Data Quality Report Card, and returns to homelessness were measured using a systemwide report run by CoC staff for each project. All measures have HUD or locally established benchmarks against which projects are scored. Those benchmarks account for the severity of barriers faced by project participants which are not the same for all project types. The benchmarks and the amount of points performance rates would score was part of the local application self scoring sheet, and can be found in the attachments to this application.
1D-3 Describe the extent in which the CoC is open to proposals from entities that have not previously received funds in prior Homeless Assistance Grants competitions. (limit 750 characters)

EveryOne Home solicits applications through electronic announcements to several list serves, and holds a widely publicized bidders conference to go over the proposal process and application requirements. Prior to the NOFA period, providers that express an interest in applying are offered an informal capacity assessment and direction on how to strengthen their likelihood of qualifying for funding, such as enrolling in HMIS and partnering with current recipients/sub-recipients. All providers that submit an application are provided section by section details of their score and offered the opportunity to get further feedback. Any eligible applicant is encouraged to apply for new projects.

1D-4 On what date did the CoC post on its website all parts of the CoC Consolidated Application, including the Priority Listings with ranking information and notified project applicants and stakeholders the information was available? Written documentation of this notification process (e.g., evidence of the website where this information is published) must be attached to the application.

02/03/2014

1D-5 If there were changes made to the ranking after the date above, what date was the final ranking posted?

1D-6 Did the CoC attach the final GIW approved by HUD either during CoC Registration or, if applicable, during the 7-day grace period following the publication of the CoC Program NOFA without making changes?

Yes

1D-6.1 If no, briefly describe each of the specific changes that were made to the GIW (without HUD approval) including any addition or removal of projects, revisions to line item amounts, etc. For any projects that were revised, added, or removed, identify the applicant name, project name, and grant number. (limit 1000 characters)

NA
1D-7 Were there any written complaints received by the CoC in relation to project review, project selection, or other items related to 24 CFR 578.7 or 578.9 within the last 12 months?

No

1D-7.1 If yes, briefly describe the complaint(s), how it was resolved, and the date(s) in which it was resolved. (limit 750 characters)

NA
1E. Continuum of Care (CoC) Housing Inventory

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

1E-1 Did the CoC submit the 2013 HIC data in the HDX by April 30, 2013? Yes
2A. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Implementation

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2A-1 Describe how the CoC ensures that the HMIS is administered in compliance with the CoC Program interim rule, conformance with the 2010 HMIS Data Standards and related HUD Notices. (limit 1000 characters)

With oversight from the CoC, the HMIS lead conducts compliance meetings monthly to initiate policy and data collection changes to align with HUD standards and notices. In 8/09 collection forms and input screens were updated to meet 2010 Data Standards. In 1/11 the process for adopting annual reviews was established, including training was conducted on executing transition APRs. In 12/11 a process for collecting homeless definition data was identified. HMIS rules were adopted to meet chronic homelessness expansion (2013). In 10/13 the process for recording annual updates was modified to meet the HUD guidance that was released. In 1/13 provider details were added to HMIS data. In 12/13 the CoC formalized existing MOUs and policies into a governance charter. The CoC compliance meeting also includes evaluation of project data quality and performance factors that ensure the accurate entry and effective use of the HMIS. The CoC uses standard forms which are approved by the CoC governing body.

2A-2 Does the governance charter in place between the CoC and the HMIS Lead include the most current HMIS requirements and outline the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and the HMIS Lead? If yes, a copy must be attached.

Yes

2A-3 For each of the following plans, describe the extent in which it has been developed by the HMIS Lead and the frequency in which the CoC has reviewed it: Privacy Plan, Security Plan, and Data Quality Plan. (limit 1000 characters)
The Privacy, Security, and Data Quality Plans were created in compliance with HUD regulation and implemented in 11/2004 (outlined within the Policies and Procedures Manual) and are each reviewed by the CoC on an annual basis. The revision process is conducted by the HMIS Lead, in conjunction with the Policy Group. Updates and changes are conducted by the governing body of the CoC with input from the Performance Management Committee. Alameda County’s HMIS Policies and Procedures (2.10 Quarterly Compliance Review – implemented 2004) outlines the CoC expectation that agencies will monitor Privacy, Security and Data Quality on a quarterly basis. Following the 2004 implementation of each Plan, Agencies/Jurisdictions were provided copies via email. Agencies are provided updated copies of each Plan, following changes or modifications (updates distributed within 48 hours of CoC adoption) via the County’s Homelessness email Listserv. Each plan will be modified and updated, following the release of the upcoming HUD data standards.

2A-4 What is the name of the HMIS software selected by the CoC and the HMIS Lead?
ServicePoint
Applicant will enter the HMIS software name (e.g., ABC Software).

2A-5 What is the name of the HMIS vendor?
Bowman Systems
Applicant will enter the name of the vendor (e.g., ESG Systems).

2A-6 Does the CoC plan to change the HMIS software within the next 18 months?
No
2B. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Funding Sources

2B-1 Select the HMIS implementation coverage area: Single CoC

2B-2 Select the CoC(s) covered by the HMIS: CA-502 - Oakland/Alameda County CoC (select all that apply)

2B-3 In the chart below, enter the amount of funding from each funding source that contributes to the total HMIS budget for the CoC.

2B-3.1 Funding Type: Federal - HUD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoC</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$14,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPWA</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - HUD - Total Amount</td>
<td>$406,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B-3.2 Funding Type: Other Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal - Total Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B-3.3 Funding Type: State and Local
### Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$76,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local - Total Amount</td>
<td>$129,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2B-3.4 Funding Type: Private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private - Total Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2B-3.5 Funding Type: Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation Fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Total Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B-3.6 Total Budget for Operating Year: $536,475

2B-4 How was the HMIS Lead selected by the CoC?  

Agency was appointed

2B-4.1 If other, provide a description as to how the CoC selected the HMIS Lead.  
(limit 750 characters)
2C. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Bed Coverage

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2C-1 Indicate the HMIS bed coverage rate (%) for each housing type within the CoC. If a particular housing type does not exist anywhere within the CoC, select "Housing type does not exist in CoC" from the drop-down menu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Coverage Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>65-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven (SH) beds</td>
<td>Housing type does not exist in CoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing (TH) beds</td>
<td>86%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) beds</td>
<td>86%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds</td>
<td>76-85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2C-2 How often does the CoC review or assess its HMIS bed coverage? Annually

2C-3 If the bed coverage rate for any housing type is 64% or below, describe how the CoC plans to increase this percentage over the next 12 months. (limit 1000 characters)

2C-4 If the Collaborative Applicant indicated that the bed coverage rate for any housing type was 64% or below in the FY2012 CoC Application, describe the specific steps the CoC has taken to increase this percentage. (limit 750 characters)
2D. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Data Quality

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2D-1 For each housing type, indicate the average length of time project participants remain in housing. If a housing type does not exist in the CoC, enter “0”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>Average Length of Time in Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-housing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2D-2 Indicate the percentage of unduplicated client records with null or missing values on a day during the last 10 days of January 2013 for each Universal Data Element listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal Data Element</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security number</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran status</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabling condition</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence prior to program entry</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code of last permanent address</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing status</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of household</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2D-3 Describe the extent in which HMIS generated data is used to generate HUD required reports (e.g., APR, CAPER, etc.). (limit 1000 characters)
HMIS generated data is used to generate all relevant HUD required reports, which include submission of CAPER, ESG CAPER, SSVF monthly data uploads, PATH reporting needs, the APR and formerly the Transition APR reports. HMIS data is used for the submission of the Housing Element, a subset of the CAPER. Additionally, HMIS generated data is used as the primary database source of the Sheltered Point-In-Time and Housing Inventory Count, including the relevant sub-population data. All AHAR data elements are extracted from HMIS (except for DV programs). Alameda County HMIS data is used for submission of demographic information for the CDBG and CSBG quarterly requirements. HMIS generated data is an integral part of the HUD Annual NOFA application - including rating and ranking process for the local scoring competition.

2D-4 How frequently does the CoC review the data quality in the HMIS of program level data?  

Monthly

2D-5 Describe the process through which the CoC works with the HMIS Lead to assess data quality. Include how the CoC and HMIS Lead collaborate, and how the CoC works with organizations that have data quality challenges.  
(Limit 1000 characters)

The CoC works with the HMIS Lead to ensure that agency responsibility of data quality management, input and remediying of inaccurate data elements on a monthly basis. Before any data is entered into HMIS by end users, HMIS staff provides extensive remote and in-person training sessions and overview of policies and procedures. HMIS users receive a Policies & Procedures Manual, which includes Data Standards, forms, data quality expectations, and guidelines. The HMIS team provides follow-up training for newly-engaged partners. HMIS staff conducts ongoing monthly checks of project data quality. A variety of data quality report tools assist with identifying missing/inaccurate data elements. The CoC ensures that the HMIS Lead facilitates the creation and distribution of “Job Aids,” which assist with data entry. The HMIS team is available via email and phone for user issues. User Group meetings (held monthly) focus on troubleshooting data quality, best practices, and relaying pertinent vendor updates. In addition, the use of HMIS data for community performance measurement enhances the Alameda County data quality.

2D-6 How frequently does the CoC review the data quality in the HMIS of client-level data?  

Monthly
# 2E. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Data Usage and Coordination

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at [https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/](https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/).

**2E-1 Indicate the frequency in which the CoC uses HMIS data for each of the following activities:**

| * Measuring the performance of participating housing and service providers | Bi-Monthly |
| * Using data for program management | Bi-Monthly |
| * Integration of HMIS data with data from mainstream resources | Monthly |
| * Integration of HMIS data with other Federal programs (e.g., HHS, VA, etc.) | Monthly |
2F. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Policies and Procedures

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2F-1 Does the CoC have a HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual? If yes, the HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual must be attached. 
Yes

2F-1.1 What page(s) of the HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual or governance charter includes the information regarding accuracy of capturing participant entry and exit dates in HMIS? (limit 250 characters)
Governance Charter: pages 3, 4, 5

2F-2 Are there agreements in place that outline roles and responsibilities between the HMIS Lead and the Contributing HMIS Organizations (CHOs)?
Yes
2G. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2G-1 Indicate the date of the most recent sheltered point-in-time count (mm/dd/yyyy):
01/29/2013

2G-2 If the CoC conducted the sheltered point-in-time count outside of the last 10 days of January 2013, was an exception granted by HUD?
Not Applicable

2G-3 Enter the date the CoC submitted the sheltered point-in-time count data in HDX:
04/30/2013

2G-4 Indicate the percentage of homeless service providers supplying sheltered point-in-time data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Provider Shelter</th>
<th>Client Interview</th>
<th>HMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelters</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Havens</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2G-5 Comparing the 2012 and 2013 sheltered point-in-time counts, indicate if there was an increase, decrease, or no change and then describe the reason(s) for the increase, decrease, or no change. (Limit 750 characters)
The 2013 Sheltered Count (1927 people) showed an overall negligible decrease from 2012 (2,045 people), accountable through reductions in the TH inventory and also offset by increased utilization of shelters. The primary factor contributing to the overall decrease was less bed capacity (136 less beds total for 2013). Seven programs were removed/or realigned: five due to confirmation that the target population served was not consistent with HUD HIC guidance (i.e. substance abuse or rehab facility and not targeted to homeless population), one program was no longer in existence, and one PSH program inaccurately categorized in 2012 (TH). An increase in the occupancy rate (utilization) between the 2012 and 2013 PIT resulted in more persons residing in a shelter or TH program, aligned with efficient use of system resources.
2H. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Methods

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

* 2H-1 Indicate the method(s) used to count sheltered homeless persons during the 2013 point-in-time count:

   Survey providers: X
   HMIS: X
   Extrapolation: 
   Other:  

2H-2 If other, provide a detailed description. (limit 750 characters)

2H-3 For each method selected, including other, describe how the method was used to ensure that the data collected on the sheltered homeless population during the 2013 point-in-time count was accurate. (limit 750 characters)

Survey providers: Non-HMIS (25 of 137 projects) entering agency staff were contacted via phone and email and distributed a survey containing detailed instructions and HUD definitions for submitting the PIT data. PIT communication with all providers commenced in advance (5 months) of the data submission deadline. HMIS and Survey Providers: Detailed communication occurred with all agencies to ensure accuracy in data collection and confirm accuracy of occupancy and client population (including subpopulation) information. Further confirmation and review was solicited from key programmatic agency staff. The count extracted from HMIS and survey data was used in conjunction with the HIC data; agencies were required to validate the capacity with occupancy to confirm quality data.
2I. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Data Collection

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

* 2I-1 Indicate the methods used to gather and calculate subpopulation data for sheltered homeless persons:

- HMIS: X
- HMIS plus extrapolation: 
- Sample of PIT interviews plus extrapolation: 
  Sample strategy:
  (if Sample of PIT interviews plus extrapolation is selected)
  Provider expertise: 
  Interviews: 
  Non-HMIS client level information: X
  Other: 

2I-2 If other, provide a detailed description. (limit 750 characters)

2I-3 For each method selected, including other, describe how the method was used to ensure that the data collected on the sheltered homeless population count during the 2013 point-in-time count was accurate. (limit 750 characters)

The sheltered PIT was based upon a HMIS extraction and surveying non-HMIS providers. Non-HMIS entering providers (25 of 137 projects) were contacted in October 2012 via phone and email and received a survey containing detailed instructions and HUD definitions for submitting accurate population and subpopulation data. Detailed communication occurred with all agencies to ensure accuracy in data collection and confirm accuracy of client population and subpopulation information. Implausible and logically inconsistent data was directly addressed with key project staff (Executive Directors and Project Managers) to validate accuracy or initiate corrections. The population count extracted from HMIS and survey data provided by the non-HMIS agencies was combined together to generate the full PIT count for Alameda County.
2J. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Homeless
Point-in-Time Count: Data Quality

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed
Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the
OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

* 2J-1 Indicate the methods used to ensure the quality of the data
collected during the sheltered point-in-time count:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-HMIS de-duplication:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2J-2 If other, provide a detailed description.
(limit 750 characters)

2J-3 For each method selected, including other, describe how the method
was used to ensure that the data collected on the sheltered homeless
population count during the 2013 point-in-time count was accurate.
(limit 750 characters)

Training: Clear, concise instructions were provided to all PIT projects. Providers
received training instructions via email and in-person sessions to define the
needed data elements. Follow-up: Staff conducted training session to instruct
agencies on providing accurate population count data. Follow-up was
conducted to all agencies and clarifications to inconsistent or missing data was
completed. The PIT data was coordinated in association with the HIC to confirm
accurate subpopulation data. A thorough review and confirmation of data was
conducted to ensure accurate data quality and extraction. HMIS: HMIS-entering
programs were given detailed instructions in identifying standardized data
collection methods, population types and subpopulation elements. Detailed
instructions were followed, as well as HMIS vendor-created PIT reports used.
2K. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2K-1 Indicate the date of the most recent unsheltered point-in-time count: 01/29/2013

2K-2 If the CoC conducted the unsheltered point-in-time count outside of the last 10 days of January 2013, was an exception granted by HUD? Not Applicable

2K-3 Enter the date the CoC submitted the unsheltered point-in-time count data in HDX: 04/30/2013

2K-4 Comparing the 2013 unsheltered point-in-time count to the last unsheltered point-in-time count, indicate if there was an increase, decrease, or no change and describe the specific reason(s) for the increase, decrease, or no change. (limit 750 characters)

In 2011, Alameda County reported 1,966 sheltered homeless persons and 2,212 unsheltered homeless persons for a PIT total of 4,178. In 2013, we reported 1,927 sheltered homeless and 2,337 unsheltered homeless for a total of 4,264 persons. Our PIT statisticians and analytical research states that the increase of 86 homeless persons (2%) from 2011 to 2013 is NOT statistically significant and therefore, we are reporting no change. Alameda County did not see an overall decrease but did see a significant decrease within the chronically homeless subpopulation, down 17% (from 1,116 in 2011 to 931 in 2013). County wide factors such as an increase in population, poverty, and rental market prices have stymied our progress in decreasing our overall numbers.
2L. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Point-in-Time Count: Methods

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

* 2L-1 Indicate the methods used to count unsheltered homeless persons during the 2013 point-in-time count:

Public places count: [ ]
Public places count with interviews on the night of the count: [ ]
Public places count with interviews at a later date: [ ]
Service-based count: X
HMIS: [ ]
Other: [ ]

2L-2 If other, provide a detailed description. (limit 750 characters)

2L-3 For each method selected, including other, describe how the method was used to ensure that the data collected on the unsheltered homeless population during the 2013 point-in-time count was accurate. (limit 750 characters)

A two-stage service-based count design led by professional researchers ensured accurate data. First, an updated list was generated of all food pantries, drop-in centers, soup kitchens, and outreach programs in the county & their number of service units being provided. The statistical team identified a subset of 31 sites via randomized selection at which interview and service count data would be collected to give a statistically representative sample of the service universe. Next, a sample of 1,400 service users at selected sites were approached to be interviewed. Respondents who weren’t unsheltered were removed from the dataset. Researchers used the service unit and survey data to determine an accurate and unduplicated count.
2M. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Homeless Point-in-Time Count: Level of Coverage

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

2M-1 Indicate where the CoC located unsheltered homeless persons during the 2013 point-in-time count:
A Combination of Locations

2M-2 If other, provide a detailed description.
(limit 750 characters)
2N. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Homeless Point-in-Time Count: Data Quality

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

* 2N-1 Indicate the steps taken by the CoC to ensure the quality of the data collected for the 2013 unsheltered population count:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training:</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Blitz&quot; count:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique identifier:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey question:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumerator observation:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2N-2 If other, provide a detailed description. (limit 750 characters)

2N-3 For each method selected, including other, describe how the method was used to reduce the occurrence of counting unsheltered homeless persons more than once during the 2013 point-in-time count. In order to receive credit for any selection, it must be described here. (limit 750 characters)

Interviewers and Site coordinators received TRAINING for how to properly record data about service use and persons who were suspected of or disclosed as being previously interviewed that day. All respondents who were determined to be housed or sheltered homeless (by the questionnaire used) were removed from the unsheltered data set. SURVEY QUESTIONS asked of each volunteer to record the number of times the respondent used each type of service program in our scope. This data was used by statisticians to deduplicate and weight responses. The survey instrument capacity provided for ENUMERATOR OBSERVATION which included notation of respondents being surveyed more than once. This along with the statistical weighting reduced the occurrence of counting unsheltered persons more than once.
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 1: Increase Progress Towards Ending Chronic Homelessness

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

In FY 2013, applications submitted to HUD for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be evaluated in part based on the extent in which they further the achievement of HUD’s goals as articulated in HUD’s Strategic Plan and Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (FSP). The first goal in Opening Doors is to end chronic homelessness by 2015. Creating new dedicated permanent supportive housing beds is one way to increase progress towards ending homelessness for chronically homeless persons. Using data from Annual Performance Reports (APR), HMIS, and the 2013 housing inventory count, complete the table below.

3A-1.1 Objective 1: Increase Progress Towards Ending Chronic Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A-1.1a For each year, provide the total number of CoC-funded PSH beds not dedicated for use by the chronically homeless that are available for occupancy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-1.1b For each year, provide the total number of PSH beds dedicated for use by the chronically homeless.</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-1.1c Total number of PSH beds not dedicated to the chronically homeless that are made available through annual turnover.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-1d Indicate the percentage of the CoC-funded PSH beds not dedicated to the chronically homeless made available through annual turnover that will be prioritized for use by the chronically homeless over the course of the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-1.1e How many new PSH beds dedicated to the chronically homeless will be created through reallocation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3A-1.2 Describe the CoC’s two year plan (2014-2015) to increase the number of permanent supportive housing beds available for chronically homeless persons and to meet the proposed numeric goals as indicated in the table above. Response should address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to achieve the goal of ending chronic homelessness by the end of 2015.

(HUD’s evolving definition of a “CH dedicated” bed for the HIC led to reporting PSH beds “occupied” by CH in 2012 and only those “dedicated by contract” in 2013, indicating a decline in CH beds which is not actual. HMIS reports chronically homeless (CH) persons comprised 55% of those living in non-dedicated CoC units, while 42% of new PSH leases in all non-dedicated units went to CH households last year. 18 of 22 CoC funded PSH projects have formally committed to prioritizing 50 to 100% of their turnover to CH in the coming year. When current wait lists are reopened, many will increase prioritization up to 85-100%, getting the whole CoC up to 85% of turnover prioritized to CH by the end of 2015. Dedicated CH capacity was created through reallocation of an SSO project in 2013. The CoC will explore reallocating one TH project per year. The increase in dedicated units also reflects the 2011 bonus project of 46 CH units, under development in the 2013 HIC, reaching capacity in 2014; and the 2012 reallocation of 8 units; and a conversion of 14 CoC TH units to PSH funded by other sources. Over-leasing in existing projects will achieve the increase in non-dedicated CoC PSH capacity.

3A-1.3 Identify by name the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for implementing the goals of increasing the number of permanent supportive housing beds for persons experiencing chronic homelessness.

(The Home Stretch Team, a group of providers and funders formed to ensure that PSH gets targeted to CH whenever feasible, will oversee the implementation of the commitments to prioritizing CH through turn-over. The team, an outgrowth of the 100,000 Homes Campaign Rapid Results Boot Camp, is building a centralized list that prioritizes CH based on vulnerability and cost to the system, which will provide housing matches for PSH turnover. Abode Services is the lead agency implementing AC Impact, the 2011 bonus project, and Laguna Commons, the 2012 reallocation project. Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department will implement the 2013 reallocation project. The City of Berkeley and Alameda County Housing and Community Development administer the CoC Shelter Plus Care Programs and will continue to over-lease to the maximum extent possible. Finally, Berkeley’s Health Housing and Human Service Director; the Collaborative Applicant’s representative; Behavioral Health Care Services’ Housing Services Director; and the CoC Director, will work with CoC providers to convert TH projects to PSH in the next two funding rounds if possible.)
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 2: Increase Housing Stability

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

In FY2013, applications submitted to HUD for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be evaluated in part based on the extent in which they further the achievement of HUD’s goals as articulated in HUD’s Strategic Plan and the Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (FSP). Achieving housing stability is critical for persons experiencing homelessness. Using data from Annual Performance Reports (APR), complete the table below.

3A-2.1 Does the CoC have any non-HMIS projects for which an APR should have been submitted between October 1, 2012 and September 30, 2013? Yes

3A-2.2 Objective 2: Increase Housing Stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Actual Numeric Achievement and Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
<th>2015 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A-2.2a Enter the total number of participants served by all CoC-funded permanent supportive housing projects as reported on APRs submitted during the period between October 1, 2012 and September 30, 2013:</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-2.2b Enter the total number of participants that remain in CoC-funded permanent supportive housing projects at the end of the operating year PLUS the number of participants that exited from all CoC-funded permanent supportive housing projects to a different permanent housing destination.</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-2.2c Enter the percentage of participants in all CoC-funded projects that will achieve housing stability in an operating year.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3A-2.3 Describe the CoC’s two year plan (2014-2015) to improve the housing stability of project participants in CoC Program-funded permanent supportive housing projects, as measured by the number of participants remaining at the end of an operating year as well as the number of participants that exited from all CoC-funded permanent supportive housing projects to a different permanent housing destination. Response should address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements proposed in the table above. (limit to 1000 characters)

The CoC has already achieved very high rates of housing stability and occupancy in its PSH projects, which it intends to maintain while serving more individuals. This will be accomplished by fully leasing up the new PSH projects funded in last two NOFA rounds. AC Impact, funded in 2011, will house an additional 46 persons by September 2014, and Laguna Commons will house another 8. The CoC will encourage the PHAs to reinstate some regular Section 8 vouchers for participants ready to “graduate” from supportive housing which will increase the number of participants who exit from PSH to other permanent housing. Last year 176 participants moved from PSH to other permanent options, a modest increase from prior years. CoC leadership has encouraged PSH providers to help participants who want to move to other permanent housing to do so. These two strategies can increase the number of move outs by 20-25 each year.

3A-2.4 Identify by name the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for increasing the rate of housing stability in CoC-funded projects. (limit 1000 characters)

Abode Services is the lead agency on AC Impact and Laguna Commons and will be responsible for achieving full lease up of both projects. AC Impact launched in August 2013 and has housed 20 persons to date. Laguna Commons is not yet under contract. Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department and City of Oakland Department of Human Services will continue to work with their respective Housing Authorities to secure non-PSH vouchers. The CoC will continue encouraging PSH providers to help participants who want to move to other permanent housing to do so.
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 3: Increase project participants income

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

In FY2013, applications submitted to HUD for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be evaluated in part based on the extent in which they further the achievement of HUD’s goals as articulated in HUD’s Strategic Plan and the Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (FSP). Assisting project participants to increase income is one way to ensure housing stability and decrease the possibility of returning to homelessness. Using data from Annual Performance Reports (APR), complete the table below.

3A-3.1 Number of adults who were in CoC-funded projects as reported on APRs submitted during the period between October 1, 2012 and September 30, 2013:

5337

3A-3.2 Objective 3: Increase project participants income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Actual Numeric Achievement and Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
<th>2015 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A-3.2a Enter the percentage of participants in all CoC-funded projects that increased their income from employment from entry date to program exit?</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-3.2b Enter the percentage of participants in all CoC-funded projects that increased their income from sources other than employment from entry date to program exit?</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3A-3.3 In the table below, provide the total number of adults that were in CoC-funded projects with each of the cash income sources identified below, as reported on APRs submitted during the period between October 1, 2012 and September 30, 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Income Sources</th>
<th>Number of Participating Adults</th>
<th>Percentage of Total in 3A-3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>17.74 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>28.80 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**3A-3.4 Describe the CoC’s two year plan (2014-2015) to increase the percentage of project participants in all CoC-funded projects that increase their incomes from non-employment sources from entry date to program exit.** Response should address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements proposed in the table (3A-3.2) above. (limit 1000 characters)

In 2009 HMIS data indicated that 47% of participants had no source of income. That portion has declined to 22% primarily due to CoC wide strategies to increase SSI and General Assistance (GA) advocacy focused on homeless persons who are most costly to Social Services and Health Care Services. Currently, 74% of CoC project participants receive income from mainstream benefit sources; 47% of participants are on some form of disability income and are unlikely to realize income increases. Therefore, the focus will continue to be on securing SSI benefits for those disabled persons who are currently without income or on GA benefits. The County funds an annual capacity of 900 SSI advocacy slots between Behavioral Health and SSA contracts, and county SSA staff members. Additionally, the cities of Oakland and Berkely have their own contracts for further advocacy slots. The CoC expects 125-160 individuals annually to increase their income this way, and another 150 to enroll in GA each year in order to achieve the increases indicated in the chart above.

**3A-3.5 Describe the CoC’s two year plan (2014-2015) to increase the percentage of project participants in all CoC-funded projects that increase their incomes through employment from entry date to program exit.** Response should address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements proposed in the table above. (limit 1000 characters)
Prior to the release of the new APR and HMIS vendor’s specifications on 10/1/13, CoC projects were capturing income changes only at exit and annual update, consistent with HMIS Data Standards. This may have impacted accuracy of income changes reflected in the APRs. CoC proposes to address this by continuing to ensure agencies record and input income changes (through the annual update AND when amounts have changed) within HMIS. The CoC has also concentrated efforts in reviewing project effectiveness; One of two employment projects has demonstrated an increase in the percentages of adults exiting with earned income (36% to 50% within 12 months). The other program continued to struggle with very low outcomes, and will no longer be CoC-funded. Local System-wide CoC Outcomes include income efficiency, measuring maintenance and increases, which are reviewed quarterly (and published annually). These combined strategies will work to ensure 20% of participants will have increased income by 2015.

3A-3.6 Identify by name the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for increasing the rate of project participants in all CoC-funded projects that increase income from entry date to program exit. (limit 1000 characters)

The Trust Clinic, based in Oakland, is designed to fast track disabled GA recipients to SSI income. It is a partnership of Health Care for the Homeless (which provides housing services assistance, health care and disability verification), Behavioral Health Care Services, Social Services Agency, and the Homeless Action Center (which provides the SSI advocacy). Homeless Action Center carries a much larger case load beyond the Trust Clinic and helps participants obtain/maintain General Assistance as well as gain SSI. Rubicon Programs will provide employment services in Berkeley and Hayward.
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 4: Increase the number of participants obtaining mainstream benefits

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

In FY2013, applications submitted to HUD for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be evaluated in part based on the extent in which they further the achievement of HUD's goals as articulated in HUD’s Strategic Plan and the Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (FSP). Assisting project participants to obtain mainstream benefits is one way to ensure housing stability and decrease the possibility of returning to homelessness. Using data from Annual Performance Reports (APR), complete the table below.

3A-4.1 Number of adults who were in CoC-funded projects as reported on APRs submitted during the period between October 1, 2012 and September 30, 2013.

5337

3A-4.2 Objective 4: Increase the number of participants obtaining mainstream benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Actual Numeric Achievement and Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
<th>2015 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3A-4.3 In the table below, provide the total number of adults that were in CoC-funded projects that obtained the non-cash mainstream benefits from entry date to program exit, as reported on APRs submitted during the period between October 1, 2013 and September 30, 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Cash Income Sources</th>
<th>Number of Participating Adults</th>
<th>Percentage of Total in 3A-4.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental nutritional assistance program</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>32.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAID health insurance</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>43.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICARE health insurance</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State children’s health insurance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3A-4.4 Describe the CoC’s two year plan (2014-2015) to increase the percentage of project participants in all CoC-funded projects that access mainstream benefits from entry date to program exit. Response should address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements proposed in the table above. (limit 1000 characters)

In 2014 the CoC will continue to partner with the Health Care Services Agency to ensure that all eligible participants in CoC-funded projects are enrolled in MEDICAID or MEDICARE. Alameda County actively participated in a state and federally-sponsored Low Income Health Program designed to prepare county health systems for Affordable Care Act changes. Through this project, Alameda County “pre-enrolled” over 41,000 of estimated 50-55,000 eligible individuals in Medicaid, hundreds of whom experienced homelessness. CoC organizations were provided with information and resources related to the expansion of health insurance coverage, and several of these organizations have established themselves as health insurance enrollment sites. Additionally, The Health Care Services Agency has applied for a state grant to fund additional outreach and enrollment resources for homeless persons. Case managers in CoC funded projects will continue to assist participants to secure SNAP and other non-cash benefits.

3A-4.5 Identify by name the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for increasing the rate of project participants in all CoC-funded projects that access non-cash mainstream benefits from entry date to program exit. (limit 1000 characters)

Health Care Services Agency (HCSA) and the CoC Leadership Board will continue to promote all enrollment resources to provider agencies. HCSA agency has offered multiple trainings on enrollment for provider staff and the Leadership Board and will continue to do so in 2014 and 2015. CoC member agencies serving as health insurance enrollment sites include Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency, LifeLong Medical Care, and East Bay Community Recovery Project, and Health Care for the Homeless.
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

Objective 5: Using Rapid Re-Housing as a method to reduce family homelessness

Instructions:

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

In FY2013, applications submitted to HUD for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be evaluated in part based on the extent in which they further the achievement of HUD’s goals as articulated in HUD’s Strategic Plan and the Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (FSP). Rapid re-housing is a proven effective housing model. Based on preliminary evidence, it is particularly effective for households with children. Using HMIS and Housing Inventory Count data, populate the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>2013 Actual Numeric Achievement and Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
<th>2015 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A-5.1a</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>2013 Actual Numeric Achievement and Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A-5.1b</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>2013 Actual Numeric Achievement and Baseline</th>
<th>2014 Proposed Numeric Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A-5.1c</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3A-5.2 Describe the CoC’s two year plan (2014-2015) to increase the number homeless households with children assisted through rapid re-housing projects that are funded through either McKinney-Vento funded programs (CoC Program, and Emergency Solutions Grants program) or non-McKinney-Vento funded sources (e.g., TANF). Response should address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements proposed in the table above. (limit 1000 characters)
This year’s CoC submission includes a proposal for a new Rapid Re-housing for Families project to cover Oakland, Berkeley, and other north county cities. It will serve approximately 38 families per year. The increase of the new project is reflected in 2015 column of the table above. Prior to that, increases will be achieved by shortening the length of subsidies in current RRH projects in order to serve more families per year. All three entitlement jurisdictions have used 60% or more of ESG funds for Rapid Re-housing and will continue to do so. We also have an RRH project funded with State ESG funds. The modest increases in numbers reflect the increases to the ESG program nationally that will get targeted to RRH locally. Non-CoC funded increases will come from new SSVF projects that have just begun serving families in late 2013 and Child Welfare dollars available through June 2014. Finally, the CoC has begun negotiations with the Social Services Agency to restart the TANF RRH program that was so successful during the federal stimulus.

3A-5.3 Identify by name the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for increasing the number of households with children that are assisted through rapid re-housing in the CoC geographic area. (limit 1000 characters)

Housing and Community Development (HCD) and Abode Services are the lead agencies implementing the Linkages Project. This project is a collaborative of six providers serving families from seven shelters in southern and eastern Alameda County. With the flexibility allowed in Rapid Re-Housing, Linkages expects to double the number of families served in previous years. Abode Services also administers SSVF, Probation and Child Welfare RRH. Building Futures with Women and Children operates ESG and Child Welfare RRH and is the lead provider in the new North County Family Rapid Re-housing Collaborative (NCFRRHC) being created through reallocated CoC funds. East Oakland Community Project is also a partner in NCFRRHC and operates Probation-funded RRH. Berkeley Food and Housing is a NCFRRHC referral partner and operates ESG and Probation RRH programs. The City of Oakland is NCFRRHC lead and OHA will administer the subsidies.

3A-5.4 Describe the CoC’s written policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible households will receive rapid re-housing assistance as well as the amount or percentage of rent that each program participant must pay, if applicable. (limit 1000 characters)

McKinney funded RRH projects house families being served by the shelter and outreach agencies connected to the projects, neither of which have sobriety and income requirements. Families at 15% AMI or lower are prioritized. ESG and CoC funded RRH are restricted to families living in shelters and places not meant for human habitation with incomes at 30% AMI or lower. Participants pay 50% of their income or 50% of the rent whichever is lower. Projects can make exceptions on a case by case basis. Participants’ needs and eligibility are reviewed minimally every 3 months with the goal of paying ever increasing portions of the rent. SSVF, Probation, and Child Welfare funded RRH is restricted to serving the families of veterans, ex-offenders and foster children respectively with the same percentages of rent to be paid.
3A-5.5 How often do RRH providers provide case management to households residing in projects funded under the CoC and ESG Programs?
(limit 1000 characters)
Services in RRH programs are voluntary for participants, with the exception of the initial housing stability plan and the quarterly reassessment. Service outreach, however, is mandatory for project staff—weekly or more often during housing search and within the first month of tenancy, then typically monthly thereafter. Participants are encouraged to contact their housing case manager as needed. In current projects that has ranged from daily to rarely depending on the family and how long they have been in the program. Housing specialists and case managers are trained to use a “whatever takes” approach to achieving and maintaining housing stability, which means being responsive no matter how often they are contacted and proactive in reaching out and offering assistance to families who have not been in touch for a month or more.

3A-5.6 Do the RRH providers routinely follow up with previously assisted households to ensure that they do not experience additional returns to homelessness within the first 12 months after assistance ends?
(limit 1000 characters)
Yes. At the end of assistance families are encouraged to keep in touch and reminded that if they encounter challenges that could impact their housing to contact their housing case manager. If new assistance is sought within three months, a needs assessment is done, but not a new intake. Periods of more than three months between assistance warrant a new program intake. Families can get additional assistance as long as they have not exceeded the regulatory limits on the funding. If they have, the housing case manager will work to assist them with another resource. Housing case managers typically contact families at 3 and 6 months post assistance to check on their housing stability and if they need any referrals or other assistance. As noted elsewhere in this application, returns to homelessness from RRH is below 3% continuum-wide.
3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning: Foster Care

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

3B-1.1 Is the discharge policy in place mandated by the State, the CoC, or other?

State Mandated Policy

3B-1.1a If other, please explain.
(limit 750 characters)
NA

3B-1.2 Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure persons are not routinely discharged into homeless and specifically state where persons routinely go upon discharge.
(limit 1000 characters)
Primarily through its member providers who serve transition age youth (TAY), the CoC has worked with the County Department of Children and Family Services (DCSF) to maximize the opportunities afforded by the California Fostering Connections to Success Act (AB 12). The 2010 law funds multiple housing options to ensure that non minor dependents and youth exiting foster care “maintain stable housing” including SLIPS, THP Plus, and THP Plus Foster Care. TAY are steered toward these programs before those funded by McKinney Vento. 75% of the housing for this population is non-McKinney Vento. Due to AB 12, DCSF has seen nearly 80% of its youth age 18 or older opt to stay in foster care, dramatically reducing discharges to only 45 TAY in 2013. Those that initially opt to exit can re-enter foster care, which includes housing, up until their 21st birthday. DCSF reports that less than 2% of youth report no housing option during exit planning and another 7% are AWOL. 20% move in with a parent or care giver, 21% utilize transition-in-place housing subsidies, 32% move in with other roommates, 12% become renters, and 6% move into dorms.

3B-1.3 Identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness.
(limit 1000 characters)
The Alameda County Social Services Agency, Department of Children and Family Services and Probation Department work closely with the Court system and a robust community of providers to ensure that youth exiting foster care are not routinely discharged into homelessness. Key community partners include First Place for Youth, who developed scattered site, transition-in-place housing for TAY which became the model for housing this population in implementing AB12 statewide. Other youth housing providers include East Oakland Community Project, Covenant House California, Abode Services, Bay Area Youth Center, Beyond Emancipation, and Fred Finch Youth Center. Social Services Agency, First Place, and EOCP have representatives on the CoC Leadership Board. In 2014 DCFS will launch and lead a federally funded planning process to prevent homelessness among transition age youth who are currently in or have recently left foster care. The CoC Director, and the collaborative applicant will serve on the Leadership Council of this effort.
3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning: Health Care

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

3B-2.1 Is the discharge policy in place mandated by the State, the CoC, or other?
CoC Adopted Policy

3B-2.1a If other, please explain.
(limit 750 characters)
NA

3B-2.2 Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure persons are not routinely discharged into homeless and specifically state where persons routinely go upon discharge.
(limit 1000 characters)
Persons are not routinely discharged from health care facilities into homelessness, and the CoC has worked aggressively with a variety of health care institutions to reduce discharges into literal homelessness. In recent years the County has established two medical respite programs for individuals being discharged from local hospitals. Several care transition initiatives with two of the area’s major hospitals have resulted in improved discharge planning efforts. A federally qualified health center in the region provides supportive housing-based services and operates a housing first program targeted to frequent users of local hospital emergency departments. Individuals admitted to health care institutions as homeless are discharged to a variety of locations depending on a variety of factors. Locations include skilled nursing facilities, licensed residential care facilities, room and boards, medical respite programs, emergency hotels, family/friends, and others.

3B-2.3 Identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness.
(limit 1000 characters)
Key stakeholders in Alameda County include the Alameda Health System (public hospital and clinics), including Highland Hospital, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency and its Health Care for the Homeless Program, Alameda Alliance for Health (managed Medicaid plan), Alameda County Social Services Agency (SSA), LifeLong Medical Care (an FQHC), Sutter Hospitals, East Oakland Community Project (medical respite), Berkeley Food and Housing Project (medical respite), Bay Area Community Services (medical respite). The medical director for Health Care for the Homeless serves on the Leadership Board of the CoC.
3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning: Mental Health

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

3B-3.1 Is the discharge policy in place mandated by the State, the CoC, or other?

3B-3.1a If other, please explain.
(limit 750 characters)
NA

3B-3.2 Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure persons are not routinely discharged into homeless and specifically state where persons routinely go upon discharge.
(limit 1000 characters)

The CoC works with Housing Services Office of Behavioral Health Care Services (BHCS) to improve discharge planning from mental health facilities. To that end, the Office, with coordination by the CoC created a homelessness prevention/rapid-rehousing fund, modeled after and delivered in partnership with the HPRP program. The fund has been used to help hospitalized persons continue to pay rent so units are not lost, or to obtain units upon exit from the facility. The CoC worked with PSH providers to develop protocols allowing tenants hospitalized for more than 30 days to retain their units. The CoC and the Housing Services Office have trained staff on how to assess patients’ housing needs and assist in resolving them as part of discharge planning, utilizing the Office’s centralized housing resource database and webpage. BHCS also contracts for dedicated emergency hotel beds for use while ACT teams work on locating permanent housing. BHCS also pays subsidies for licensed residential care facilities to which people routinely exit.

3B-3.3 Identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness.
(limit 1000 characters)
Alameda County Health Care Services Agency, Behavioral Health Care Services (BHCS) Housing Services Office was created in 2007 to reduce homelessness among individuals with serious mental health issues and works in collaboration with its contract provider network to address the housing needs of clients in the mental health system. All mental health contract providers are required to engage in programmatic improvement efforts each year related to improving the housing status of their clients. Several mental health contract providers also maintain ongoing HUD SHP funding, including but not limited to, Abode Services, Bay Area Community Services, BOSS, and LifeLong Medical Care. BHCS operates the County psychiatric hospital and several in-patient crisis facilities each with discharge staff who make every effort not to discharge people into homelessness. The County ACCESS program connects all eligible in-patient users to community services, which include those that address housing issues.
3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning: Corrections

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

3B-4.1 Is the discharge policy in place mandated by the State, the CoC, or other? CoC Adopted Policy

3B-4.1a If other, please explain.
(limit 750 characters)

NA

3B-4.2 Describe the efforts that the CoC has taken to ensure persons are not routinely discharged into homeless and specifically state where persons routinely go upon discharge.
(limit 1000 characters)

In 2012 the CoC and the Alameda County Probation and Housing and Community Development Departments launched the Realignment Housing Program, rapid rehousing funded by Probation to ensure that formerly incarcerated people returning to, or remaining in, Alameda County due to realignment at the State level are not released into homelessness. When ex-offenders initially report, housing status is assessed and a referral is made if needed. In the first year 28% reported having a housing crisis. To ensure that inmates at Santa Rita Jail are not discharged into homelessness Inmate Services conducts a pre-release housing needs assessment as far in advance as possible and connects the person to housing services. They also work to reconcile prisoners with friends and family to whom many return. Inmates can also elect to utilize the following programs which are not funded by HUD McKinney-Vento: multiple residential drug treatment programs funded by BHCS; the MOMS program, which provides transitional housing and wrap around services; or up to 90 days of post-release housing assistance specifically for those with HIV or dementia.

3B-4.3 Identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating agencies that are responsible for ensuring that persons being discharged from a system of care are not routinely discharged into homelessness.
(limit 1000 characters)
Alameda County has a Community Corrections Partnership which includes many CoC member organizations and County departments, including the Sheriff, Probation, Housing and Community Development, Social Services Agency, Health Care Services Agency (especially Public Health and Behavioral Health Services) and the District Attorney’s office and the Public Defender’s office. Direct discharge services are provided by Inmate Services at Santa Rita Jail, overseen by Lt. Melanie Ditzenberger; Maximizing Opportunities for Moms to Succeed, Corizon and Operation MyHome Town run by the Sheriff’s Department start working with inmates while they are still inside as well as post-release. Community-based providers that assist with housing needs include Berkeley Food and Housing Project, Building Futures with Women and Children, Abode Services, and East Oakland Community Project.
3C. Continuum of Care (CoC) Coordination

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

3C-1 Does the Consolidated Plan for the jurisdiction(s) within the CoC’s geography include the CoC’s strategic plan goals for addressing and ending homelessness? Yes

3C-1.1 If yes, list the goals in the CoC strategic plan. (limit 1000 characters)
Alameda County’s CoC is comprised of three Consolidated Plan jurisdictions: the Cities of Berkeley and Oakland, and the Alameda County HOME Consortium. All three jurisdictions’ Consolidated Plans include the goals of the EveryOne Home Plan (the CoC Strategic Plan). Alameda County quotes the EveryOne Plan directly, Oakland and Berkeley include the same goals with modified language. The goals are: 1. Prevent homelessness and other housing crises; 2. Increase permanent housing opportunities for homeless and high risk households; 3. Provide wrap-around services to ensure housing stability and quality of life—no wrong door to help; 4. Measure success and report outcomes; 5. Develop long-term leadership and political will, which includes interjurisdictional cooperation and participation in the CoC. The Consolidated Plans also discuss the importance of maintaining key safety net services for the homeless.

3C-2 Describe the extent in which the CoC consults with State and local government Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) program recipients within the CoC’s geographic area on the plan for allocating ESG program funds and reporting on and evaluating the performance of ESG program recipients and subrecipients. (limit 1000 characters)
Local government ESG program recipients sit on the CoC Leadership Board, and along with CoC staff facilitated a joint planning process for how to allocate funds and evaluate performance upon the release of new ESG regulations in 2012. The CoC held community-wide meetings and several focus groups to determine how best to prioritize the use of ESG funds. From this process common language for Consolidated Plans and a joint program policies and procedures manual were developed. It was determined that rapid rehousing would be prioritized and funds would be limited to persons with incomes at 30% AMI or lower. Local providers of state funds and jurisdictional recipients agreed that participants would pay at least 50% of their income or 50% of the rent, whichever was lower, with the option to make exceptions, and they further agreed that participant eligibility and need would be assessed every three months. The countywide strategy informed the CoC’s participation and planning in the state ESG program. In addition to evaluating provider performance, the CoC also facilitates the process for prioritizing each local applicant for state ESG funding.

3C-3 Describe the extent in which ESG funds are used to provide rapid re-housing and homelessness prevention. Description must include the percentage of funds being allocated to both activities. (limit 1000 characters)

HCD, the grantee for ESG funding for Urban County, has set aside 60% of its annual allocations to rapid re-housing and prevention activities (a total of $437,408) and the City of Berkeley utilizes a total of 89% of its ESG funds to fund rapid re-housing (70%) and prevention (19%). Oakland dedicates about 60% of its allocated funds towards rapid re-housing and prevention combined. The State of California, utilizes the maximum ESG funds allowable for shelters (60%) allocates 40% to rapid re-housing and prevention. One of the four awards made to this CoC went to rapid re-housing. Local jurisdictional recipients approved a greater portion of funds to rapid re-housing because of the success of HPRP and because emergency shelter is generally funded through other local and federal sources. However, given that over 50% of the CoC’s homeless population is unsheltered, the need for shelter in the county far exceeds the supply and local planners are concerned about maintaining shelter capacity with shrinking resources.

3C-4 Describe the CoC's efforts to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless within the CoC's entire geographic area. (limit 1000 characters)
The CoC works aggressively with mainstream systems such as health care, foster care, probation and corrections to ensure their clients are not discharged into homelessness. Behavioral health care, foster care and probation have all established rapid re-housing and prevention funds with which CoC providers assist their participants to exit to or maintain stable housing. While ESG funds have been prioritized for rapid re-housing, a small portion is being used for shelter diversion, providing resources at the front door to shelter to avoid an entry whenever possible. The Child Welfare and Probation housing programs both also include prevention resources. The Con Plan jurisdictions note the following impediments to fair housing choice—insufficient income, discrimination against income source, and lack of accessible features in housing. The CoC prevention strategy of using housing specialists in conjunction with rental assistance supports vulnerable households in overcoming these barriers through advocacy with landlords on income amounts and sources as well as ensuring accessibility through reasonable accommodation.

3C-5 Describe how the CoC coordinates with other Federal, State, local, private and other entities serving the homeless and those at risk of homelessness in the planning and operation of projects. (limit 1000 characters)

Local jurisdictions coordinate with the CoC in using HOME, HOPWA, and CDBG to address homelessness. HCD allocates HOPWA dollars for both capital and operations of projects that serve the homeless, including $1 million annually for a PSH program, a shelter and an AIDS housing hotline operated by 211. Oakland invested HOME and local Housing Trust Funds, to build 300 units of housing targeted to homeless persons. Cities use CDBG funds for homeless safety net services. Working with CoC providers, TANF funds and Title IV-E Waiver funds assist families to keep or obtain permanent housing. Alameda County has used Mental Health Services Act funding to develop hundreds of PSH units and spends $5 million annually to provide short- and long-term housing subsidies for homeless individuals with serious mental health issues. Head Start has a center located in the heart of hundreds of family PSH units at the redeveloped Alameda Naval Air Station. There are no RHYA funded services in Alameda County. Finally, the CoC advocated to secure hundreds of thousands in grants from local foundations to support rapid re-housing and prevention services during the recession that are still in place today.

3C-6 Describe the extent in which the PHA(s) within the CoC’s geographic area are engaged in the CoC efforts to prevent and end homelessness. (limit 1000 characters)
Alameda County CoC’s PHAs are major partners in efforts to prevent and end homelessness. Examples include, the Oakland Housing Authority (OHA), the Housing of the County of Alameda (HACA) and City of Alameda Housing Authority (AHA), all administer S+C rental assistance under contract to HCD. AHA administers 30 Sect 8 Mod Rehab vouchers for PSH at Alameda Point. Berkeley Housing Authority administers these vouchers in the City’s two major supportive housing developments and provides project-based rental assistance for Harmon Gardens, PSH targeting homeless TAY. OHA has provided hundreds of project-based vouchers for PSH developments in Oakland, including the recently opened Savoy and California Hotel with 64 homeless targeted units between them. OHA, the City, and a team of CoC providers operate a Housing First program for more than 200 people from the streets and shelters of Oakland. HACA administers 157 Mental Health Services Act funded vouchers for homeless Behavioral Health Care clients. Finally, HACA and OHA administer 205 VASH vouchers and help to ensure that they are awarded to chronically homeless, vulnerable vets.

3C-7 Describe the CoC’s plan to assess the barriers to entry present in projects funded through the CoC Program as well as ESG (e.g. income eligibility requirements, lengthy period of clean time, background checks, credit checks, etc.), and how the CoC plans to remove those barriers. (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has assessed and is eliminating barriers to entry in CoC and ESG funded projects as well as broadly across the continuum starting with aggressively promoting the principle that housing (emergency, transitional and permanent) should not be a reward for clinical success but available with the lowest barriers to entry and retention. In 2010 the Property Management Committee assessed entrance barriers to PSH and affordable housing. With HUD funded TA, TH was assessed in 2012. Both found programs with more stringent sobriety, income, criminal background and credit check requirements than HUD requires. For PSH the Committee developed and promoted leasing practices that eliminated questions regarding substance use, lowered criminal history, income and credit benchmarks. They have been adopted by PSH developers and local housing funders. For TH and ES the CoC developed trainings on Housing First, Harm Reduction and Trauma Informed Care that promoted eliminating those entrance barriers. To date, eliminating barriers has been voluntary, and many programs have. The CoC local application scores providers on the extent to which these barriers are gone.

3C-8 Describe the extent in which the CoC and its permanent supportive housing recipients have adopted a housing first approach. (limit 1000 characters)
The CoC Strategic Plan published in 2006 indicated that the Continuum and its providers would explore and pilot the Housing First model. Since then the approach has been broadly adopted, with providers, local funders, advocates and CoC staff describing us as a Housing First Continuum. All new projects must use it and are targeted to the highest barrier households. For example, the 2011 bonus project, AC Impact, is housing persons on the street with the highest volume of encounters with local law enforcement, often for behaviors associated with addiction and untreated mental illness. Existing PSH recipients have changed entrance requirements and housing retention strategies to embrace the approach. Applicants for housing do not have to demonstrate med compliance or sobriety, and tenants do not lose their housing if they go off their meds or abuse substances. 99% of HUD funded PSH units in the continuum assert that they use the Housing First approach to operate their program. The challenge now is to ensure consistency of praxis across the Continuum.

3C-9 Describe how the CoC's centralized or coordinated assessment system is used to ensure the homeless are placed in the appropriate housing and provided appropriate services based on their level of need. (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC is piloting centralized assessment starting with chronically homeless through Home Stretch, a project launched in 2013 to accelerate our reductions in CH by housing the most vulnerable, long-term homeless. The coordinated assessment is being piloted county-wide for this population. The process is easily accessible because it can be incorporated into a program intake or street outreach. The tool builds on the HMIS intake, includes an ROI, incorporates the Vulnerability Index, and gathers information that will assist in a housing match. Information gathered is then input into a data base managed by Behavioral Health Care Services which has data sharing agreements with other County systems to determine use of other services such as hospitals, emergency services, general assistance, and the county jail. The most vulnerable and highest end users are then prioritized for openings in PSH. PSH providers notify Home Stretch of openings and unit requirements and BHCS sends several eligible persons. The tool and the process are being piloted through 2014 with a plan to expand it to the entire homeless population, until then, it is not being advertised to the public.

3C-10 Describe the procedures used to market housing and supportive services to eligible persons regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, familial status, or disability who are least likely to request housing or services in the absence of special outreach. (limit 1000 characters)

The EveryOne Home Property Management Committee has developed a set of leasing guidelines that were piloted by 3 affordable housing developers in 2011. The guidelines recommended strategies for reaching eligible persons who might not apply without special outreach. Those strategies included very assertive marketing of the units through service providers such as shelters and drop-in centers, training of case managers and housing specialist on the requirements of the application so that they could assist their participants in completing it, and having supportive services involved in the leasing process from the beginning to serve as an advocate for these applicants. All approaches were tried in one or more projects to great success, and developers have adopted and incorporated these approaches as routine for opening new projects.
3C-11 Describe the established policies that are currently in place that require all homeless service providers to ensure all children are enrolled in early childhood education programs or in school, as appropriate, and connected to appropriate services within the community. (limit 1000 characters)

Homeless providers in Alameda County have long established policies requiring that children enroll in school immediately upon program entry. They have worked with local school districts to ensure rapid enrollment, often in as little as three business days. These policies predate the establishment of the CoC and make it unnecessary for it to establish a duplicative set of policies. In addition to rapid enrollment, local school districts allow homeless families to stay in a school until a natural break in the semester or year even if the family re-locates to another program and thereby another school district. CoC providers also work closely with Head Start to ensure that younger participants get access to early childhood education.

3C-12 Describe the steps the CoC, working with homeless assistance providers, is taking to collaborate with local education authorities to ensure individuals and families who become or remain homeless are informed of their eligibility for McKinney-Vento educational services. (limit 1000 characters)

McKinney-Vento Coordinators from the local school districts are active members of the CoC committees and work closely with local providers to ensure that homeless children are accessing local educational resources. Coordinators come to local shelters and transitional housing sites to inform families of their eligibility on a regular basis and work with the case managers to support children’s successful participation in school. Providers and the school districts provide transportation vouchers and school supplies to families living in CoC programs.

3C-13 Describe how the CoC collaborates, or will collaborate, with emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent housing providers to ensure families with children under the age of 18 are not denied admission or separated when entering shelter or housing. (limit 1000 characters)

All ESG or CoC funded emergency shelters are informed of and compliant with the policy that requires them to ensure families with children under age 18 are not denied admission or separated when entering shelter or housing. Local ESG rating and ranking asks shelters and transitional housing to confirm their compliance and articulate what procedures and policies are in place to implement it. All funded providers have provided the CoC with satisfactory evidence of their compliance.
3C-14 What methods does the CoC utilize to monitor returns to homelessness by persons, including, families who exited rapid re-housing? Include the processes the CoC has in place to ensure minimal returns to homelessness.

Returns to homelessness for households served by rapid re-housing are under 3% continuum-wide. Persons and families served by rapid re-housing are rarely served the full 18 or 24 months allowed by regulations and are thereby encouraged to contact the program if a new housing crisis arises before losing their housing. Housing Case Managers frequently maintain contact with households monthly for 3-6 months post the rental assistance to confirm the household remains stably housed. The HMIS is an open data system and staff can access the service record of a new person seeking services even if it was with a different agency and can potentially intervene to protect or regain that housing before shelter entry.

3C-15 Does the CoC intend for any of its SSO or TH projects to serve families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes?

No

3C-15.1 If yes, describe how the use of grant funds to serve such persons is of equal or greater priority than serving persons defined as homeless in accordance with 24 CFR 578.89. Description must include whether or not this is listed as a priority in the Consolidated Plan(s) and its CoC strategic plan goals. CoCs must attach the list of projects that would be serving this population (up to 10 percent of CoC total award) and the applicable portions of the Consolidated Plan.

3C-16 Has the project been impacted by a major disaster, as declared by President Obama under Title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Act in the 12 months prior to the opening of the FY 2013 CoC Program Competition?

No

3C-16.1 If 'Yes', describe the impact of the natural disaster on specific projects in the CoC and how this affected the CoC's ability to address homelessness and provide the necessary reporting to HUD.

(limit 1500 characters)
3D. Continuum of Care (CoC) Coordination with Strategic Plan Goals

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

In 2013, applications submitted to HUD for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program will be evaluated in part based on the extent in which they further the achievement of HUD's goals as articulated in HUD's Strategic Plan and the Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (FSP).

3D-1 Describe how the CoC is incorporating the goals of Opening Doors in local plans established to prevent and end homelessness and the extent in which the CoC is on target to meet these goals. (limit 1000 characters)

The COC and its stakeholders have made progress on all four of the Opening Doors key goals. 1. Chronic homelessness has been reduced by 27% in the last decade, and 17% in the last two years (Please see the attached report of the CoC Homeless Count Key Findings) This summer CoC leaders attended the 100,000 Homes Rapid Results Boot Camp and came away with new strategies to finish the job of ending chronic homelessness. Three primary strategies are: prioritize PSH for the most vulnerable, create a centralized prioritized list of CH persons, and create standardized practices for housing navigators to work with unsheltered CH to house them quickly. The team set a goal of increasing CH housing placements from 40 per month to 80 per month in order to get to zero by the end of 2015. The central assessment list launched in October and placements are over 50 per month. Strategies for goals 2, veterans and 3, families are discussed below. The CoC’s work to transform the homeless system of care and improve exits to permanent housing have put the community on the path to ending all forms of homelessness (Goal 4).

3D-2 Describe the CoC’s current efforts, including the outreach plan, to end homelessness among households with dependent children. (limit 750 characters)

Since 2003 the CoC has reduced the # of persons in households with children by 52%, from over half the homeless population to just under 1/3, 462 families in 2013. At this pace, the CoC is on track to end family homelessness by 2020. Historically, the CoC invested most in TH and PSH for families, but saw RRH have a great impact on reducing the numbers during HPRP. It has committed to expanding the RRH approach. To this end, it has converted a scattered site transitional program for 47 families into a RRH project that expects to serve double the families for less time. It reallocated SSO funding to a new RRH program in 2013 and is working with the Social Services Agency to rapidly rehouse child welfare involved families and TANF recipients. The partnership with Child Welfare has helped 100+ families and is extended through June of 2014.
3D-3 Describe the CoC's current efforts to address the needs of victims of domestic violence, including their families. Response should include a description of services and safe housing from all funding sources that are available within the CoC to serve this population. (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has emergency, transitional and permanent housing to meet the needs of DV victims and their families. Alameda County has five domestic violence providers that operate 24 hour hotlines and emergency shelters with a 143-bed capacity. Family Violence Law Center also has capacity to provide emergency hotel vouchers after hours and when shelters are full. Four of the five providers participate in the CoC funded Linkages Rapid Rehousing Program giving them access to scattered-site permanent housing with transitional subsidies and case management support. Building Futures also provides RRH in partnership with the City of Oakland’s OPRI collaborative as well as operating 30 units of PSH and 22 units of TH targeted to survivors of domestic violence. Domestic violence programs use comparable data bases and do not enter client data into HMIS. Property addresses are not published and are physically secured with fencing and alarms where appropriate.

3D-4 Describe the CoC’s current efforts to address homelessness for unaccompanied youth. Response should include a description of services and housing from all funding sources that are available within the CoC to address homelessness for this subpopulation. Indicate whether or not the resources are available for all youth or are specific to youth between the ages of 16-17 or 18-24. (limit 1000 characters)

Alameda County has a strong TAY provider network with 200 beds of independent housing to non minor dependents (ages 18-21) in foster care which allows other providers to target resources to non-systems youth, offering a range of services from street outreach to emergency shelter, to TH, to PSH. The CoC supports the Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative with CoC resources. Three providers, First Place for Youth, East Oakland Community Project, and Covenant House collectively operate 25 TH beds for unaccompanied youth ages 16-24. Covenant House also has 25 emergency beds and 15 TH beds available to all unaccompanied youth in Alameda County. The Fred Finch Youth Center and Satellite Affordable Housing Associates operate 15 units of PSH targeting TAY and are developing a 42 unit PSH project targeting at risk youth leaving foster care. Dream Catcher Youth Shelter is a 10-bed shelter for minors up to the age of 18 and YEAH in Berkeley operates a 24-bed winter shelter for unaccompanied youth. All providers subscribe to the strategic plan’s goal of ensuring homeless people of all ages get permanently housed as soon as possible with the level of services they need for stability.

3D-5 Describe the efforts, including the outreach plan, to identify and engage persons who routinely sleep on the streets or in other places not meant for human habitation. (limit 750 characters)
The CoC has a number of outreach programs including Square One in Berkeley, Operation Dignity in Oakland, Health Care for the Homeless mobile health vans for the entire county, and Abode’s HOPE Street Outreach program, which serves sites in Fremont, Livermore and Hayward for 900 households each year. These programs include case management and clinical staff and partner with local Police and Human Services Departments to identify people on the streets needing assistance. Square One, Operation Dignity and HOPE have Housing First housing subsidies, which operate on principles of harm reduction and consumer choice, not requiring sobriety or med compliance to get housed. These programs are funded with Oakland, Berkley and the City of Albany general funds, and the Health Services Agency funds HOPE with proceeds from a locally passed sales tax.

3D-6 Describe the CoC’s current efforts to combat homelessness among veterans, particularly those ineligible for homeless assistance and housing through the Department of Veterans Affairs programs (i.e., HUD-VASH, SSVF and Grant Per Diem). Response should include a description of services and housing from all funding sources that exist to address homelessness among veterans. 

(limit 1000 characters)

Over the last decade veterans’ homelessness has declined 13%. Improved coordination with the VA and among providers positions the CoC to accelerate those results over the next two years, with the goal of ending veterans’ homelessness locally by the end of 2015. Representatives from the VA serve on multiple committees, which helped to ensure that 100% of the most recent round of VASH vouchers went to chronically homeless vets. Operation Dignity, the CoC’s largest veterans services provider collaborates with ABODE Services on a $2 million SSVF Program which has served over 400 veterans since October 2012 with an average permanent housing rate of 90%, and 10-25% of households connected to VASH. In concert with other SSVF providers, a shared referral system for streamlined and targeted referrals that truly meet the needs of the veterans has been established. Other collaborating agencies include BFHP, EOCP, Swords to Plowshares, and EBCRP, which each have an Alameda county based SSVF program.
3E. Reallocation

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

3E-1 Is the CoC reallocating funds from one or more eligible expiring grant(s) into one or more new permanent supportive housing projects dedicated to chronically homeless persons?

Yes

3E-2 Is the CoC reallocating funds from one or more eligible expiring grant(s) into one or more new rapid re-housing project for families?

Yes

3E-2.1 If the CoC is planning to reallocate funds to create one or more new rapid re-housing project for families, describe how the CoC is already addressing chronic homelessness through other means and why the need to create new rapid re-housing for families is of greater need than creating new permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless persons. (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has reallocated funds to create two new projects, one for Rapid Re-housing for 38 families annually and one for 29 units of PSH for chronically homeless persons. The expansion of both types of housing are needed in the CoC. Adding this RRH project ensures that families in Oakland and Berkeley continue to be served now that the former Homeless Families Support Network, CoC funded TH program, has changed its target population from families to singles. RRH is a very effective model for families as the Linkages Project clearly demonstrates in Southern and Eastern Alameda County. The CoC wanted the model to cover the entire geography of the continuum, which it will should this new project be awarded funding. The CoC is committed to accelerating our progress reducing chronic homelessness, without risking the progress made on family homelessness. The reallocation balance submitted in this project will help the CoC achieve both federal strategic objectives.

3E-3 If the CoC responded 'Yes' to either of the questions above, has the recipient of the eligible renewing project being reallocated been notified?

Yes
3F. Reallocation - Grant(s) Eliminated

CoCs planning to reallocate into new permanent supportive housing projects for chronically homeless individuals may do so by reducing one or more expiring eligible renewal projects. CoCs that are eliminating projects entirely must identify those projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliminated Project Name</th>
<th>Grant Number Eliminated</th>
<th>Component Type</th>
<th>Annual Renewal Amount</th>
<th>Type of Reallocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Services...</td>
<td>CA0098L9T021205</td>
<td>SSO</td>
<td>$879,703</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco Court</td>
<td>CA0107L9T021205</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>$97,978</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount Available for New Project:
(Sum of All Eliminated Projects)

$977,681
3F. Reallocation - Grant(s) Eliminated Details

3F-1 Complete each of the fields below for each grant that is being eliminated during the FY2013 reallocation process. CoCs should refer to the final HUD approved FY2013 Grant Inventory Worksheet to ensure all information entered here is accurate.

**Eliminated Project Name:** Homeless Services One Stop Employment Center

**Grant Number of Eliminated Project:** CA0098L9T021205

**Eliminated Project Component Type:** SSO

**Eliminated Project Annual Renewal Amount:** $879,703

3F-2 Describe how the CoC determined that this project should be eliminated.
(limit 750 characters)

Prior to rating and ranking applications, the NOFA Committee determined that based on HUD’s funding priorities, any TH or SSO project whose score placed it in Tier 2 was extremely unlikely to be funded and thereby determined that such projects would be reallocated to new permanent housing. This project’s performance was well below HUD and local benchmarks, seeing less than 15% of its participants exit with employment income. It was not cost effective, and the NOFA committee determined that these dollars could be more effective if used on housing programs.

3F. Reallocation - Grant(s) Eliminated Details

3F-1 Complete each of the fields below for each grant that is being eliminated during the FY2013 reallocation process. CoCs should refer to the final HUD approved FY2013 Grant Inventory Worksheet to ensure all information entered here is accurate.

**Eliminated Project Name:** Pacheco Court

**Grant Number of Eliminated Project:** CA0107L9T021205

**Eliminated Project Component Type:** TH

**Eliminated Project Annual Renewal Amount:** $97,978
3F-2 Describe how the CoC determined that this project should be eliminated.
(limit 750 characters)

This project elected not to request renewal funding. The provider and the CoC determined several years ago that based on the population served and the physical plant, the project was ideal for PSH. Unfortunately, HUD would not allow the project to convert to this use via contract amendment. The project is negotiating with Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services and Housing and Community Development to fund operations using project based vouchers from the Mental Health Services Act and Shelter Plus Care. If funding is identified it will allow the project to continue housing persons with disabling mental health conditions on a permanent basis.
3G. Reallocation - Grant(s) Reduced

CoCs that choose to reallocate funds into new rapid rehousing or new permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless persons may do so by reducing the grant amount for one or more eligible expiring renewal projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced Project Name</th>
<th>Reduced Grant Number</th>
<th>Annual Renewal Amount</th>
<th>Amount Retained</th>
<th>Amount available for new project</th>
<th>Reallocation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Sufficiency ...</td>
<td>CA0115L9T021205</td>
<td>$750,177</td>
<td>$486,800</td>
<td>$263,377</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Available for New Project (Sum of All Reduced Projects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$263,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3G. Reallocation - Grant(s) Reduced Details

3G-1 Complete each of the fields below for each eligible renewal grant that is being reduced during the FY2013 reallocation process. CoCs should refer to the final HUD approved FY2013 Grant Inventory Worksheet to ensure all information entered here is accurate.

Reduced Project Name: Self Sufficiency Project
Grant Number of Reduced Project: CA0115L9T021205
Reduced Project Current Annual Renewal Amount: $750,177
Amount Retained for Project: $486,800
Amount available for New Project(s): $263,377
(This amount will auto-calculate by selecting "Save" button)

3G-2 Describe how the CoC determined that this project should be reduced.
(limit 750 characters)

Prior to rating and ranking applications, the NOFA Committee determined that based on HUD’s funding priorities, any TH or SSO project whose score placed it in Tier 2 was extremely unlikely to be funded and thereby determined that such projects would be reallocated to new permanent housing. This project’s performance and activity type earned it the second lowest score of renewing projects. Because it provides essential services to chronically homeless people in Berkeley and Hayward the Committee reduced the grant to a budget that fit it into Tier 1 so that it could continue to serve this population. In informing the project of its reduced amount the CoC noted that the project’s current performance put future funding at risk, and the CoC and local funders will be working with them to improve.
3H. Reallocation - New Project(s)

CoCs must identify the new project(s) it plans to create and provide the requested information for each project.

Sum of All New Reallocated Project Requests
(Must be less than or equal to total amount(s) eliminated and/or reduced)

$1,241,038

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Priority #</th>
<th>New Project Name</th>
<th>Component Type</th>
<th>Transferred Amount</th>
<th>Reallocation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>$620,519</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>North County...</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>$620,519</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3H. Reallocation - New Project(s) Details

3H-1 Complete each of the fields below for each new project created through reallocation in the FY2013 CoC Program Competition. CoCs can only reallocate funds to new permanent housing—either permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless or rapid re-housing for homeless households with children.

FY2013 Rank (from Project Listing): 49
    Proposed New Project Name: Welcome Home
    Component Type: PH
    Amount Requested for New Project: $620,519

3H. Reallocation - New Project(s) Details

3H-1 Complete each of the fields below for each new project created through reallocation in the FY2013 CoC Program Competition. CoCs can only reallocate funds to new permanent housing—either permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless or rapid re-housing for homeless households with children.

FY2013 Rank (from Project Listing): 50
    Proposed New Project Name: North County Family Rapid Rehousing
    Component Type: PH
    Amount Requested for New Project: $620,519
3I. Reallocation: Balance Summary

3I-1 Below is the summary of the information entered on forms 3D-3H. and the last field, “Remaining Reallocation Balance” should equal “0.” If there is a balance remaining, this means that more funds are being eliminated or reduced than the new project(s) requested. CoCs cannot create a new reallocated project for an amount that is greater than the total amount of reallocated funds available for new projects.

Reallocation Chart: Reallocation Balance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reallocated funds available for new project(s):</td>
<td>$1,241,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount requested for new project(s):</td>
<td>$1,241,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Reallocation Balance:</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Performance

Instructions
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

4A-1 How does the CoC monitor the performance of its recipients on HUD-established performance goals? (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has had a performance management initiative in place for four years. In 2010, the community implemented local performance outcomes and benchmarks for each sector of the CoC from street outreach to permanent supportive housing. The measures are consistent with those of HUD and the HEARTH Act. They include maintaining/obtaining permanent housing, reducing time homeless, reducing returns to homelessness, and obtaining income from employment/mainstream benefits. This data is reported on for individual projects and the system as a whole through HMIS and published on an annual basis in a report that is both printed and available on the CoC website (The 2012 Outcomes Success Report is attached) The CoC uses this system-wide progress report and the APR data submitted through the local rating and ranking process to monitor performance remotely. Jurisdictional ESG and CoC grantees are responsible for on-site monitoring and alert the CoC if there are concerns. In 2013 CoC funded PSH projects formally committed to prioritize the chronically homeless for a given percentage of turnover beds. The CoC and HMIS will develop a reporting tool to track the results of those commitments.

4A-2 How does the CoC assist project recipients to reach HUD-established performance goals? (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC provides training and technical assistance to improve performance, including but not limited to: how to improve exits to permanent housing, how to access mainstream benefits, how to generate and interpret HMIS outcomes reports, and using data to support performance improvement. EveryOne Home has developed a curriculum, known at the EveryOne Housed Academy (Facilitation Plan attached), to teach agencies to translate best practices such as housing first and rapid rehousing into program policies and practices. Providers send a team of 4-7 staff to the two-day training. A total of 11 agencies and over 75 employees completed the first two Academies and are seeing improvements in their performance. Last year in partnership with a local foundation the CoC created two cash awards for projects with highest rates and most improved rates of obtaining permanent housing in the shortest time. Unrestricted grants of $10,000 and $5,000 respectively were awarded at a ceremony this past July. This year the CoC will focus its trainings teaching front line staff to utilize a new screening tool for assessing and prioritizing for housing the most vulnerable homeless individuals and families.
4A-3 How does the CoC assist recipients that are underperforming to increase capacity? (limit 1000 characters)

As noted above, the EveryOne Housed Academy was targeted to lower performing providers. Jurisdictional grantees also provide individual TA to providers on issues of reporting and funding draws. HMIS staff provides monthly trainings to license and update data base users and provides assistance with running reports and submitting APR’s. In 2013 the CoC began individual TA with grantees who were not fully expending their CoC grants to explore strategies for improvement, which was reflected in improved spending rates in this year’s local applications. CoC staff and local project funders meet with individual projects that are not meeting performance benchmarks with the goal of improving performance and the consequence of defunding if performance is not improved.

4A-4 What steps has the CoC taken to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless? (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has been unable to establish a clear way of tracking length of time homeless over multiple program stays and would appreciate clarity and technical guidance from HUD on this measure. As a proxy it tracks and reports on the average lengths of stay in every program and for each sector of the CoC, including all ESG and CoC funded projects. Between 2010 and 2011 our local lengths of stay in emergency and transitional housing before exiting to permanent housing went down 10% and 6% respectively. Though the CoC continues to work with providers to bring down lengths of program stay, the results were the same in 2012 as 2011. Providers focused more on maintaining high rates of housing placement.

4A-5 What steps has the CoC taken to reduce returns to homelessness of individuals and families in the CoC’s geography? (limit 1000 characters)

Returns to homelessness remain very low for all individuals and families exiting the homeless system to permanent housing, even in cases where the exits are to unsubsidized housing. As part of the countywide performance measures, the CoC has been tracking returns to the homeless system on a CoC wide and sector basis since 2010. The CoC considers a return to homeless to be a person or household that left one of our HMIS programs, including drop-ins and street outreach programs as well as emergency shelters, TH, RRH and PSH, for permanent housing and reentered a program with a status of homelessness within 12 months. Based on this calculation method the CoC’s return to homelessness rate was 7% in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

4A-6 What specific outreach procedures has the CoC developed to assist homeless service providers in the outreach efforts to engage homeless individuals and families? (limit 1000 characters)
Several street outreach programs operate throughout the County which reach homeless persons on the street and other outside locations. In late 2013 the CoC began working with these providers to standardize procedures for street outreach as part of the Home Stretch effort to accelerate our results in reducing chronic homelessness. The work is currently in a facilitated peer to peer information sharing stage, which will result in the development of standards for outreach and housing navigation that can be used across the continuum.
4B. Section 3 Employment Policy

Instructions

*** TBD ****

4B-1 Are any new proposed project applications requesting $200,000 or more in funding?

Yes

4B-1.1 If yes, which activities will the project(s) undertake to ensure employment and other economic opportunities are directed to low or very low income persons?

As with most projects serving the homeless, new employment opportunities are distributed widely to all homeless service agencies. Since the budgets of the new projects submitted are largely rental assistance, the number of jobs created by these projects will be minimal.

4B-2 Are any of the projects within the CoC requesting funds for housing rehabilitation or new constructions?

No

4B-2.1 If yes, which activities will the project undertake to ensure employment and other economic opportunities are directed to low or very low income persons:
4C. Accessing Mainstream Resources

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2013 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2013 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical question to the OneCPD Ask A Question at https://www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question/.

4C-1 Does the CoC systematically provide information about mainstream resources and training on how to identify eligibility and program changes for mainstream programs to provider staff?

Yes

4C-2 Indicate the percentage of homeless assistance providers that are implementing the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless assistance providers supply transportation assistance to clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments, employment training, or jobs.</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless assistance providers use a single application form for four or more mainstream programs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless assistance providers have staff systematically follow-up to ensure mainstream benefits are received.</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4C-3 Does the CoC make SOAR training available for all recipients and subrecipients at least annually?

No

4C-3.1 If yes, indicate the most recent training date:

4C-4 Describe how the CoC is preparing for implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in the state in which the CoC is located. Response should address the extent in which project recipients and subrecipients will participate in enrollment and outreach activities to ensure eligible households are able to take advantage of new healthcare options. (limit 1000 characters)
Alameda County actively participated in a state and federally-sponsored Low Income Health Program designed to prepare county health systems for Affordable Care Act changes. Through this project, Alameda County “pre-enrolled” over 41,000 of estimated 50-55,000 eligible individuals in Medicaid, hundreds of whom previously experienced homelessness. CoC organizations were provided with information and resources related to the expansion of health insurance coverage and several of these organizations have established themselves as health insurance enrollment sites. Those include Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency, LifeLong Medical Care, East Bay Community Recovery Project, and Health Care for the Homeless. Additionally, The Health Care Services Agency has applied for a state grant to fund additional outreach and enrollment resources for homeless persons and will, along with the CoC, continue to promote enrollment resources to provider agencies.

4C-5 What specific steps is the CoC taking to work with recipients to identify other sources of funding for supportive services in order to reduce the amount of CoC Program funds being used to pay for supportive service costs? (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has worked closely with project recipients and the Health Care Services Agency to look at all opportunities for HCSA to fund services, allowing the CoC to reallocate funding to permanent housing. The CoC has convened several local funders from Social Services, Behavioral Health, HCD, and the Human Services Departments of Oakland and Berkeley to explore what elements of the CoC project budgets can more appropriately be funded by them. These local funders often contribute more services dollars than are needed for the local match, so already have investment in the project. This group is committed to working its way through the package project by project, starting with the SSO projects and then looking at TH projects that also might be best funded through other sources. This year 1.2 million of SSO funding is being proposed for conversion to PH.
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<td>Yes</td>
<td>2013 GIW</td>
<td>01/24/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013 Rank (from Project Listing)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FY2013 Rank</td>
<td>01/31/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CoC Policies &amp; Pr...</td>
<td>01/24/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sec4A EveryOne Ho...</td>
<td>01/31/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sec3D Key Finding...</td>
<td>01/31/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects to Serve Persons Defined as Homeless under Category 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Solicitation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Public Solicitation</td>
<td>01/31/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment Details

Document Description: Consolidated Plan Certifications

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC-HMIS Governance Agreement

Attachment Details

Document Description: NOFA CoC Rating and Review

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC Process for Making Cuts

Attachment Details

Document Description: FY2013 Chronic Homeless Project Prioritization List
Document Description: 2013 GIW

Attachment Details

Document Description: FY2013 Rank

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC Policies & Procedures Manual

Attachment Details

Document Description: Sec4A EveryOne Housed Curriculum and Outcomes Report

Attachment Details

Document Description: Sec3D Key Findings Report

Attachment Details

Document Description: Public Solicitation
Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan

I certify that the proposed activities/projects in the application are consistent with the jurisdiction's current, approved Consolidated Plan.

Applicant Name: See attached list

Project Name: See attached list

Location of the Project: See attached list

Name of the Federal Program to which the applicant is applying: Continuum of Care Program

Name of Certifying Jurisdiction: City of Berkeley

Certifying Official of the Jurisdiction: Christine Daniel

Title: City Manager

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 1/22/14
Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan

I certify that the proposed activities/projects in the application are consistent with the jurisdiction's current, approved Consolidated Plan.

(Type or clearly print the following information):

Applicant Name: See attached list

Project Name: See attached list

Location of the Project: See attached list

Name of the Federal Program to which the applicant is applying: Continuum of Care Program

Name of Certifying Jurisdiction: City of Oakland

Certifying Official of the Jurisdiction: Lisa Brown

Title: Manager, CDBG Programs/Commercial Lending

Signature: [Signature]

Date: January 24, 2014
I certify that the proposed activities/projects in the application are consistent with the jurisdiction's current, approved Consolidated Plan.

(Applicant Name: See attached list)

(Project Name: See attached list)

(Location of the Project: See attached list)

(Name of the Federal Program to which the applicant is applying: Continuum of Care Program)

(Name of Certifying Jurisdiction: Alameda County HOME Consortium)

(Certifying Official of the Jurisdiction Name: Linda M. Gardner)

(Title: Director, Housing and Community Development Department)

(Signature: [Signature])

(Date: 1/21/14)
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Renewal Projects

1. Channing Way Apartments $33,710
   Bonita House, Inc. operates Channing Apartments, which provides permanent supportive housing for homeless adults with a dual diagnosis of a severe, persistent psychiatric disability and co-occurring substance use disorder for four individuals in Berkeley.

2. Concord House $71,524
   Concord House provides safe, service-enriched permanent housing to eight homeless adults disabled by HIV and AIDS in unincorporated Alameda County. On-site supportive services include: clinical and peer case management, health education and counseling, drug and alcohol counseling, benefits advocacy, conflict resolution and mediation, community building, and life skills development.

3. Lorenzo Creek $100,788
   The Lorenzo Creek Project provides permanent supportive housing for seven families with disabilities in Castro Valley.

4. Regent Street $76,967
   Developed by Resources for Community Development and operated by Building Opportunities for Self-sufficiency (BOSS), Regent House in Berkeley provides six units of permanent service-enriched housing for homeless single men and women who are disabled by HIV or AIDS.

5. Spirit of Hope I $44,962
   Located at the former Alameda Naval Air Station, Spirit of Hope I offers permanent housing for families and families with disabilities. Specifically, the project serves large families who are currently living on the streets or in shelter, and operates to create a healthy community through a village model of interdependence.

6. Alameda Point Permanent $188,290
   Alameda County Housing and Community Development is the grantee for Alameda Point Permanent, which provides 23 units of permanent housing at Alameda Point.

7. Russell Street Residence $258,461
   The Berkeley Emergency Food and Housing Project operates the Russell Street Residence, a permanent supportive housing project that serves 14 severely mentally disabled homeless individuals at a former board and care facility in South Berkeley.

8. Peter Babcock House $37,363
   Affordable Housing Associates (AHA) operates Peter Babcock House, which provides permanent supportive housing for five individuals living with HIV/AIDS in Berkeley.

9. Walker House $212,473
   Walker House in Oakland, operated by the Ark of Refuge, provides permanent supportive housing for 10 homeless, medically fragile dual and triply diagnosed adults living with disabling HIV disease and/or other disabilities who have critical need of care and supervision. Supportive services include attendant care by nursing attendants, meals, registered nurse case management, medication management (to assist with complex medical regimens), and on-site drug counseling as well as a 24-hour supervision for medical emergencies and crisis intervention.

10. STAY Well Housing Project $539,714
    Stay Well, operated by Abode Services, is a permanent housing program for Transition Age Youth (TAY) ages 18 to 25 who have a diagnosed mental health disability. Abode Services works with landlords throughout the county, serving as the master tenant and then subleasing units to participants in the Stay Well Housing Program.

11. Families in Transition Project $249,815
    The City of Oakland’s Department of Human Services leads this scattered-site transitional housing program for low-income, homeless families. The Families in Transition Program can house up to 10 families of up to 50 individuals for up to 24 months.
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12 Banyan House Transitional
The Family Emergency Shelter Coalition, (FESCO), under the lead agency of Alameda County Housing and Community Development, operates a 24 bed transitional housing facility with on-site supportive services for eight families with children per year in the Cherryland district in unincorporated Alameda County. Services are provided and coordinated by FESCO. $81,320

13 Housing Stabilization Team
Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency’s Housing Stabilization Team provides two levels of service to homeless people with disabilities and special needs: (1) rental subsidies for up to 18 months with case management and services; and (2) services provided on-site in SROs in Oakland to help residents who came from the streets or shelters stabilize in housing. $237,812

14 Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program
The City of Oakland operates the Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program, which provides 14 units of transitional housing for women and their children in Oakland. Childcare, employment training and health care services are provided. $264,765

15 Southern Alameda County Housing/Jobs Linkages Program
This 7-agency collaborative program, led by Alameda County Housing and Community Development (HCD), provides transitional housing subsidies, job preparation and placement, case management and other support services to homeless families throughout Mid, South and Eastern Alameda County. The program serves approximately 47 families at a time. Partners include Abode Services, FESCO, ESP, Building Futures with Women and Children, SAVE, and Tri-Valley Haven. $1,095,078

16 McKinley Family Transitional House
Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency operates McKinley House, a transitional house that serves homeless families for 3-18 months in Berkeley. McKinley House has seven bedrooms and can serve 24 adults and children with support services, skills building, and other services to move into stable, self-sufficient living. $75,919

17 Bessie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional Housing
Alameda Point Collaborative operates the Bessie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional Housing, which provides 44 units of transitional housing for homeless families, with units targeting victims of domestic violence and families in recovery at Alameda Point. $195,928

18 North County Women’s Center
Berkeley Emergency Food and Housing Project’s North County Women’s Center offers Alameda County’s homeless women and children a seamless, integrated system of care from streets to home. Since the Spring 2000 completion of expanded transitional housing, the combined emergency shelter, transitional housing, and daytime supportive services at their site in Berkeley provides the entire range of services homeless women and children need, in one location. $390,535

19 Rosa Parks House
Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency operates Rosa Parks House, a transitional housing program in Oakland serving homeless individuals with mental disabilities and/or with HIV/AIDS. Rosa Parks provides transitional housing and supportive services (case management, mental health and recovery services and HIV/AIDS services) to 23 individuals. The program is designed to provide a structure for residents to achieve a level of personal and financial stability in order to move along to a more permanent, independent living arrangement and to sustain that housing over time. $167,162

20 Ashby House
Developed by Resources for Community Development and operated by the Veteran’s Assistance Center, Ashby House, located in Berkeley, provides transitional service-enriched housing for up to 10 homeless veterans at a time seeking to sustain recovery, increase independence, achieve greater self-sufficiency and obtain permanent housing. $56,447
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Oakland Housing Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>$713,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oakland Youth Housing Collaborative, led by City of Oakland Dept. of Human Services, provides transitional housing and supportive services to homeless, runaway and at-risk youth in Oakland. Services provided include drop-in centers, vocational/educational training, life skills training, emotional support and transitional housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Turning Point</td>
<td>$663,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Point, led by Fred Finch Youth Center, provides transitional housing units for youth in Berkeley. Services provided include outreach, life skills training, mental and physical health care, employment, childcare, skills training and transitional housing follow-up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Homeless Families Support Network</td>
<td>$1,864,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Collaborative, led by the City of Oakland, provides 54 units of transitional housing for families at the Henry Robinson Multi-Service Center in downtown Oakland. Case management and a full complement of supportive services are provided at the Center and at the Network's service sites in downtown Oakland and the Fruitvale district. Partners include Henry Robinson Multi-Service Center, Anka Behavioral Care, Inc., and Oakland Homeless Families Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>$70,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Women's Daytime Drop-In Center operates Bridget Transitional House in Berkeley, which provides transitional housing and case management assistance for four single parent homeless women with one or two children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Tri-City FESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>$42,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-City Homeless Coalition's Bridgeway Apartments are comprised of three units located in Union City and eight units in Fremont, seven of which are designated for SHP transitional housing participants. FESCO's Third Street Transitional Housing is a four-unit transitional housing complex located adjacent to FESCO's emergency shelter in Hayward. This project provides transitional housing while participants receive training in order to bridge their employment skills gap.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Harrison House Family Services Program</td>
<td>$117,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency's Harrison House Family Services Program provides transitional housing and comprehensive on-site services to approximately 40 parents and 60+ children per year. Located in West Berkeley, the project provides adult and children's education, training and employment services, recovery support, housing advocacy, case management, meals, and more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 South County Sober Housing</td>
<td>$189,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency operates South County Sober Housing, a transitional housing program in the Cherryland area of unincorporated Alameda County serving 18 homeless individuals who have chronic problems with alcohol and/or drugs or who are dually diagnosed (chronic alcohol and/or drug use with a co-occurring mental disability). The program is designed to provide a structure for residents to achieve a level of personal and financial stability in order to move them along to a more permanent, independent living arrangement and to sustain that housing over time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 InHOUSE (Homeless Management Information System (HMIS))</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about Homelessness, Outcomes, and Service Engagement (InHOUSE) is Alameda County's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). The data in the system is used to assess needs within the Alameda County homeless service system, enumerate the homeless, monitor efforts to end homelessness, and coordinate with multiple systems of care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Berkeley Employment Services</td>
<td>$1,038,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Homeless One-Stop Center in Berkeley meets the employment and training needs of homeless individuals with multiple barriers to self-sufficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30 Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment (RISE) $160,183
Alameda County Housing and Community Development is the lead agency of this six agency collaborative serving disabled homeless people, including veterans, with a range of integrated supportive services focused on assisting participants to obtain and maintain permanent housing. RISE serves 155 participants and their families annually at six partner agency sites in south county, and conducts frequent home visits to scattered residential sites when participants obtain housing.

31 APC - Multi Services Center $1,111,092
The Alameda Point Support Services and Employment Project provides case management, employment training and placement, and comprehensive supportive services to more than 600 formerly homeless adults and children living at the former Alameda Naval Air Station.

32 Health Housing and Integrated Services Network $549,672
Operated by Lifelong Medical Care, the Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network is an interagency partnership which, through the establishment of Integrated Services Teams, provides a full range of support services linked to permanent housing for homeless individuals. Services are provided to 400 tenants each year, the majority of whom has one or more special needs, including serious mental illness, substance use related problems, and HIV/AIDS. The Project provides support services at seven permanent housing sites located across Oakland and Berkeley.

33 Homeless Outreach for People Empowerment (HOPE) $274,929
The City of Fremont's HOPE Project operates a mobile unit providing health, mental health, substance abuse/detoxification services, AIDS/HIV counseling, mediation, employment services and payee/conservatorship assistance to homeless people who are living on the streets or in places not suitable for human habitation in Southern and Eastern Alameda County. The HOPE Project provides services to 137 families and nearly 1,500 individuals. Partners include Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services, Tri-City Homeless Coalition, Tri-Valley Haven and Tri-City Health Center.

34 Self-Sufficiency Project $486,820
Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency's Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) provides comprehensive services to homeless individuals and families with drug/alcohol problems. The project serves 525 singles and 60 families per year at multiple sites throughout Alameda County. Services include drug/alcohol recovery, mental/physical health care, training and employment service, housing advocacy, outreach, case management, and more. SSP is a partnership with Building Futures with Women and Children in San Leandro and works with over 40 other service providers to ensure that participants access all needed services.

35 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA $305,656
The Alameda Point Shelter Plus Care PRA Program provides permanent housing and supportive services to 14 formerly homeless individuals with disabilities and their families at Alameda Point.

36 City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Program - Supportive Housing Network $124,291
The City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Supportive Housing program serves 12 single adults who are homeless with serious and persistent mental illness.

37 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - Lorenzo Creek $142,948
Lorenzo Creek S+C SRA provides nine units of permanent supportive housing for homeless people disabled by serious mental illness, chronic alcohol and drug problems, or AIDS and Related Disorders, and their families in an accessible multifamily housing complex constructed using principles of universal design in Castro Valley.

38 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA $4,403,183
The Alameda County Shelter Plus Care (S+C) Program provides safe, secure housing for homeless people disabled by serious mental illness, chronic alcohol and other drug problems, and/or AIDS and related disorders.

39 City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA $1,971,274
The Berkeley S+C Program is a partnership between the City's Housing Department, Berkeley Mental Health and nine community-based organizations (CBOs). The partner CBOs place individuals in housing, assign case managers to their applicants, and provide a variety of services before and after housing has been found. The
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40 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRA
The Alameda County Shelter Plus Care (S+C) Program provides safe, secure housing for homeless people disabled by serious mental illness, chronic alcohol and other drug problems, and/or AIDS and related disorders. The Sponsor-based Rental Assistance (SRA) component is comprised of 16 individual sponsors and currently assists 66 participants. The SRA component is part of a comprehensive Shelter Plus Care Program which provides $1,066,208

41 City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Program-Pathways
The City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Pathways program serves 11 single adults who are homeless and dually diagnosed with serious and persistent mental illness and a history of drug and/or alcohol dependency. $121,004

42 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO
The Alameda County Shelter Plus Care (S+C) Program provides safe, secure housing for homeless people disabled by serious mental illness, chronic alcohol and other drug problems, and/or AIDS and related disorders. The Sponsor-based Rental Assistance (SRO) component currently assists 59 participants. The SRO component is part of a comprehensive Shelter Plus Care Program which provides rental assistance and support services to more than 400 disabled, formerly homeless individuals and their families throughout Alameda County. $506,808

43 City of Berkeley Shelter Plus Care Program - COACH
The Collaborative Opportunity to Address Chronic Homelessness (COACH) Project is a partnership between the City of Berkeley Housing and Community Services Department, the City's Homeless Outreach Team, the City’s Mental Health Division and Division on Aging Services, the Berkeley Food and Housing Project, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS), the Homeless Action Center (HAC), and LifeLong Medical Care. The program serves chronically homeless adults living on the streets in Berkeley with a serious mental illness and/or a history of drug and alcohol dependency. The program also specifically targets individuals who meet the program criteria who are frequent users of crisis and emergency services. $449,002

44 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - HOST
The Alameda County Shelter Plus Care (S+C) - Homeless Outreach and Stabilization Team (HOST) Project provides permanent housing, rental assistance and supportive services to chronically homeless, seriously mentally ill adults in Alameda County who have been previously unserved by the County's mental health system. $476,578

45 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - FACT
Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - FACT provides permanent supportive housing, Tenant-based Rental Assistance and supportive services to chronically homeless adults with a history of criminal justice system involvement. $359,710

46 Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - HOPE
HOPE Housing is a 24-unit rental assistance program serving chronically homeless single adults who have been identified and engaged through the HOPE mobile clinic program or the Greater HOPE Full Service Partnership. All of the participants have long histories of homelessness, mental health disabilities and other barriers to housing and all are chronically homeless according to HUD’s definition. $310,153

47 Impact
The Alameda County Impact Project (AC Impact) is a collaboration of Abode Services, EveryOne Home, several community-based agencies, and four local cities and police departments (Oakland, Hayward, Fremont and Livermore). AC Impact provides permanent supportive housing to 46 chronically homeless persons living in public unsheltered environments. $868,119
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48 Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI) $421,837
The Oakland PATH Re-housing Initiative (OPRI) is a program that provides permanent housing combined with comprehensive social services for people with the greatest needs: disabled households living in shelters in Oakland and chronically homeless individuals living in Oakland encampments. OPRI serves 25 households, comprised of approximately 32 individuals, through a scattered site leasing model. Success of the program is measured according permanent housing stability, as well as increased self-sufficiency (increased/maintained

Total Renewal Projects $23,579,722

New Projects—Pending HUD Approval

49 Welcome Home $620,519
Welcome Home will provide 30 units of safe and affordable housing along with increased self-sufficiency for chronically homeless individuals and families in Alameda County. It prioritizes people with long histories on the streets with multiple barriers to housing.

50 North County Family Rapid Rehousing $620,519
The North County Family Rapid Rehousing Collaborative will provide rapid rehousing (short and medium term rental assistance and supportive services) to homeless families in Berkeley, Oakland, San Leandro and Alameda who are unsheltered or living in a shelter in one of those cities.

Total New Project $1,241,038

GRAND TOTAL $24,820,760
Overview and Purpose

The Alameda Countywide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) known as InHOUSE is a data collection application that maintains information regarding the characteristics and service needs of individuals. InHOUSE, implemented in June 2005 is an acronym for Information about Homelessness, Outcomes, and Service Engagement. The InHOUSE database system facilitates effective and streamlined services to individuals-served as well as creating information that communities can use to determine the use and effectiveness of services.

The InHOUSE system is designed to benefit multiple stakeholders, including persons using homeless and/or at-risk of homelessness-targeted services, provider agencies, jurisdictions, other systems of care, funders and the community. Improved knowledge gained from InHOUSE about various communities with special needs and their service usage aides with providing a more effective and efficient service delivery system. By community partner agreement, the InHOUSE database operates as a shared system: permission granted by an individual-served allows for all HMIS-entering Covered Homeless Organizations (CHO) to have viewership of client level data (excluding Case Management tasks).

Geographic Area

The InHOUSE data system serves all 14 cities within Alameda County, including unincorporated jurisdictions.

Alameda County Continuum of Care (CoC) Responsibilities

The Alameda County CoC is responsible for:
• Designating a single information system as the official HMIS software for the geographic area.
• Designating an HMIS Lead to operate the HMIS.
• Providing for governance of the HMIS Lead, including:
  o The requirement that the HMIS Lead enter into written HMIS Participation Agreements with each Contributing HMIS Organization (CHO) requiring the CHO to comply with federal regulations regarding HMIS and imposing sanctions for failure to comply; and
  o The participation fee, if any, charged by the HMIS;
• Maintaining documentation evidencing compliance with this part and with the governance charter; and
• Reviewing, revising and approving the policies and plans required by federal regulation.
• Monitors milestones and makes high level decisions on HMIS
• Creates and updates the Data Quality Plan

Organizational Relationships

Performance Management Committee Responsibilities:

  o Membership comprised of:
    ▪ CoC representatives
    ▪ EveryOne Home
    ▪ HMIS Lead Staff
    ▪ Health and Human Services staff
    ▪ Participating Agency staff
    ▪ Jurisdictional Staff

  o Conducts regular monthly meetings
  o Makes all final decisions on
    ▪ Planning
    ▪ Participation
Alameda Countywide HMIS
InHOUSE: Information about Homelessness, Outcomes, and Service Engagement

- Coordination of HMIS/ data resources
  - Coordination of Data Integration- either with outside industries’ data storage systems or with participating agencies’ internal data collection systems
  - Determination of long term policies and procedures
  - Makes recommendation on software application/ vendor as needed
  - Supports and protects the rights and privacy of clients
  - Reviews quarterly Outcomes Reports
  - Develops Communitywide Outcomes Measures and Goals
  - A list of the current members of the Performance Management Committee is available from the EveryOne Home Executive Director or the Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department

HMIS Lead Agency Duties and Responsibilities

- Responds to Performance Management Committee directives
- Oversees the day-to-day operation of HMIS
- Provides staffing for HMIS
- Provides technical support to participating agencies
- Provides training on privacy, and software related issues
- Regularly reviews data quality (monthly)
- Coordinates and submits Housing Inventory Chart, and Annual Homeless Assessment Reports
- In conjunction with EveryOne Home, coordinates and submits Point in Time Count and Notice of Funding Availability Application
- Supports HMIS by providing ongoing funding
- Monitoring data quality and taking necessary actions to maintain input of high-quality data from all HMIS-utilizing agencies
- The HMIS Lead must submit a security plan, an updated data quality plan, and a privacy policy to the CoC for approval within 6 months after the effective date of the HUD final rule establishing the requirements of these plans. The HMIS Lead...
must review and update the plans and policy at least annually. During this process, the HMIS Lead must seek and incorporate feedback from the CoC and applicable entities. The HMIS Lead must implement the plans and policy within 6 months of the date of approval by the Alameda County CoC.

- Adopt written policies and procedures for the operation of the HMIS that apply to the HMIS Lead, its CHO’s, and the Continuum of Care.
- Policies and procedures must comply with all applicable Federal law and regulations, and applicable state or local governmental requirements.
- Solicits HMIS User feedback – including operational milestones, system functionality and ease of use, and progress.

**HMIS Policy Group Responsibilities**

The HMIS Policy Group Committee will work with the HMIS Lead to:

- Coordinate and prepare written HMIS policies and procedures in accordance with § 580.31 for all CHO/agencies, for review, update and adoption by the Performance Management Committee.
- Develop, annually review, and, as necessary, revise for Performance Management Committee approval a privacy plan, security plan, and data quality plan for the HMIS, as well as any other HMIS policies and procedures required by HUD.

**HMIS User Group Responsibilities**

The HMIS Policy Group Committee will work with the HMIS Lead to:

- Provides recommendations on use of software and software enhancements.
- Trouble-shoot frequent data quality errors.
- Recommends modifications to HMIS staff created reports.

**HMIS End-User Responsibilities**
Alameda Countywide HMIS
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- Comply with federal regulations regarding HMIS
- Provides data entry in manner that meets standards established in Data Quality Plan
- Attends trainings, as needed
- Comply with Federal, state, and local laws that require additional privacy or confidentiality protections
- Takes all necessary measures to ensure security and confidentiality of client information
- Reports security incidents in compliance with Security Plan
Welcome to EveryOne Home

EveryOne Home is Alameda County's road map for ending homelessness. By emphasizing a coordinated, efficient regional response to a regional problem, we can and will end homelessness in Alameda County.

What's Happening

EveryOne Home Facilitates Local HUD CoC 2015 NOFA Process
Click here for results of the local process and the completed HUD CoC application.

2015 Homeless Count Findings Released
Read more about our latest Homeless Count findings here or download the entire report here [PDF].

Measuring Success - Achieving Outcomes
We are pleased to present our third report detailing the coordinated efforts of our partners in Alameda County working toward homelessness. Click here for more info or download the PDF here.

Announcing the Outcomes Achievements Awards
The Virl Sims Foundation has generously donated one $10,000 and one $5,000 grant to be presented to programs that have excelled at achieving permanent housing outcomes. Read more here...

Read a blog post about incent(ing) assistance here.

Ending Homelessness, Building on our Success
View a slideshow of images from the Ending Homelessness, Building on our Success breakfast held in Oakland on October 7th, 2011.

GET INVOLVED

- Sign up to receive our E-Newsletter
  Type your email here  Go

- Support our efforts by donations:

DONATE!

- Recently added to our Endorsers' List:
  St. Mary's Center
  Santa House Inc.
  Washington Programs Inc.
  Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO) Housing
  Catholic Charities of the East Bay
  Davis Street Community Center
  City of Alameda

- Join the list of endorsing individuals and groups by clicking here

- Volunteer to help by clicking here

DID YOU KNOW?
Over the course of the year almost 600,000 families with 1.35 million children experience homelessness nationwide, and 50% of the homeless population is made up of people who live in families.
Resources: Alameda County — Continuum of Care 2013
Notice of Fund Availability (NOFA) Process

EveryOne Home is facilitating Alameda County’s response to the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) issued by the federal department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This process is taking place under the CoC Program Interim Regulation Implementing the HEARTH Act for the second year in a row, which was published by HUD in the Federal Register on July 31st, 2012 and became effective August 30th, 2012. The EveryOne Home Leadership Board approved the establishment of a non-conflicted, informed NOFA Committee who are charged with guiding our CoC’s response to the NOFA. The work of the NOFA Committee is informed by community input which was solicited via a Community Meeting, held October 17th, 2013. HUD issued the 2013 CoC NOFA on November 22nd, 2012 and collaborative application is due February 3rd, 2014. Project applications for the local rating and ranking process are due EveryOne Home by January 3rd, 2014. Any additional documents and announcements will be made available on this page during this process.

- 2013 HUD Continuum of Care Consolidated Application
  CoC (Exhibit 1) Application [.pdf format]
  Project Applications [.pdf format]
  Project Priority List [.pdf format]

- Results of the HUD 2013 CoC Local Application Process
  Download the results of the HUD 2013 CoC Local Application Process here [PDF]

- Alameda County 2013 CoC NOFA Local Requests for Proposals
  Click the appropriate link to download an application (.doc format). Email everyonelomearegen.org with questions.
  Request for Proposals for RENEWAL Projects [.doc format]
  Request for Proposals for NEW Projects [.doc format]
HUD 2013 CoC NOFA
Download PDF here
(As of 12.10.13, project applications had not been released)

Tools for the CoC NOFA Process

Download PDF of Sample Leverage Letter here
During the 2012 NOFA process, applicants requested this sample leverage letter be provided by EveryOne Home.

Download PDF of 12.10.13 Presentation here
This is the PowerPoint that was presented to applicants at the meeting on 12.10.13 for your reference.

NOFA Committee Meeting Minutes

The NOFA Committee has determined that making their meeting minutes available publicly will offer the greatest degree of transparency possible. The NOFA Committee invites you to submit comments by emailing everyoneshome@egov.org with “NOFA Committee Comments” in the subject line. Any comments will be shared with the Committee for their consideration; however, the Committee will not respond to comments.

Please note: These minutes reflect the ongoing discussions of the NOFA Committee and do not necessarily reflect final decisions.

12.03.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.06.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.17.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.23.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.30.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here

Frequently Asked Questions

Download answers to questions received 12.10.13 through 12.27.13 here [PDF]

NOFA Committee Members
Download PDF here

Guiding Principles

These Guiding Principles for Alameda County’s 2012 NOFA process were developed with community input. The NOFA Committee adopted these to inform their work for the 2013 process.
The NOFA Committee has determined that making their meeting minutes available publicly will offer the greatest degree of transparency possible. The NOFA Committee invites you to submit comments by emailing everyonehome@acgov.org with "NOFA Committee Comments" in the subject line. Any comments will be shared with the Committee for their consideration; however, the Committee will not respond to comments.

Please note: These minutes reflect the ongoing discussions of the NOFA Committee and do not necessarily reflect final decisions.

12.03.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.06.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.12.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.23.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here
12.30.13 Meeting Notes | Download PDF here

Resources:

- Frequently Asked Questions
  Download answers to questions received 12.10.13 through 12.27.13 here [PDF]
- NOFA Committee Members
  Download PDF here
- Guiding Principles
  These Guiding Principles for Alameda County's 2012 NOFA process were developed with community input. The NOFA Committee adopted these to inform their work for the 2013 process as well.
  Download PDF here

[View the 2012 NOFA application page]
EveryOne Home Leadership Board Meeting  
Thursday, August 22, 2013

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:
Members- Jill Dunner, Damon Francis, Linda Gardner, Amy Hiestand, Wendy Jackson, Terrie Light, Deanne Pearn, Robert Ratner, Susan Shelton, Suzanne Shenfil, Eve Stewart, Riley Wilkerson  
Staff/Guests- Sabrina Balderama, Elaine DeColigny

1) Updates and Announcements

- Health & Human Services planning grant. Alameda County Social Services submitted a proposal for a planning grant to end homelessness among foster youth. First Place for Youth, EveryOne Home and Alameda County Housing and Community Development are partners in this project. The grant was awarded and will fund a two year system’s change planning process for this populations.

- Partnership with the Probation Dept. renewed. The Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) program has been renewed for an additional year. Berkeley Food and Housing Project and East Oakland Community Project along with Abode Services will continue to provide services in the second year. Building Futures with Women & Children will not continue in the second year.

- The Family Reunification Housing Pilot through the Child Welfare Department has also renewed their partnership with Abode Services and Building Futures with Women and Children. After its first year, the program continues to be a success.

- Oakland’s Henry Robinson Multi Service Center is transitioning from serving families to singles.

- AC Impact launched this month. The program addresses high visibility homeless persons (those with multiple encounters with police) in Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, and Oakland. Services are provided by Abode Services.

2) Review and Approval of Minutes

A. June 2013 minutes were approved.

3) Committee & Project Updates

A. Outcomes Achievement Awards event- EveryOne Home staff was pleased to announce the success of the first awards event hosted by EveryOne Home to acknowledge the success programs have had in achieving performance benchmarks. Board members were invited to share their experience of the event all of which were positive. Staff will be meeting with the Y and H Soda Foundation to explore how they may be able to continue to support this effort in the future.
B. EveryOne Counts! 2013 Homeless Count Report- The Board was presented with options for the anticipated release of the 2013 Homeless Count report. While the technical report was completed in July, limited staff capacity has delayed the production of the companion report. The Board determined that the release of the data should be postponed until the end of October so that both the technical report and the Key Findings and Policy Implications are released together.

C. Rapid Results Boot Camp (Home Stretch)- The Executive Director provided an update from the Rapid Results boot camp which is now known as Home Stretch. The program focuses on housing veterans and chronically homeless at an accelerated rate and will be a countywide initiative that connects the most expensive permanent housing resource with the highest need individuals. Home Stretch will be operating with resources that are already available as opposed to new resources. This caused some concern among Board members due to concerns regarding the ability of service providers to implement the project’s goals without additional resources. While this concern was expressed the Board was in support of the project and requested that staff provide regular updates.

5) Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Process
   A. The Board was asked to approve the 2013 NOFA process that was presented in the MEMO provided by the Executive Director. The Board approved maintaining the NOFA Committee structure and scope of responsibility as in 2012. In an effort to mitigate a conflict of interest, the Board encouraged EveryOne Home staff to release an Expression of Interest and solicit for committee members widely. The Executive Committee will hold the final decision making regarding the membership of the committee. The NOFA committee’s work was also amended to include the authority to decide how the mandatory 5% cut ($1.25 million) of funding will distributed. Options include a cut to all programs equally or funding cuts to low performing programs only. While the NOFA committee will make the ultimate decision, community input will be gathered and considered. Finally, community input will be solicited and the NOFA committee will decide on the process for identifying transitional housing projects, if any, which will be asked to reallocate resources to permanent housing.

6) Other Business
   A. None

Items included in the agenda and not appearing in this report were not covered during this meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40AM
Alameda Countywide Continuum of Care HUD 2013 NOFA Committee

Request for Persons to Serve

HUD will release its second NOFA this Fall under the interim regulations for the new CoC Program established under the HEARTH Act enacted in 2009. EveryOne Home is seeking informed and non-conflicted individuals to serve on the NOFA Committee. EveryOne Home hopes to have the NOFA Committee seated by early October.

**Background:**

Alameda County spends approximately $45 million dollars annually to address homelessness. Interventions range from prevention to street outreach and drop-in centers, to shelters and transitional housing, as well as permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing. Approximately half, or an estimated $24 million of the resources the community uses are funded through what the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) now calls the *Continuum of Care Program (CoC)*. The CoC Program funds permanent housing, transitional housing and support services only grants. It does not fund emergency shelters.

For more than a decade, the bulk of funds went to renewing current projects. The only new projects funded were permanent housing ones, at the rate of one per year at most. Starting last year HUD encouraged communities to reallocate funding from transitional housing and support services only projects to create permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing. That will be true again this year.

All communities receiving HUD funding have been told to anticipate a 5% cut to their funding packages. In the case of Alameda County, this will result in a loss of approximately 1.25 million dollars. All indications are that there will not be enough funding to cover all renewals. The NOFA Committee will determine how to handle this cut based on community feedback and models previously presented to the Leadership Board.

Our community must determine a doable approach with which to move forward that makes the best use of our resources, both financial and organizational, in the service of ending homelessness in Alameda County.

HUD expects each local Continuum of Care to design a community process for developing the annual response to the CoC NOFA. Requirements regarding conflict of interest need to be taken into account in determining and implementing a NOFA option and rating and ranking process. EveryOne Home serves as Alameda County’s Continuum of Care, and acting in this role, the EveryOne Home Leadership Board has called for the establishment of an informed and non-conflicted NOFA Committee with the following charges:

1. Determine, after community input and the review of the HUD CoC NOFA (expected to be released late September to mid-October), the approach that will be used in Alameda County for selecting projects, including renewals and new projects funded through reallocation as well as determine how to manage the anticipated 5% cut to the renewal package.

2. Direct the staff’s work developing the local application process, including revising the process for scoring projects.

3. Ensure that a non-conflicted panel scores local applications.

4. Approve the final application package that will be submitted to HUD.
Time Commitment and Responsibilities:

- Possible pre-read and comment on the materials for the Community Meeting—30-60 mins
- Attend the October 17th Community Meeting focused on our local strategies—3 hours. 9:00-12:00 at the San Leandro Library.
- Background Reading (At a minimum read staff analysis of HEARTH regulations and NOFA or read originals)—2-4 hrs
- Participate in 2-4 NOFA design meetings—6-8 hours
- If applicable, review and approve staff design of local application process, forms and scoring—1-2 hours
- Attend community meeting releasing decisions on how local process will proceed—4 hours
- If applicable read and score project proposals—6-8 hours
- Meet to review and finalize NOFA Panel recommendation—2 hours
- Miscellaneous emails and calls—2-3 hrs

Total Time Commitment approximately 20-35 hours of work starting in October and likely wrapping up in December depending on when the NOFA comes out and is due.

Qualifications

In addition to the time commitment, we are looking for individuals who have:

1. Experience with applying for, awarding and/or administering federal grants, especially HUD grants
2. Knowledge of the EveryOne Home Plan and strategies to end homelessness
3. Familiarity with current trends and research in the field of homeless service delivery
4. Knowledge and familiarity with the housing and services system for homeless people in Alameda County
5. Experience utilizing performance measures and other data in strategic planning and decision making

To avoid conflict of interest committee members cannot be employed by or serve on the board of directors of any non-profit organization that receives or might apply for Continuum of Care Funds (formerly S+C, Section 8 Mod Rehab, or SHP) in Alameda County, be related by blood or marriage to someone who is, or have other potential or perceived conflicts of interest about the resultant decisions of this process. This also applies to employees of any department/division of local government that receives or might apply for Continuum of Care Funds. EveryOne Home seeks representatives from the broad geography of Alameda County as well as homeless or formerly homeless people and non-conflicted providers if possible.

To Apply:

If you are interested in serving on the NOFA Committee please contact Elaine de Coligny, Executive Director of EveryOne Home at e.decoligny@acgov.org or (510) 670-5944 by October 1st at 5:00 p.m. Due to how quickly the HUD NOFA process is moving EveryOne Home is hoping to seat the committee by early October.
2013
HUD Continuum of Care NOFA

Local NOFA and Request for Proposals Meeting
Presented by EveryOne Home
December 10, 2013
Key Dates for 2013

- **7/14/2012:** Continuum of Care Interim Rule released
- **10/17/2013:** Community meeting on NOFA options
- **11/22/2013:** C of C NOFA released
- **12/10/2013:** Local Application Released
- **1/3/2014:** Date by which local apps due and renewal e-snaps must be complete
- **1/20/2014:** Date by which local applicants must be notified of status
- **2/3/2014:** C of C application due to HUD
- **3/18/2014:** Approximate date for 1st round of award notifications
## The 2013 HUD NOFA:
It’s different alright

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission Had 3 Major Elements</td>
<td>Submission has same major elements, but the CoC Application scoring will be applied to both the 2013 and 2014 NOFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Application which was scored</td>
<td>Our CoC score impacts our access to additional funds for Tier II projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Listings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Elements covered a 1 year funding cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Application (Exhibit 1) that earns the points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Applications (Exhibit 2) that must be rated and ranked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2013 HUD NOFA: It’s different alright

2012
Required CoCs to rank projects in two tiers with Tier II subject to defunding
- Tier II was 3.5% of total package--$870,000 for us.
- All renewals in Tier II were funded last year
All renewals were funded before new projects in each tier

2013
Maintains the two-tier ranking requirement
- Tier 2 was 5% of total package—about $1.2 mil. for us.
- Projects in Tier 2 are unlikely to be funded this year.
Permanent Housing will be funded first for both renewals and reallocations
The 2013 HUD NOFA: It’s different alright

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed breakdown of 130 pts</td>
<td>Detailed breakdown of 150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Performance = 34 pts</td>
<td>CoC Strategic Planning &amp; Performance = 69 pts*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Strategic Planning = 55</td>
<td>CoC Service Coordination = 28 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Services &amp; Structure = 14</td>
<td>Recipient Performance = 15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging = 6</td>
<td>Housing, Services &amp; Structure = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS = 13</td>
<td>Leveraging = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Point in Time Count = 8</td>
<td>2012 Point in Time Count = 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 16 pts for reducing chronic homelessness by dedicating and expanding PSH units in package (pg. 36)
2013 HUD CoC NOFA

**Scoring and Process Still**
Emphasizes performance of both CoC and projects
Allows reallocation of unspent funds and “low performing” projects to “new” permanent housing.
“HUD strongly encourages CoC’s to take advantage of this option” (pg. 9)

**New This Year**
Demonstrates commitment to permanent housing, gives extra points for rapid rehousing for families, and PSH for chronic homeless. (p. 36 and 38)

Gives points for using a Housing First approach. (p. 41)

Prioritizes targeting the chronically homeless and increasing beds available to them even in non-dedicated units.
Alameda County’s Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = $24,820,761*

ARD is the total amount of all the CoC’s projects that will be eligible for renewal this year.

HUD does not currently have enough funding for all renewals. Thus, HUD has established the following tiering process.

Alameda County TIER 1 = $23,579,723*

Tier 1 is the CoC ARD less 5%.

HUD will first allocate funding to projects in Tier 1 for all CoC’s. All projects in Tier 1 are expected to be funded.

TIER 2 = difference in renewal demand

Tier 2 represents the difference in renewal demand. In Alameda County, $1,241,038 of renewal demand will fall into Tier 2.

HUD will not begin funding projects in Tier 2 (for any CoC) until ALL grants in Tier 1 (for all CoC’s) have been funded. Projects in Tier 2 are very vulnerable to not receiving funding.

*Tiering in the 2013 CoC NOFA

CoC ARD

$24.8 million*

TIER 1

$23.6 million*

TIER 2

*These numbers are all estimates that may be tweaked by a few thousand by HUD.
HUD will fund ALL projects in Tier 1 before funding ANY projects in Tier 2.

HUD will fund Tier 1 projects in the following priority order. Because ALL Tier 1 projects are expected to be funded, this order is essentially inconsequential in Tier 1.

**HUD’s Selection Priority for Tier 1 Projects:**

1) Renewal RRH and PSH projects
2) New PSH projects created through reallocation
3) New RRH projects for families
4) Renewal TH
5) CoC Planning costs
6) UFA costs
7) SSO projects for centralized intake
8) Renewal HMIS
9) All other SSO renewals

#5 through #7 do not apply to our CoC

* These numbers are all estimates that may be tweaked by a few thousand by HUD.
Once ALL Tier 1 projects for ALL CoC’s have been funded, HUD will begin allocating funding to projects in Tier 2 as much as funding allows.

HUD will begin by funding projects of its first Selection Priority, beginning with the highest-scoring CoC and continuing through the lower-scoring CoC.

HUD will then move down to its second Selection Priority, highest-scoring CoC through lowest-scoring CoC and so on, until funding runs out.

**HUD’s Selection Priority for Tier 2 Projects:**

1) Renewal PSH and RRH projects  
2) New PSH projects created through reallocation  
3) New RRH projects created through reallocation  
4) Renewal Transitional Housing project  
5) CoC Planning costs  
6) UFA costs  
7) SSO projects for centralized intake  
8) Renewal HMIS  
9) All other SSO renewals

#4 through #9 will not apply to our CoC
Where could funding for Tier 2 projects come from?

Currently, HUD only has enough funding for all projects ranked in Tier 1 nationwide.

Funding for projects ranked in Tier 2 will become available depending on how much funding HUD is able to recapture from previously unspent funds and/or unallocated Tier 1 funding.

The higher our CoC score is, the higher the likelihood of our Tier 2 projects receiving funding will be.

When will projects be notified of whether they will receive funding?

**Tier 1 Projects:**
HUD will notify Tier 1 projects 45 days after the NOFA deadline. All Tier 1 projects are expected to be funded.

- NOFA deadline: February 3rd, 2014
- Tier 1 projects notified: 2nd half of March, 2014

**Tier 2 Projects:**
HUD will notify Tier 2 projects *after* Tier 1 projects, but no specific timing has been announced. Depending on how quickly HUD is able to assess the amount of funding available for Tier 2, these projects could be notified anytime during 2014 after March. There is no guarantee that any Tier 2 projects in our package will be funded.
Local Process and Priorities
Our Local Process

- In August the EveryOne Home Leadership Board appointed a NOFA Committee charged with:
  - Soliciting community input
  - Evaluating the HUD NOFA
  - Determining the local application strategy for maximizing the dollars and effectiveness of the package.
  - Approving the local RFP, rating and ranking the proposals, and
  - Approving the final selection and ordering of projects to be included in the package.
The NOFA Committee

Jill Dunner, Consumer and EveryOne Home Leadership Board Member

Damon Francis, Alameda County Public Health Department

Grace Kong, City of Hayward

Duane Poe, Black Bay Area United Fund

Angela Robinson-Pinion, Alameda County Planning Department

Marnell Tinson, Consumer

Moe Wright, BBI Construction
The Committee’s Approach

- Participated in the October Community Meeting and helped develop NOFA analysis and review NOFA options.

- Met three times since to develop the application and approach being outlined today.
The Committee’s Approach

- We built on the groundwork of last year for using performance standards in funding decisions.

- Committed to rate and rank in the most fair way possible, given the intensive constraints being placed upon us by the 5% cut.

- Used rating and ranking criteria we believe will maximize our scoring for the C of C application (exhibit 1), thereby positioning us to get as much money from Tier 2 as possible.
What We Heard

The feedback we heard from the community at the meeting:

- Desire to see Alameda County Philosophy incorporated into this process, not just to fall in line with HUD’s priorities only.
- Be mindful of the “real cost” to cutting programs.
- Consider partial across the board cuts.
- Be conscious of geography and populations served.
- Time constraints make reallocation extremely challenging.
- Be careful that the decisions we make do not make anyone end up homeless.
The NOFA Strategy

- Emphasizes performance again this year:
  - Higher performing projects will be ranked in Tier 1, The lowest performing renewals will be ranked in tier 2.
  - Projects must score a minimum of 60 points for inclusion in Tier 1
  - We removed ‘exiting to known destination’ and replaced it with ‘access to mainstream benefits’ and ‘returns to homelessness’
  - We are still scoring the expending of grant funds.
  - We are keeping data accuracy and completeness as a performance measure.
The NOFA Strategy

- Prioritizes Permanent Housing, which means:
  - No C of C Planning Grant will be included in the package.
  - Transitional Housing and SSO renewals who score into Tier 2 will not be included in the package. They will be reallocated into permanent housing.
The NOFA Strategy

Additional Strategies:

- We welcome voluntary reductions to grants.

- As a renewing project and essential for C of C funding, HMIS will be in tier 1.

- The Committee will take into account geographic and population diversity, loss of housing, grant expiration and whether projects have tried to convert as possible basis for adjusting the rating and ranking.
NOFA Strategy and Local Apps

The Committee did its best to create a process that:

- Responds to requirements and addresses cuts dictated by HUD
- Creates the strongest application for submission
- Focuses our efforts on strategies to target the most vulnerable people, and focuses our resources in the most strategic way possible.
- Deploys proven strategies and target resources to best practices, maximizes dollars at the front line, and uses data and performance to make choices
Renewal Applications
Renewal Project Applications

• Complete Project Application in e-snaps

• Complete Local application and email to EveryOneHome@acgov.org

• Include back-up documentation in a PDF

• Both parts due January 3, 2014, by 4:00:00 pm
Overview

• Application includes questions needed by EveryOne Home to complete CoC Application (e.g. Mainstream resources, education)
• Application focuses on performance on various indicators – aligns with the information required in CoC Application and HUD concerns and priorities
• Lower performers will be designated at Tier 2 and may funding may be reallocated to fund new permanent housing projects.
General Section

• Information about Project and applicant
• Information needed for CoC Application
• Points on this section for:
  – Project Type – up to 18 points
  – HUD’s priorities -- 22 points
    – Does PSH for CH or RRH for families
    – Serves certain target populations
    – Uses a Housing First Approach
Outcome Measures

• Using information from HMIS and from APR’s, complete outcomes measure charts for the project types.
• Points on this section up to 38
Outcome Measures

• Measures required and benchmarks different for different program types
  A. Obtains or Retains Permanent Housing (16 pts)
  B.Exiting with income, for those entering with no income
     or
  B. Exiting with earned income (for SSO Employment Programs only) (12 pts)
  C. Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits (6 pts)
  D. Returns to Homelessness (4 pts)
Info from HMIS outcome reports

* - Clients may have multiple exits in this category. The count is duplicated by client so the percentage is calculated based on all exits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Types in Data</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Transitional Housing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>Hmis %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>57/71</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>54/71</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>45/56</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing - entered w/housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 36 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to permanent or interim housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults exiting with employment income</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency/Process Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>Hmis %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People exiting to Known Destination</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>67/71</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>64/71</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>52/56</td>
<td>(95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain permanent housing within 60 days</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults who gain employment, 50% do so within 13 weeks</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Info from APR
(PSH, RRH, and SSOs tied to housing only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than or equal to 30 days</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 Days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 Days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 Days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 Days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average and Median Length of Participation in Days</th>
<th>Average Length</th>
<th>Median Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>1203.79</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayers</td>
<td>1592.65</td>
<td>1186.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Participation by Exit Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 Days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 Days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 Days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 Days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Retention >6 months: \[\frac{(P - H - I - J + G) - A - B - C}{(P - H - I - J + G)} = \%\text{ of persons}\]
### Info From APR (all program types)

#### 26a2. Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status - Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 26b2. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources - Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(B+G)/(E+J) = \% \text{ of adults with non-cash mainstream benefits}\]
Returns to Homelessness

• EveryOne Home / HMIS staff will generate this report, which will be provided by December 17, 2013.

• Use this report to complete measure D for all program types.
Spending

- Points on this section up to 4
- Report on amount of unspent funds for past years; explain any issues
- This year, Rental Assistance programs will be considered differently and get 2 pts even if under spent, but must explain
HMIS

• Report on data quality for required Universal data elements using Bowman “Data Quality Report Card”
• Points on this section up to 2
• Points based on percent of data quality must be higher than 95% to get 2 points, 90% to get 1
## Data Completeness Report Card (EE)

### Summary by Provider

**Date Range:** 1/1/12 - 11/28/12

### GRADE BASED ON AVERAGE PERCENTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal Data Element</th>
<th>Required for</th>
<th>Number of Applicable Entry Exits</th>
<th>Number of Non-Null Values</th>
<th>Percentage Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Security Number</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of Residence</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veteran Status</strong></td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabling Condition</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specified Disability</strong></td>
<td>Disabled = Y</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Prior to Program Entry</strong></td>
<td>Adults &amp; UY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zip Code of Last Permanent Address</strong></td>
<td>Adults &amp; UY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless (Y/N)</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronically Homeless</strong></td>
<td>Homeless = Y</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Status</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services Not Included</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Received (Y/N) (Entry)</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Received (Y/N) (Exit)</strong></td>
<td>All Exits</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Source at Entry</strong></td>
<td>Income = Y</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Source at Exit</strong></td>
<td>Income = Y</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Amount at Entry</strong></td>
<td>Income = Y</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Amount at Exit</strong></td>
<td>Income = Y</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Cash Benefit Received (Y/N) (Entry)</strong></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Cash Benefit Received (Y/N) (Exit)</strong></td>
<td>All Exits</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Cash Source at Entry</strong></td>
<td>Non-Cash = Y</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Cash Source at Exit</strong></td>
<td>Non-Cash = Y</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Violence</strong></td>
<td>Adults &amp; UY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* HIC Universal Data Elements
Leveraging

• Complete Leveraging Chart in e-snaps
• Summarize amounts in local application
• Points on this section up to 3
• Points based on ratio of leveraging to HUD request
• See self scoring sheet for details
Quality Assurance

• Worth 14 points

• Narrative on use of best practices, customer satisfaction, performance monitoring, use of data staff training and quality of care

• Whether had to submit a PIP last year and if met goals in PIP or 10% increase.
New Applications
New Project Applications

- Complete Local application and email to EveryOneHome@acgov.org
- Due January 3, 2014 at 4:00:00pm
- Notified by January 20, 2014
- If selected to submit, complete Project Application in e-snaps by January 28, 2013
- Local app draws strongly from HUD app
New projects

• New projects are those that use reallocated funds from other projects or reductions from other projects
  or

• Those that are TH or SSO that want to convert to PSH or RRH

• Those projects which want to convert should have already been in discussion with HCD and EveryOne, and possibly HUD
General Section

- Basic information about project, applicant and subrecipients

  - Primary Activity = PH = 18 points
  - Serve chronically homeless = 8 points
  - Or RRH for families = 4 points
  - Housing First Approach = 6 points
Demonstrated Capacity of Applicant

- Section worth 30 points
- Section describes applicant team, roles, experience, performance on similar projects, and monitoring or audit issues and quality assurance
- Points for strong experience of partners, no outstanding issues or explanation of issues, strong past performance or explanation of how performance will be ensured
**Past Performance of Team members on similar projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Agency Name</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>Project 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type (PSH, RRH, SSO tied to PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.1: Obtaining Permanent Housing for RRH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.2: Permanent Housing Retention &gt; 6 months for PSH and SSO’s tied to perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B: Of those adults entering with no income % who obtain some income for all project types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure C: Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits for all projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project details

• Section worth 16 points
• Section describes overall project, target population, housing assistance, and supportive services to be provided
• Points for well-designed project, appropriate services and outreach plan to population and need
Timing

• Section worth 8 points
• Section describes project timing, management plan (if applicable), and dates to begin Housing people and reach capacity
• Points for clear, realistic schedule and ability to begin serving homeless people quickly
• Reach full capacity within a year
Budget

• Section worth 8 points
• Points for reasonable and clear budget for type of project; Required match is included; Other project funds needed for project are committed or likely; Project is cost effective compared to other similar new permanent housing applications
• If project is converting ensure no persons made homeless if there will be a funding gap between new and old project
Leverage

- Section worth 3 points
- Section consists of leverage chart
- Points for leveraging ratio to budget request.
HUD Continuum of Care NOFA 2013 Committee Meeting Notes

12.3.13 – 224 west Winton ave Hayward

Present: Elaine DeColigny, Damon Francis, Jill Dunner, Grace Kong, Duane Peo, Moe Wright, Angela Pixon- Robinson, Jackie Ballard

Absent: Marnell Timson

The meeting started at 9:45

The committee was given time to review the minutes from last week’s meeting. Elaine de Coligny, Executive Director to EveryOne Home, clarified that the minutes will be on the EveryOne Home website. The committee approved the minutes.

As follow up to the prior meeting clarification was provided on the following topics:

- **What are mainstream benefits?** In the homeless assistance field, ‘mainstream benefits’ are resources available to eligible people regardless of their homelessness status; TANF, MediCal, Social Security, SSI, Food Stamps, Veterans benefits are all examples of mainstream benefits.

- **Explain the use of Performance Improvement Plans in last year’s application.** If a project fell too far below a performance benchmark, it did not score points in that category. The project then had to submit an improvement plan saying what it would do to increase performance, and that would earn the project some points back, though it could not get the same points as people who were performing at benchmark.

- **Given the goal to move people into PSH, is there a measure for people moving from PSH into market rate housing?** Locally the community has set a goal of 10% turn over in PSH, but that is not HUD’s goal. For PSH projects HUD is interested in housing retention, and that is what those projects were scored on.

- **What is the mechanism for doing across board cut?** If the decision was made to do across the board cuts, the Committee would instruct the project applicants to reduce their grant amounts by the percentage cut agreed upon and ask HCD, the collaborative applicant, to ensure the cuts were also reflected in the E-snap applications. If the committee elected to pursue this strategy, the approach would have to be verified as allowable by HCD.

The Committee made the following changes to the renewal proposal scoring criteria:

1. The Committee doubled the total point value for activity type from a maximum of 10 to a maximum of 20, for permanent housing, while TH and SSO tied to permanent housing projects are given 10 points, and other SSO get 0.
NOFA Committee Meeting 12.30.2013
224 West Winton Ave., Hayward

Present: Damon Francis, Jill Dunner, Moor Wright,
Present by email: Angela Robinson-Pinion, Duane Poe
Staff: Elaine De Coligny, Jackie Ballard
Absent: Maness Timson, Grace Kong

The meeting began at 9:36am

Agenda:
FAQs
Requesting additional information from projects
Providing committee with staff scores

Regarding FAQs, the Committee agreed to the following:
1. **Question:** How will local government investments into owned SHP properties be rated in this process?
   **Answer:** The Committee will consider each project case by case based on where it falls in the rating and ranking. As stated in the application instructions, the Committee can adjust the order of ranking as necessary to strengthen the package and protect vital elements of our system of care. The impact of defunding residential buildings is a factor to be considered. Staff can be directed by the Committee to request additional information about physical plant and local funding to assist in their deliberation.

2. **Question:** In relationship to Outcomes Measure 2b, ‘exiting with income for those entering with no income’, how will projects with very low exiting numbers be scored? One recommendation is that any project exiting less than 5 people not be scored on this measure, with the point scale adjusted accordingly.
   **Answer:** The Committee acknowledged that each person’s outcome carries greater weight in smaller projects, and that is true if the outcomes are poor or excellent. Eliminating results with fewer than 5 exits, could help projects with fewer bad exits, but it could also hurt a project that had all good exits. Therefore, the Committee has elected to maintain the approach used in last year’s NOFA process—projects, except those exiting zero people, will be scored on all outcomes measures initially. For those projects close to the Tier 2 line, the Committee will evaluate the degree to which a score on an outcome with less than 5 people made the difference in where a project was ranked and consider potential modifications during its work session on the 15th.

Both questions will be responded to as FAQs, which will be published on the EveryOne Home website, and electronically distributed to the community at large.

Proposed: As was done last year, the staff will complete an initial review of applications as they come in for completeness and clarity. In cases where clarity is needed or back-up documentation is missing, staff will request the project submit it with a 24 hour turn-around time. This may mean that some
applications don't come to reviewers until Tuesday, though we expect most of them will be available by the 6th as our work plan intended. Passed

The staff will be verifying the self scored portions of the applications the weekend preceding applications being sent to the committee. In the interest of objectivity, the Committee has requested that the reviewers not be given the scoring sheets as part of the application packets.

Proposed: As staff will have assessed approximately 75% of the total score for each application, the time during which the Committee is scoring the remainder of the application will be used by staff to request additional information, such as local funding amounts and sources, from those projects which are at risk of falling into Tier 2 based on the self-scored portion of the application. This will allow the Committee to make the most informed decision possible about that project’s rank during the work session on 1/15. Passed

Finally, the staff will flesh out 1-2 scoring alternatives for projects with low numbers of outcomes. Two the group has discussed are: 1) eliminate those questions for which a project has less than 5 outcomes, and 2) give projects 60% of the available points for a measure on which they have less than 5 outcomes to score. This will provide the Committee with an opportunity to see if accounting for small programs with fewer outcomes in a different way works better for the overall package.

The meeting ended at 10:30.
2. Given that almost all projects get full points for the outcome measure ‘exiting to known destination’ last year, and HUD does not score or ask about that indicator, that measure was dropped as a basis for scoring applications.

3. The committee expressed interest in measuring persons obtaining income who both stayed in programs such as PSH and at the point of exit. Staff was not sure if this was possible with the new Annual Performance Review. If it was then the Committee directed staff to change the way the outcome was reported, if not keep the current measure.

4. The committee wanted to add “maintains or obtains mainstream benefits” and “returns to homelessness” as outcome measures that were scored. Staff was instructed to determine the best way to do that. These two measures were valued as less than the housing and income measures.

5. The committee had a lengthy discussion of whether to measure and score “cost per housing outcome” and decided to collect that data this year, but not score it as the community did not have a current baseline for this measure.

6. The spending performance measure will be kept in the application; however, it will be weighted less (5 points). In the interest of understanding the complications which arise for Rental Assistance programs in relationship to under-spending, those projects will get a minimum of 2.5 points, with a maximum five (5) points for spending, regardless of program type.

7. The data completeness performance measure will be kept in the application, but its weight will be dropped to five (5) points.

8. The value of Leveraging will be dropped to five (5) points or less, and projects will not need to submit letters with their local applications.

9. The Committee expressed interest in scoring on the length of time a person spends homeless, but determined that we did not currently have a good measure for that, and referred it to the Performance Management Committee for scoring the 2014 NOFA.

10. Projects will be asked on how they incorporate a housing first approach and scored up to 10 points on a narrative answer. Staff was asked to provide guidance around how to score this question fairly. E. de Coligny, will look into that question and return to the group with a response. Given HUD’s priority for communities to focus on ending chronic homelessness, maximum points should be awarded to programs specifically working with 100% chronically homeless individuals, and that the maximum points allowable will be ten (10). No consensus was reached about how to break down the point values for programs working with different percentages of chronically homeless individuals. Staff will return to the group with different breakdown options, and the committee will decide at that time which is the most appropriate.

11. Projects that provide Rapid Rehousing for families should be worth 5 points.
12. There will not be a 5% across the board cut.

13. The Committee did not want to utilize the Performance Improvement Plans in the same way as last year. They wanted all projects to address how they assured and improved performance as a standard of doing business. It was agreed to include a section on quality assurance worth up to 20 points. Half the points would come from a narrative description of how the project addressed this issue and half would come from either having achieved the benchmarks set in last year’s PIPs or not needing to write them last year. Staff was instructed to develop the details of this scoring criterion.

14. No points will be awarded for attending the bidder’s meeting, as had been done last year, and that the total maximum points for completeness and clarity of the application itself would be 5 points, as in 2012.

15. Staff noted that with the additional criteria to be scored the points now totaled more than 100. The committee instructed staff to keep the total at 100 and adjust the point values to accommodate that change and present a scoring sheet at the next meeting.

The following ideas need further exploration before being finalized:

1. The committee remained undecided on if a threshold should be established and utilized in the scoring process. E. de Coligny will bring back to the group three potential ways to create a threshold, and a decision will be made at that time.

2. Will all renewals be included in the package as they were last year, or given that HUD will fund renewing and new permanent housing in Tier 2 prior to TH and SSHO renewals, is a different approach more strategic?

3. Should projects have the option to voluntarily give up all or a portion of their credits if they felt that this is a better option, rather than requiring all projects to submit an application?

4. Will there be an across the board cut of a smaller percentage than 5%?
NOFA 2013 Committee Meeting


Present: Elaine de Coligny, Jill Dunner, Moe Wright, Damon Francis, Angela Robinson-Pinon, Marnell Timmon, Jackie Ballard

Agenda:
Confirm decisions made by the committee at the 12-3-13 meeting.
Resolve open issues from last meeting.
Discuss the scoring of HMIS.
Discuss new projects.
Next steps.

The Committee reviewed the scoring matrix for renewing projects and confirmed the point values assigned to each question and the basis for assigning full and partial points articulated on the score sheet.

The Committee discussed whether to have HMIS submit a renewal proposal for scoring and agreed that it was responsive to the feedback received from last year’s process. It was viewed as more fair to have the HMIS project placed in the package where it ranked rather than automatically at the top as it was last year. Members approved the scoring matrix developed by staff and directed that it be released at the community meeting with the other renewal scoring criteria.

The Committee revisited the implications of HUD’s priorities for funding in Tier 2, noting that HUD will fund renewing TH as a 4th priority and renewing SSOs as a 5th priority, making it highly unlikely that either of these types of projects that fall into Tier 2 will get funded. In light of the community’s goal to maximize the resources available to address homelessness, the Committee determined it was most strategic to only include permanent housing—renewing or new—in Tier 2. TH and SSO projects that score in Tier 2 will be reallocated for new permanent housing and not included in the application package.

The committee discussed whether to establish a threshold that projects must meet in order to be eligible for inclusion in Tier 1. They evaluated three options: A. Capping the number of projects in Tier 1; B. Capping the dollar amount of renewals in Tier 1; C. Establishing a minimum score that projects needed to achieve to be considered for Tier 1. The Committee selected option C, viewing it as most consistent with HUD’s directives about how to evaluate and prioritize projects and that it was a basis over which projects had the most control. Members determined that a score of 90 points out of 100 would be the threshold for inclusion for renewals, HMIS, and any new projects. The Committee reserved the right to adjust ratings and rankings based on factors such as geography and population served, grant size and expiration date, whether there were residential properties to protect, and finally...
If projects had attempted to convert through the contract amendment process and were denied by HUD.

The Committee discussed the viability of this approach in light of several scenarios including the possibility that more renewal projects score the minimum than there is funding in Tier 1 to cover, or conversely fewer projects score the minimum than Tier 1 funds available. Projects will be ranked according to score and those with the lowest scores will fall into Tier 2, pending Committee adjustments, even if they score 60 points or more. If not enough renewal projects score 60 points, that potentially creates room in Tier 1 for funding new permanent housing. The Committee confirmed that the threshold worked in either scenario and agreed to proceed with it.

The Committee reviewed the plans for scoring and reviewing new projects. Changes to the new project applications included aligning them with the renewal application by including points for being permanent housing, adding points for using the Housing First Approach and serving the chronically homeless, and/or rapidly rehousing families. The Committee elected not to award bonus points for serving 50% or more of the subpopulations HUD prioritized beyond chronically homeless and families. Quality assurance was incorporated as a scoring factor in the “Demonstrated Capacity of Grantee and Partners”. Because the total amount available for new projects would not be known until the rating and ranking of renewals was finalized, new projects would be asked to consider including a minimum and maximum budget for the project to be finalized post the rating and ranking.

New projects could be either the same grantees converting an existing project or a new grantee applying for the funds from reallocated SSD and TH projects that do not meet the threshold. The Committee discussed whether to give converting projects more points than those applying for reallocated funds. The Committee was concerned that doing so could incentivize conversion proposals that were not necessarily strong projects, because the timing would make the project financially vulnerable and/or the proposing grantees did not have experience operating permanent housing. The Committee decided the following:

1. not to give higher scores to converting projects,
2. all committee members would read the new project proposals, and
3. new projects would get ranked below renewals even if they were in Tier 1 and scored higher than renewal projects in that same Tier.

Additional Decisions included:

1. No across the board cuts of any percentage
2. Projects would be invited to voluntarily reduce their request and/or not submit a renewal
3. The CoC would not submit a planning grant application—given that it would not get funded in Tier 2 and if included in Tier 1, the amount of renewals to be cut would be more than 5%.
4. Staff would modify the application forms and instructions to reflect the decisions of the Committee in preparation for their release at the 12/10/13 Community Meeting, and the forms would not undergo additional committee review prior to that.
NGFA Committee Meeting Minutes

12.17.13 – 224 West Winton Ave.

Present: Elaine de Coligny, Jill Danner, Moe Wright, Damon Francis, Grace Kong, Duane Poe, Angela Robinson-Finnon, Jackie Ballard, Alexis Lozano

Absent: Marshall Timson

Agenda:
- FAQs and Policy
- Updates on other work
- Looking at next steps
- Schedule meetings to review scoring

Meeting began at 9:32am.

Question put to the committee: will the budget deal be impacting this round of the NOFA? EdC clarified that the amount for this NDFA is settled. What is currently not settled upon is the money for Tier two, which will not be known until all of the calculations around underspending etc., have been completed.

No additional FAQs have been presented by projects. The Committee confirmed the decisions regarding questions asked at the 12/10/13 Community Meeting:
1. The Committee did intend to avoid having a project that fell into both tiers, and would negotiate a change in the budget to such a project prior to release of the ratings and ranking if this action was needed.
2. While acknowledging that the questions about the “Returns to Homelessness” scoring factor could point to adjustments for future years, the Committee decided to stick with the scoring and use of data reports outlined in the application form and instructions.

Staff reported on current work:
- The Returns to Homelessness reports will be produced and distributed to projects by no later than December 17th.
- Conversations presently being scheduled with multiple PSH and rental assistance projects, those projects which may be able to dedicate units to chronically homeless persons and thereby strengthen our overall application.
- Staff is also responding to grantees’ inquiries about converting existing projects.

Follow-ups:
- Draft minutes will be distributed and posted after review and approval by the Committee.
- The following dates have been established or confirmed:
  a. Local applications due: January 3, 2014
  b. Applications distributed to Committee: January 6, 2014
  c. Committee members return scores to staff by close of business on January 13, 2014
  d. Committee work session: January 15, 2014
  e. Any required negotiations for those projects close to the line of T2: January 16, 2014
  f. Project rating and ranking distributed to applicants by January 17, 2014
The committee will each read approximately 24 renewal apps each, scoring quality assurance, housing first, and completeness. Every proposal will be read by three NOFA Committee members.
NGFA Committee Meeting 12.23.13

Members present: Moe Wright, Angela Robinson-Pinon, Damon Francis, Jill Dunner, and Grace Kong.

Staff: Elaine de Coligny and Jackie Ballard

Absent: Marnell Tarmson, Duane Poe

Agenda:
- Review questions being presented by applicants
- Approve previous meeting minutes

The meeting began at 2:07pm

Minutes from December 2nd, 3rd, and 17th, were discussed briefly. It was decided that meeting minutes will be approved via email by committee members present on the phone call by close of business today. Approved minutes will be published to the EveryOne Home website.

Staff noted that requesting projects to provide a cost per outcome was approved by the Committee, but was not included in the applications. This was an oversight by staff.

Staff reviewed emails received since the last FAQs on 12/17/13. Following the review, the Committee focused on two topics: scoring methodology and publicizing of information once the rating and ranking is complete.

The Committee noted that the authority and criteria for scoring projects was addressed in the applications and at the Community Meeting held 12/18/13. The FAQs will direct people to the website to download the applications and the PowerPoint presented at that meeting. In addition the community would be informed that each application would be read by a minimum of three reviewers, then averaged, with the final score being determined after the committee met and conferred on individual project scores and the ranking of all projects as a whole. The Committee confirmed projects would be scored as submitted and included or not in the application package. As noted in the 12/17/13 FAQs, adjusting the budget of a project so that it fit into the package and was not partially in both tiers would be done after negotiation with the applicant.

The Committee affirmed that on January 17, 2014 the final rating and ranking of all projects will be distributed to all applicants and posted on the EveryOne Home website. As was the case last year, individual applicants will get the aggregate score for their project(s), and applicants wishing to see each reviewers’ scores or comments may make an appointment to come to the EveryOne Home offices to read the original documents. The names of the individual reviewers and any further identifying information will be redacted from the documents. The Committee directed staff to research whether other NGFA processes made all applications, scores and comments available to any interested applicant or just an applicants own submissions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
[Docket No. FR-5700-N-31B]
Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014
Continuum of Care Program Competition

OVERVIEW INFORMATION


B. Funding Opportunity Title: Notice of Funding Availability for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program.

C. Announcement Type: Initial Announcement.

D. Funding Opportunity Number: The funding opportunity number is FR-5700-N-31B.

The OMB Approval number is 2506-0112.


F. Deadline: The deadline for submitting applications to HUD for the FY 2013 – FY 2014 Continuum of Care Program Competition (CoC Program Competition) will have separate deadlines for FY 2013 and FY 2014 funding requests. For FY 2013 funds, the deadline for submitting applications is 7:59:59 p.m. eastern time, February 3, 2014. Applicants will be required to complete and submit their applications in e-snaps at www.hud.gov/esnaps. See Section VI of this NOFA for application submission and timely receipt requirements.

The deadline for submitting the documentation required for FY 2014 funds will be announced in a subsequent Notice to be published by HUD, but will be no earlier than 60 days after Congress enacts an appropriation funding the Department for the balance of FY 2014. See Section I.B.2 of this NOFA for information on when and how to apply for FY 2014 funds.

G. For Further Information: HUD staff will be available to provide general clarification on the content of this NOFA. HUD staff cannot assist applicants in preparing their applications to submit for funding.

1. Local HUD CPD Field Office. Questions regarding specific program requirements should be directed to the local HUD CPD Field Office, a directory of which can be found at www.hud.gov/offices/cpdf/about/staff/fieldoffices/index.cfm.

2. Training and Resources. CoCs and project applicants that need assistance completing the applications in e-snaps or understanding the program requirements under the CoC Program may access the CoC Program interim rule, training materials, and program
Date: January 17, 2014
TO: Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants
From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home
Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($524,103) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UPA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HKS; and 9. renewing SRO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 3 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount. Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct planner only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant scoring information to your project partners. If you are the lead agency on multiple projects, all scores will be listed in the same attachment, but in their own individual tables. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@seap.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 27th through January 28th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIER 1</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COMOR Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>Alate Services</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oakland Parks Rehousing Initiative (OPRI)</td>
<td>Alate Services</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HOPE Housing</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russet Street Residence (RSG)</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PH-RFH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safe Homes Alameda County Housing</td>
<td>Alate Links</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lomitas Creek S/C</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Swift of Hope</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Housing Past Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lomitas Creek S/C</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Alate Services</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tri-City/TESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>APC Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nixson Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Sanita House, Inc.</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network</td>
<td>Lifelong Medical Care</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Turning Point, Inc.</td>
<td>Food Bank Youth Center</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>Women's Daytime Drop-Ins Center</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NOCC- North County Women's Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - FACT</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Harrison House Family Services Program</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ashby House</td>
<td>Operation Dignity, Inc.</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rubicon Berkeley Employment Services</td>
<td>Rubicon Programs Inc.</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Madison Centennial Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Homeless Outreach for People Empowerment</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Families in Transition - Residential Setup</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>Veritas A. Florida Foundation</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>South County Sobriety Housing</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Barrett House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>McKinley Family Transitional House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rose Park House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Self-Sufficiency Project</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER 2</td>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PH-SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>North County Family Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PH-RFH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.)

Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2, one of which is the North County Family Rapid Re-housing Collaborative. As we discussed your application is being submitted with a total budget of $620,519. Please proceed with your E-snaps submission at this amount.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct grantee only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant to scoring information to your project partners. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s
Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
Date: January 17, 2014
TO: HCD / Welcome Home
From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home
Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount.

Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2, one of which is Welcome Home. As we discussed your application is being submitted with a total budget of $620,519. Please proceed with your E-snaps submission at this amount.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct grantee only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant to scoring information to your project partners. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.
A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority. With that in mind, the Committee determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects.

The NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. As you are aware, BOSS had two projects whose applications did not earn the minimum score for direct inclusion into Tier 1 for renewals. There were a number of criteria on which both projects failed to score the full points available, including completeness and Housing First. The attached scoring table also indicates that both projects scored 0 points for their exits to permanent housing. The Committee elected to put Rosa Parks House in Tier 1 because it is a residential building which houses homeless people. The portion of the Self Sufficiency Project that landed above the Tier 1 funding line ($486,820) remains in the package because the committee did not want to lose a program that made showers and services available to people forced to live outdoors without giving time to work on alternative funding strategies. The Committee expressed serious concerns about the program’s performance on community-wide outcomes and the long-term viability of funding such services with Continuum of Care dollars. The Committee strongly recommends that you work with the local funders copied on this memo and others to identify the essential services provided by the Self Sufficiency Project and alternate funding sources for them because given the combination of HUD’s priorities and the program’s performance, it is highly uncertain that it will be competitive in future funding rounds.

We recognize that many of BOSS’s projects were funded in the early years of McKinney funding and HUD’s priorities and expectations have shifted over the years, while leaving the grant contracts quite rigid and inflexible. EveryOne Home does not want to see any essential services lost in our community and is very willing to work with BOSS and other local funders, as we historically have, to improve your projects’ performance and identify more stable and appropriate funding for those projects that are no longer a good match for CoC funding.
The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
January 17, 2014

Date: January 17, 2014

TO: Goodwill Industries of the East Bay

From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home

Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects.

Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Yours was the lowest scoring project submitted, and therefore will not be included in the package. Your application failed to earn points on a number of measures, including completeness, people exiting with earned income, people exiting with permanent housing, and returns to homelessness. Attached is the scoring chart, which contains the full detail of points awarded based on your application. The full amount of your project has been reallocated, while a portion of the other will be reallocated.

Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.
MEMORANDUM

To:   Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants
From:   HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home
Date:   January 31, 2014
Re:   2013 HUD Continuum of Care Consolidated Application notice of availability for review

EveryOne Home and the Collaborative Applicant have completed the Alameda County 2013 HUD Continuum of Care Consolidated Application. The submitted CoC application (exhibit 1), the project applications (exhibit 2), and the Project Priority List are now available for review on the EveryOne Home website.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

If you have questions, please email everyonehome@acgov.org
January 17, 2014

To: Donald Frasier, Executive Director, BOSS

From: HUD NOFA Committee/Everyone Home

Cc: Jane Micallef, City of Berkeley; Robert Ratner, Behavioral Health Care Services; Riley Wilkerson, Alameda County Housing and Community Development

Subject: Your Project Scores and inclusion in the 2014 Continuum of Care Application

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority. With that in mind, the Committee determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects.

The NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. As you are aware, BOSS had two projects whose applications did not earn the minimum score for direct inclusion into Tier 1 for renewals. There were a number of criteria on which both projects failed to score the full points available, including completeness and Housing First. The attached scoring table also indicates that both projects scored 0 points for their exits to permanent housing. The Committee elected to put Rosa Parks House in Tier 1 because it is a residential building which houses homeless people. The portion of the Self Sufficiency Project that landed above the Tier 1 funding line ($486,820) remains in the package because the committee did not want to lose a program that made showers and services available to people forced to live outdoors without giving time to work on alternative funding strategies. The Committee expressed serious concerns about the program’s performance on community-wide outcomes and the long-term viability of funding such services with Continuum of Care dollars. The Committee strongly recommends that you work with the local funders copied on this memo and others to identify the essential services provided by the Self Sufficiency Project and alternate funding sources for them because given the combination of HUD’s priorities and the program’s performance, it is highly uncertain that it will be competitive in future funding rounds.

We recognize that many of BOSS’s projects were funded in the early years of McKinney funding and HUD’s priorities and expectations have shifted over the years, while leaving the grant contracts quite rigid and inflexible. EveryOne Home does not want to see any essential services lost in our community and is very willing to work with BOSS and other local funders, as we historically have, to improve your projects’ performance and identify more stable and appropriate funding for those projects that are no longer a good match for CoC funding.
The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
January 17, 2014

Date: January 17, 2014
TO: Goodwill Industries of the East Bay
From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home
Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects.

Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Yours was the lowest scoring project submitted, and therefore will not be included in the package. Your application failed to earn points on a number of measures, including completeness, people exiting with earned income, people exiting with permanent housing, and returns to homelessness. Attached is the scoring chart, which contains the full detail of points awarded based on your application. The full amount of your project has been reallocated, while a portion of the other will be reallocated.

Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Bed Capacity</th>
<th>Current %</th>
<th>2013 Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI)- SHP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit of Hope 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-City/FESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Creek SHP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russel Street Residence (RSR)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Creek S+C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH Project</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE Housing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRA</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - FACT</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuum of Care (CoC) New Project Listing

Instructions:
Prior to starting the CoC New Project Listing, Collaborative Applicants should carefully review the “CoC Priority Listing Instructions” and the “CoC Project Listing” training module, both of which are available at: https://www.onecpd.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources/

To upload all new project applications that were created through reallocation and have been submitted to this CoC Project Listing, click on the “Update List” button. This process may take a few minutes based upon the number of new projects created through reallocation that need to be located in the e-snaps system. The Collaborative Applicant may update each of the Project Listings simultaneously. The Collaborative Applicant can wait for the Project Listings to be updated or can log out of e-snaps and come back later to view the updated list(s). To review a project on the New Project Listing, click on the magnifying glass next to each project to view project details. To view the actual project application, click on the orange folder. If there are errors identified by the Collaborative Applicant, the project can be amended back to the project applicant to make the necessary changes by clicking on the amend icon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Grant Term</th>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Comp Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>2014-01-30 18:47:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County Ho...</td>
<td>$620,519</td>
<td>R49</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Fami...</td>
<td>2014-01-31 12:46:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>$620,519</td>
<td>R50</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuum of Care (CoC) Renewal Project Listing

Instructions:
Prior to starting the CoC Renewal Project Listing, Collaborative Applicants should carefully review the “CoC Priority Listing Instructions” and the “CoC Project Listing” training module, both of which are available at: https://www.onecpd.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources/

To upload all renewal project applications that have been submitted to this CoC Project Listing, click on the "Update List" button. This process may take a few minutes based upon the number of renewal projects that need to be located in the e-snaps system. The Collaborative Applicant may update each of the Project Listings simultaneously. The Collaborative Applicant can wait for the Project Listings to be updated or can log out of e-snaps and come back later to view the updated list(s). To review a project on the Renewal Project Listing, click on the magnifying glass next to each project to view project details. To view the actual project application, click on the orange folder. If there are errors identified by the Collaborative Applicant, the project can be amended back to the project applicant to make the necessary changes by clicking on the amend icon.

The Collaborative Applicant certifies that there is a demonstrated need for all renewal permanent supportive housing and rapid re-housing projects listed on the Renewal Project Listing.

The Collaborative Applicant does not have any renewal permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing renewal projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Grant Term</th>
<th>Applicant Name</th>
<th>Budget Amount</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Comp Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland PATH Reho...</td>
<td>2014-01-03 11:17:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>$421,837</td>
<td>W4</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>2014-01-03 11:38:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>$539,714</td>
<td>W17</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Employme...</td>
<td>2014-01-02 20:52:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Rubicon Programs ...</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
<td>W35</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby House</td>
<td>2014-01-13 14:04:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Operation Dignty,...</td>
<td>$56,447</td>
<td>W34</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>2014-01-13 15:29:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Resources for Com...</td>
<td>$71,524</td>
<td>W7</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Transitio...</td>
<td>2014-01-13 18:44:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Women's Daytime D...</td>
<td>$70,289</td>
<td>W30</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison House Fa...</td>
<td>2014-01-13 18:53:...</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Building Opportun...</td>
<td>$117,187</td>
<td>W33</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>2014-01-13</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$237,812</td>
<td>W38</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley House</td>
<td>2014-01-13</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,919</td>
<td>W45</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Based Rent</td>
<td>2014-01-13</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,971,274</td>
<td>W14</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>2014-01-14</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$124,291</td>
<td>W6</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Wome</td>
<td>2014-01-14</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$390,535</td>
<td>W31</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Sobe</td>
<td>2014-01-13</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$189,264</td>
<td>W43</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing Way Apar</td>
<td>2014-01-13</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,710</td>
<td>W26</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>2014-01-13</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$212,473</td>
<td>W41</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>2014-01-14</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$121,004</td>
<td>W24</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Street Re</td>
<td>2014-01-14</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$258,461</td>
<td>W8</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Parks House</td>
<td>2014-01-15</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$167,162</td>
<td>W47</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Babcock Hou</td>
<td>2014-01-15</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,363</td>
<td>W20</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>2014-01-15</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,967</td>
<td>W9</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Outreach</td>
<td>2014-01-16</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$274,929</td>
<td>W39</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>2014-01-22</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$868,119</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>2014-01-23</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$486,800</td>
<td>W48</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh</td>
<td>2014-01-24</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$359,710</td>
<td>W32</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Housing a</td>
<td>2014-01-27</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$549,672</td>
<td>W28</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Coleman /</td>
<td>2014-01-27</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$195,928</td>
<td>W23</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyan House Tran</td>
<td>2014-01-27</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,320</td>
<td>W44</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Creek SHP</td>
<td>2014-01-27</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,788</td>
<td>W16</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Point</td>
<td>2014-01-27</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$663,869</td>
<td>W29</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Homeless ...</td>
<td>2014-01-28</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$713,095</td>
<td>W42</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda Cleveland</td>
<td>2014-01-28</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$264,765</td>
<td>W36</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families in Trans...</td>
<td>2014-01-28</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>$249,815</td>
<td>W40</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Fast Supp...</td>
<td>2014-01-29</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>$1,864,465</td>
<td>W15</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH Project</td>
<td>2014-01-29</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>$449,002</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$305,656</td>
<td>W19</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$506,808</td>
<td>W25</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$1,066,208</td>
<td>W27</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InHOUSE</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$4,403,183</td>
<td>W37</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Alameda ...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$1,095,078</td>
<td>W10</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$310,153</td>
<td>W5</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit of Hope I</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$44,962</td>
<td>W13</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-City FESCO Br...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$42,973</td>
<td>W18</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC Multi-Service...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$1,111,092</td>
<td>W22</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$476,578</td>
<td>W12</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Per...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$188,290</td>
<td>W21</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Integr...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$160,183</td>
<td>W46</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sh...</td>
<td>2014-01-30</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$142,948</td>
<td>W11</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: January 17, 2014

TO: Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants

From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home

Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project's total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($5,244,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TM; 5. CoC planning; 6. UPA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMR; and 9. renewing SRO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuing nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SRO and TM projects whose scores put them below the Tier 3 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SRO projects' scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount. Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community's Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community's application.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct grantee only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant to scoring information to your project partners. If you are the lead agency on multiple projects, all scores will be listed in the same attachment, but in their own individual tables. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@egov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 27th through January 29th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community's Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
Date: January 17, 2014

TO: Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants

From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home

Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)' total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($2,414,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSOs; 2. new PSOs; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UPA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMMs; and 9. renewing IHO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 3 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount. Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can be funded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct grantee only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant to scoring information to your project partners. If you are the lead agency on multiple projects, all scores will be listed in the same attachment, but in their own individual tables. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@ejay.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 27 through January 28. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIER 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IHouse</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COMOR Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>Aboite Services</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI) - SIF</td>
<td>Aboite Services</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HOME Housing</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russell Street Residence (RSH)</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Southern Alameda County Housing/Linkage CCH</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lomita Creek SoC</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spirit of Hope 2</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Housing Fast Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lomita Creek SoP</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Aboite Services</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tri-City/TESCO Bridgeview Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>APC Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>tandem Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Randie House, Inc.</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network</td>
<td>Lifelong Medical Care</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>Women's Daytime Drop-In Center</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NOVC, North County Women's Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - FACT</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Harrison House Family Services Program</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ashby House</td>
<td>Operation Dignity, Inc.</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rubicon Berkeley Employment Services</td>
<td>Rubicon Programs Inc.</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mattie Cleveland Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Homeless Outreach for People Empowerment</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Families In Transition Scattered Sites</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Waller House</td>
<td>Verona A. Fender Foundation</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>South County Sober Housing</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Baranis House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>McKeeley Family Transitional House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services For Empowerment</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rose Parks House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Self-Sufficiency Project</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PHSH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TIER 2 |                                                                         |                                            |          |
| 49   | Welcome Home                                                            | Alameda County Housing and Community Development | PHSH     |
| 50   | North County Family Rapid Rehousing                                    | City of Oakland                            | PHSH     |
| 51   |                                                                                                     |                                            |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIER 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H3HOUSE</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>H3MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COCIR Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>Alente Services</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI) - SHP</td>
<td>Alente Services</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HOME Housing</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russell Street Residence (RSP)</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Southern Alameda County Housing/Linkages</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Luminous Creek S/C</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spirit of Hope 2</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Housing Fast Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Luminous Creek SHP</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Alente Services</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tri-City/TESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peter Rabinek House</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>APC Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rossie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Rentita House, Inc.</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network</td>
<td>Lifelong Medical Care</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Turnpike Point FY11</td>
<td>Fred Ross Youth Center</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>Women's Daytime Drop-Off Center</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NCWC - North County Women's Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - FACT</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Harrison House Family Services Program</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ashby House</td>
<td>Operation Dignity, Inc.</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rubicon Berlyoy Employment Services</td>
<td>Rubicon Programs Inc.</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mattie Cleveland Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Homeless Outreach for People Empowerment</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Families in Transition Scattered Sites</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Walton House</td>
<td>Venita A. Fisher Foundation</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>South County Sober Housing</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Benham House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hickman Family Transitional House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rose Park House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Self-Sufficiency Project</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>PSHP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TIER 2 |                                                                 |                                                      |         |
| 49   | Welcome Home                                                            | Alameda County Housing and Community Development     | PSHP    |
| 50   | North County Family Rapid Rehousing                                     | City of Oakland                                      | PSHP    |
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Signed Agreements:

1.0  InHOUSE Partner MOU:

Policy:

Each participating agency/jurisdiction must have a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Alameda Countywide Homeless Continuum of Care Council to use the InHOUSE system and must be compliant with the terms of the MOU to continue use of InHOUSE.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will be given two copies of the InHOUSE Partner MOU by the Council staff for signature.
B. The participating agency/jurisdiction will sign and return both copies of the MOU to the Council.
C. Council Staff will sign the MOU, retain one signed MOU and return the second copy to the agency/jurisdiction.

See Appendix A.

1.1 Privacy Agreement:

Policy:

A Privacy Agreement must be signed by each agency/jurisdiction staff who will handle client data intended for or generated by the InHOUSE system prior to collecting or handling client data. The Privacy Agreement lists the privacy and confidentiality provisions to abide by.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will provide Council staff with the names of their identified staff requiring certification and Privacy Agreements.
B. Each participating agency/jurisdiction’s staff will be given a Privacy Agreement for signature at the Privacy and Security Certification Training.

See Appendix B.
1.2 User Agreement:

Policy:

A User Agreement must be signed by each InHOUSE system user prior to a license being issued to that user and the terms of use must be adhered to in order to retain user access and rights.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will provide Council staff with the names of their identified system users requiring licensed access.

B. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will be given a User Agreement for each of its InHOUSE system users by the Council staff for signature.

C. Council Staff will retain the original User Agreements and copies will be provided to the agency/jurisdiction.

D. Licensed access to the InHOUSE system will be granted after receipt of the User Agreement and completion of both Privacy and Security Certification Training and User Training.

See Appendix C.
Participating Agency/Jurisdiction:

2.0 Roles and Responsibilities:

Policy:

Each participating agency/jurisdiction is responsible for developing and maintaining an internal infrastructure to support and monitor their agency and users’ adherence to the Governing Principles and Policies and Procedures of the Countywide InHOUSE system.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will identify an InHOUSE “Manager” who will hold final responsibility for the adherence of his/her agency’s/jurisdiction’s personnel to the Governing Principles, and Policies and Procedures outlined in this document.

B. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will identify personnel to fulfill the following roles for implementation and maintenance of the InHOUSE system. The roles may be re-assigned to more or fewer than four individuals.

**Implementation Team Leader** (role de-activated after implementation)

1. Lead agency contact with InHOUSE Implementation Project Manager.

2. Responsible for insuring HMIS is fully implemented in their agency.

3. Insures all tasks for three roles listed below are completed in a timely manner as specified.

4. Must attend all Implementation Team meetings or to debrief and strategize regularly with three team members listed below.

**Implementation Specialist** (role de-activated after implementation)

1. Data collection needs-related contact person for InHOUSE Countywide Project Manager.

2. Communicate about the services and reporting requirements of agency for incorporation into the InHOUSE system.

3. Make recommendations about data elements and pick lists.

4. Shop ideas and discuss decisions back at the agency and build buy-in for the system and decisions made in InHOUSE Implementation meetings.
**Policies and Procedures Administrator**

2. Maintain current InHOUSE-related files, including Privacy and User Agreements and InHOUSE Partner MOU.
3. Conduct one-on-one Privacy and Security Certification Training as needed.
4. Maintain compliance with confidentiality policies.
5. Respond to end-user system questions.

**Technical Administrator**

1. Add users to agency system.
2. Setup/monitor password screensavers.
3. Monitor end user workstation security.
5. Maintain and update firewalls and virus protection on agency computer system/network.
6. Maintain system software updates on end user workstations.
7. Manage digital certificates.
8. Respond to end-user system questions.
9. Work with InHOUSE System Administrator on unresolved software issues.
10. Work with InHOUSE System Administrator when Administrative system changes are requested by Agency.
11. Add/Update Agency & Program I&R.
12. Run Provider Reports.
13. Create Custom Reports.
15. Audit User Reports.

Note: Must be able to perform all client/services/shelter software functions at agency level.
2.0 Roles and Responsibilities: (continued)

**InHOUSE Manager** (begins after agency/jurisdiction’s implementation)

1. Lead contact for the InHOUSE System Administrator.
2. Responsible for insuring InHOUSE is properly utilized and in compliance in their agency.
3. Responsible for insuring that his/her agency's/jurisdiction’s personnel adhere to the Governing Principles and Policies and Procedures outlined in this document.
4. Respond to questions from Technical Administrator and Policy and Procedures Administrator.
5. Oversee and monitor the ongoing tasks of the Technical Administrator and Policy and Procedures Administrator.
6. Represent agency/jurisdiction at periodic InHOUSE user meetings.
7. Bring ideas, concerns and issues to periodic InHOUSE user meetings to facilitate enhancements and improvements to the system.
8. Conduct one-on-one Privacy and Security Certification Training as needed.
2.1 Access to Internet:

Policy:

Each participating agency/jurisdiction is responsible for maintaining their agency's/jurisdiction's Internet Connection and troubleshooting any problems with the connection.

2.2 Privacy Requirements:

Policy:

Each participating agency/jurisdiction must comply with the HMIS Privacy Standards 4.1 through 5.2.1 described in the HUD Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS); Data and Technical Standards Final Notice, including all Baseline Requirements and with Additional Privacy Protections specified by the InHOUSE Policies and Procedures manual.

Each participating agency/jurisdiction will document all baseline privacy requirements and all additional privacy protections in its Privacy Notice document.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will document and publish a Privacy Notice describing its policies and practices for the processing of Protected Personal Identifiers (PPI). This notice must include all baseline privacy protections and all additional privacy protections.

B. If the agency/jurisdiction has a website, a copy of the Privacy Notice document will be posted on that website.

C. Agency/jurisdiction must require each member of its staff (including employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors and associates) to sign (annually or otherwise) a confidentiality agreement that acknowledges receipt of a copy of the privacy notice and that pledges to comply with the privacy notice.
2.2 Privacy Requirements: (continued)

Baseline Requirements:

All baseline privacy requirements described in the HUD Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS); Data and Technical Standards Final Notice are included in full text and summary in Appendix C and Appendix D of this manual.

Additional Privacy Protections:

Collection Limitation
1. PPI will only be collected with the knowledge or consent of the individual (unless required by law).
2. Written consent will be obtained from the individual for the collections of personal information from the individual or from a third party.

Purpose Specifications and Use Limitation
1. Users and agency/jurisdiction agree to additional restrictions on use or disclosure of an individual’s PPI at the request of the individual if the request is reasonable. The agency/jurisdiction is bound by this agreement except if inconsistent with legal requirements.

Access and Correction
1. Client appeals of a denial of access to or correction(s) of collected data will be accepted. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will adopt its own appeal procedure and describe the procedure in its Privacy Notice.
2. The agency/jurisdiction will provide to any individual appealing an access or correction decision a written explanation of the reason(s) for the denial.

Accountability
1. Each member of agency/jurisdiction staff (including employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors and associates) of a participating agency/jurisdiction will undergo (annually or otherwise) formal training in privacy requirements.
2. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will establish a method, such as an internal audit, for regularly reviewing compliance with its privacy policy.
3. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will establish an internal appeal process for hearing an appeal of a privacy complaint or an appeal of a denial of access or corrections rights.
2.3 Notification of Privacy Protections:

**Policy:**

Each participating agency/jurisdiction will document all privacy protections in its Privacy Notice document.

**Procedure:**

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will document and publish a Privacy Notice describing its policies and practices for the processing of Protected Personal Identifiers (PPI). This notice must include all the above listed additional privacy protections in its published Privacy Notice.

B. The Council has a sample privacy notice that describes the data uses and system-wide privacy protections for non-HIPAA covered entities. Agencies/jurisdictions may customize this sample, adding in the agency name and any additional uses or protections specific to the agency/jurisdiction.

C. If the agency/jurisdiction has a website, a copy of the Privacy Notice document must be posted on that website.

D. Agency/jurisdiction must post a sign stating the availability of its privacy notice to any individual who requests a copy. The Council has prepared a sample of this signage.

E. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will establish or modify all necessary internal or external processes required to accommodate all the above listed additional privacy protections.

F. HIPAA-covered entities should review their current Privacy Notice to ensure it accurately discloses the collection and use of data for InHOUSE.

G. Further guidance from CoC will be forthcoming as it becomes available regarding InHOUSE implementation specific to HIPAA-covered entities.
Participating Agency/Jurisdiction:

2.4 Notice to Clients of Participation in InHOUSE:

Policy:

Clients of each agency/jurisdiction participating in the InHOUSE system will be informed by a posted notice of the agency’s/jurisdiction’s participation.

Procedure:
A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will post a notice in full view of clients in the offices where intake occurs.
B. The size of the notice must compete favorably with others posters and notices in the intake office.
C. Disclosure of the agency’s/jurisdiction’s participation in the Alameda County InHOUSE system may be added to the 4.2.1 Collection Limitation sign template identified in the HUD HMIS Final Standards. The Council has prepared a sample of this signage.
D. When administration of an intake occurs in an off-site location (e.g. the home of a participant), the client must be given a copy of the agency/jurisdiction’s Privacy Notice in addition to the “What is INHOUSE?” form distributed while seeking consent for the Release of Information.

2.5 Need-based Access:

Policy:

Access to the InHOUSE system will be based on need. Need exists only for staff who work directly with (or supervise staff who work directly with) clients or have data entry or data reporting responsibilities. Appropriate license access levels will correspond to staff’s need and use of data.

Procedure:
A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will identify the specific staff members to obtain licensed access to the InHOUSE system based on this policy and assist the InHOUSE System Administrator in determining appropriate level of access.
2.6 Access Privileges to InHOUSE Software:

Policy:

Each participating agency/jurisdiction staff member must be trained in both privacy and security procedures, and in specific software use to obtain licensed access to the InHOUSE system. Licensed access to the InHOUSE system may never be “shared” with another individual.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will identify the specific staff members to obtain licensed access to the InHOUSE system.

B. Each identified member must successfully complete the following:
   1. InHOUSE Privacy and Security Certification training.
   2. Agree to all provisions of use by reading and signing the InHOUSE Privacy Agreement. (See Appendix B)
   3. Agree to all provisions of use by reading and signing the InHOUSE User Agreement. (See Appendix C)
   4. ServicePoint User Training or InHOUSE agency administrator training.

C. Each user will create and maintain an independent and private password which will not be disclosed to anyone.
Participating Agency/Jurisdiction:

2.7 Breach of Confidentiality and/or Security:

Policy:

A breach of confidentiality and/or security by any agency/jurisdiction participant in the InHOUSE system will result in consequences up to and including termination of user rights and, potentially, termination of employment. An agency/jurisdiction that is found to have consistently and/or flagrantly violated confidentiality and/or security protocols may have their access privileges suspended or revoked.

Procedure:

A. Agency/Jurisdiction will notify InHOUSE System Administrator within three (3) business days of any identified breach of security.

B. InHOUSE System Administrator will review agency/jurisdiction data and discuss the situation with the agency/jurisdiction within three (3) business days. In addition, the InHOUSE System Administrator will inform designated CoC staff about the issue and convey the relative seriousness of the breach.

C. Based on the seriousness of the breach of security and/or confidentiality, CoC staff will recommend an appropriate intervention to the Executive Committee of the Council.

D. The Executive Committee of the Council, or a designated special committee of the Executive Committee, will decide whether a downgrading of system access, loss of user privileges, or other intervention is necessary.

E. Appeals may be made to the Executive Committee of the Council or a designated special committee of the Executive Committee.

F. Agency/jurisdiction is expected to make decisions about disciplinary action, up to and including termination, in accordance with agency/jurisdiction policies and values.

G. The InHOUSE System Administrator will monitor access logs regularly and report suspicious activity to the designated CoC staff person and agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager.
2.8 Revocation or Revision of Access Privileges:

Policy:

Other violations of system use protocols (other than breaches of confidentiality and/or security) may warrant revocation of user privileges, downgrading of access, and/or disciplinary action of specific end users by the agency/jurisdiction.

Procedure:

A. Agencies/jurisdictions should undertake disciplinary action with employees as appropriate and in accordance with agency/jurisdictional policies.

B. Agencies/jurisdictions must notify the InHOUSE System Administrator with information about any violation(s) of the policies and procedures set forth in this document or any signed MOUs and/or signed InHOUSE forms within three (3) business days of the identified incident(s) of misuse or abuse of InHOUSE privileges.

C. The InHOUSE System Administrator will monitor access logs and other system information regularly and report suspicious activity to the designated CoC staff person and agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager.

D. Once notified by agency/jurisdiction of a violation, CoC staff will respond within fifteen (15) working days with appropriate discussions and/or intervention steps. Possible intervention steps, depending on the severity of the violation, include revocation of user privileges or downgrading of access rights.

E. All sanctions are imposed by the agency/jurisdiction and/or the Council’s Executive Committee or a special committee of the Executive Committee (such as the System Grievance and Security Committee, see Section 10.1).

F. All sanctions imposed by the agency/jurisdiction can be appealed to the CoC Executive Committee or a special committee of the Executive Committee (such as the System Grievance and Security Committee, see Section 10.1).

G. All sanctions imposed by the CoC Executive Committee or its designee following the disposition of the appeal are final and binding.
Participating Agency/Jurisdiction:

2.9 Participant Data:

Policy:

HUD prohibits predicing access and utilization of services on consent for entry into the HMIS. However, funders of certain programs may require that data be collected and electronically entered and maintained in order to provide services. CoC acknowledges this conundrum and lays out the following procedures to accommodate this discrepancy in the guidelines for some programs.

Agency/jurisdiction may collect and store Client data in InHOUSE without express written consent providing the following are completed:

- the data is stored within InHOUSE such that it is inaccessible to other agencies,
- appropriate disclosure is included in the agency/jurisdiction’s Privacy Notice, and
- clients receive and initial for receipt of the “What Is InHOUSE?” form.
2.10 Quarterly Compliance Review:

Policy:

Each participating agency/jurisdiction will conduct a quarterly monitoring to review adherence to the Governing Principles and Policies and Procedures of the Countywide InHOUSE system. A plan must be developed to correct any problems that are identified. Council staff or designees will periodically review participating agency/jurisdiction’s quarterly monitoring to ensure system-wide compliance and adherence to Governing Principles and Policies and Procedures of the Countywide InHOUSE system.

Procedure:

A. Agency/jurisdiction’s quarterly monitoring will review privacy/confidentiality, data quality, and security, as follows:

1. **Privacy/Confidentiality**
   a) The agency/jurisdiction must review dataflow to insure all Privacy and Security requirements are met in obtaining and entering client data.

2. **Data Quality**
   a) Review system reports on completeness of required data.
   b) Determine that all definitions are being applied uniformly.

3. **Security**
   a) Review if all workstations are being updated regularly for virus protection.
   b) Review if system firewall is regularly updated
   c) Review handling of hardcopy versions of client data.
   d) Review disposal procedures (hard and soft copy) of client data.
Client Rights:

3.0 Decision to Participate:

Policy:

Clients have the right to specify if their personal information from the Standardized Intake may be shared in the InHOUSE system. Clients can not be refused services if they choose not to share the Intake in InHOUSE.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will post a sign at each intake desk (or comparable location) that explains generally the reasons for collecting this information. The language of the sign should read:

We collect personal information directly from you for reasons that are discussed in our privacy statement. We may be required to collect some personal information by law or by organizations that give us money to operate this program. Other personal information that we collect is important to run our programs, to improve services for homeless persons, and to better understand the needs of homeless persons. We only collect information that we consider to be appropriate.

B. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will provide a copy of its Privacy Notice document to any individual upon request.

C. Clients will be informed both verbally and in writing about what information is being collected and how the information will be used.

D. Clients will be informed both verbally and in writing about their options for participation in InHOUSE.

E. Clients will initial on the “Client Release of Information Authorization” to acknowledge receipt of the “What is InHOUSE?” form following the verbal explanation. The “What is InHOUSE?” form will be given to the client.

F. If a client chooses to share Intake data, the client will sign the “Client Release of Information Authorization” form. This form must be “witnessed” in writing by an agency/jurisdiction representative.

G. If a Client chooses to not share Intake data, the “Consent” section of the “Client Release of Information Authorization” form is not signed. All collected data may be entered into InHOUSE, but must be secured appropriately to forbid any sharing. Client may not be denied services based on that choice.

H. Client information may only be searched for or entered in the InHOUSE system AFTER the client has been informed of data collection and use, the option for data sharing, and presented the “What is InHOUSE?” form.
I. Reasonable accommodations will be made with regards to the Privacy Notice, release of information forms and posted signs for persons with disabilities and non-English speaking clients as required by law.

3.1 Client Revisions to Participation:

Policy:

Clients have the right to specify when and how their personal information in the InHOUSE system may be changed. Clients may revoke, revise, and/or amend their levels of data sharing at any time during the course of service use. Clients may not be refused services if they choose to modify their participation in InHOUSE.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will complete a new Release of Information authorization form each time a Client asks to share his/her data in InHOUSE.

B. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will complete a Revocation of Consent form each time a Client requests to no longer share data in InHOUSE.

C. Agency/jurisdiction will modify Client ROI in InHOUSE within one (1) business day in accordance with Client’s revised authorization.
Client Rights:

3.2 Client Access to Personal Information:

Policy:

Clients have the right to inspect and to have a copy of their personal information which is stored in the InHOUSE system. Clients also have the right to request that information be corrected and/or updated.

Procedure:

A. Each participating agency/jurisdiction will, within five (5) workings days of request, allow the client to review their InHOUSE record.

B. At the reasonable written request of a client, each participating agency/jurisdiction will, within 5 working days, provide a printed “hard” copy of the client’s InHOUSE record.

C. The agency/jurisdiction must offer to explain any information that the client does not understand.

D. Each participating agency/jurisdiction must consider any request by a client for correction of inaccurate or incomplete personal information pertaining to that client.

E. An agency/jurisdiction is not required to remove any information but may mark information as client-identified as inaccurate or incomplete and may supplement data fields with additional information and/or explanations.

F. Each participating agency/jurisdiction must have in its Privacy Notice the specific conditions under which it may deny the inspection of or copying of a client’s record (upon that client’s request) in InHOUSE.
3.3 Filing Client Grievances:

Policy:

Clients have the right to file a grievance for denial of access to or correction of data in the InHOUSE system, or if they believe their specific written release of information consent for the InHOUSE system has been violated.

Procedure:

A. Client files a grievance as specified in the agency/jurisdiction Privacy Notice.

B. Agency/jurisdiction must review all grievances at all levels identified in the Privacy Notice.

C. If client is unsatisfied with the resolution at the agency level, the client may request mediation at the system level. Within five (5) working days, a copy of the grievance is sent to the CoC staff member of the InHOUSE Grievance and Security Committee, who notifies and convenes the committee to review the grievance.

D. The InHOUSE Grievance and Security Committee as identified in Section 10.1 meets within ten (10) working days and sends written decision to the agency/jurisdiction and the client.
InHOUSE License Administration:

4.0 Issuing of User Licenses:

Policy:

The InHOUSE System Administrator will issue all initial agency/jurisdiction user licenses for system users. The agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator will administer user IDs and passwords for the eligible user at agency/jurisdiction site(s).

Procedure:

A. Upon completion of a signed User Agreement and Privacy and Security Certification, a system user will be eligible to be issued a license.

B. The InHOUSE System Administrator will allocate a user access license and privileges to the user prior to InHOUSE hands-on system training.

Passwords:

1) First-time, temporary passwords are automatically generated by the InHOUSE system when a user is created. This temporary password must be changed the first time the user logs onto the system.

2) InHOUSE User IDs and first-time, temporary passwords will be transmitted in two separate emails to the user.

3) NO SUBSEQUENT ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION OF AUTHENTICATORS (PASSWORDS OR USER NAMES) MAY TAKE PLACE.

4) Passwords selected by users to replace the first-time, temporary password must be at least eight characters long and meet reasonable industry standard requirements. These requirements include, but are not limited to:

   (a) Using at least one number and one letter;
   (b) Not using, or including, the username, the HMIS name, or the HMIS vendor’s name; and/or
   (c) Not consisting entirely of any word found in the common dictionary or any of the above spelled backwards.

Additional Licenses:

1) If a participating agency/jurisdiction purchases additional user licenses to the InHOUSE system, the above outlined Procedures will be followed.

C. The agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator will administer any changes in issued licenses and user IDs and passwords for eligible users at their site.
4.1 User Licenses:

Policy:

A User issued licensed access to the InHOUSE system may not share that access with any other person at any time. Sharing access is considered a breach of security and confidentiality and will result in consequences up to and including termination of user rights and potentially termination of employment as detailed in this manual.

4.2 Maintenance of User Licenses:

Policy:

Agency/jurisdictions’ InHOUSE Manager or Technical Administrator must notify the InHOUSE System Administrator upon termination or extended leave of absence of any licensed InHOUSE system user. User access will terminate at the end of business on their last day of employment or sooner if requested by the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager. If a licensed user is to go on leave for a period of longer than 45 days, their access will be inactivated within 5 business days of the start of their leave.

Procedure:

A. The agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager or Technical Administrator will notify the InHOUSE System Administrator by both email and phone of any user termination or extended leave from employment in sufficient time to comply with the above stated policy.

B. Failure to make such notifications in the time required will be considered a breach of confidentiality and will be grounds for suspending and/or revoking access of the agency/jurisdiction to the InHOUSE system.

C. Such sanctions will be imposed by agency/jurisdiction and the Council’s Executive Committee.
Maintaining InHOUSE Security:

5.0 Tracking of Unauthorized Access:

Policy:

The agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator will track system access logs and audit reports weekly. The Technical Administrator will immediately notify the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager and CoC staff of suspicious or inappropriate access.

Procedure:

A. Upon notification from the agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator of suspicious or inappropriate access, the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager will investigate the specific situation and report back to the CoC staff in writing.

B. If an infraction of security did occur, the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager will provide CoC staff with a written plan for rectifying the infraction and monitoring against further such infractions.

C. Failure to respond to such CoC notification will result in downgrading of license access.

D. CoC staff will prepare a sample corrective plan showing a plan to rectify infractions and monitor against further infractions.
5.1 Unauthorized Remote Access:

Policy:

Access to the InHOUSE system is allowed only from authorized agency locations. Remote access (from an unauthorized agency location) to the InHOUSE system is not permitted under any circumstances. Such access is considered a breach of security and confidentiality and will result in consequences up to and including termination of user rights and potentially termination of employment as detailed in this manual. The InHOUSE System Administrator will monitor access of the InHOUSE system to ensure compliance with the access policy. Agencies/jurisdictions must monitor all staff to ensure such compliance.

Procedure:

A. In addition to the InHOUSE Privacy and Security Certification Training, the agency/jurisdiction shall make this policy and its consequences known to all licensed users.

B. If a breach of security occurs, the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager will provide CoC staff with a written notice and plan for rectifying the infraction and monitoring against further such infractions.

C. Agencies wishing to authorize remote workstations as a secure and compliant authorized agency location must submit a written request to the agency Technical Administrator who will physically inspect the remote workstation for security compliance as detailed in the HUD Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS); Data and Technical Standards Final Notice. If remote workstations comply with the security standards, the Technical Administrator will complete the Authorized Remote Access Form and submit it to the InHOUSE System Administrator.

D. An authorized remote site must be inspected by the Technical Administrator once a quarter to insure the firewall is functioning properly and the virus software is up to date. Each visit will be documented on an Authorized Remote Access Form and submitted to the InHOUSE System Administrator.

E. Council staff or its designee may monitor the remote access inspection records from the agency/jurisdiction or InHOUSE System Administrator.
Maintaining InHOUSE Security:

5.2 Downloading of Data from InHOUSE System:

Policy:

InHOUSE aggregate data for an agency or system-wide must not contain any PPI and therefore does not require the highest levels of protection reserved for PPI. However, this aggregate data should be limited to authorized use and disclosure.

Data containing PPI (non-aggregated data) must always be stored in binary, not text, format. Agency/Jurisdiction may download data. However, to comply with the binary format, if an agency/jurisdiction chooses to download its data, it must download to common database applications that use a binary format which include Microsoft Access, Microsoft SQL Server, Oracle, or other appropriate databases. No data containing PPI may be downloaded to any unauthorized remote access site at any time for any reason.

Agency/Jurisdiction must never download data for clients not in its programs.

Downloaded data that includes PPI may not be stored on any network drive accessible to anyone not trained through the InHOUSE Privacy and Security Training. If the data is stored on a portable medium (e.g. disks, CDs, tape), that medium must be securely stored when not in use and never left unattended in a public area. Such storage mediums may not be taken off site at any time for any reason.

Access to the downloaded data is restricted to persons successfully completing Privacy and Security Certification Training to maintain security standards.

Failure to follow this policy will be considered a breach of security and confidentiality and will result in consequences up to and including termination of user rights and potentially termination of employment as detailed in this manual. Agency/Jurisdiction is responsible for ensuring its data users’ compliance with this policy.

Procedure:

A. A participating agency/jurisdiction shall establish printed procedures for implementing and complying with this policy, and train and monitor all users.
5.3 Deleting of Data Downloaded from InHOUSE System:

Policy:

In order to delete downloaded HMIS data containing PPI from a data storage medium, the agency/jurisdiction must reformat the storage medium a minimum of two (2) times before reusing or disposing of the medium. This is true for hard drives, floppy disks, zip drives/disks, tape backups, etc. To dispose of data stored on CDs, the CD must be physically destroyed.

If an agency/jurisdiction is not prepared to reformat a hard drive as specified to delete downloaded HMIS data containing PPI, the data should not be downloaded to that medium.

Procedure:

A. A participating agency/jurisdiction shall establish printed procedures for implementing and complying with this policy, and train and monitor all agency/jurisdiction users.

5.4 Printing of Hard Copy Data:

Policy:

Hard copy data containing PPI may only be printed from the InHOUSE system at the physical agency/jurisdiction location(s) and only on printers secured from public access.
Maintaining InHOUSE Security:

5.5 Disposing of Hard Copy Data:

Policy:

An agency/jurisdiction is responsible for disposing of documents that contain PPI by shredding paper records.

Procedure:

A. A participating agency/jurisdiction shall establish printed procedures for implementing and complying with this policy.
B. CoC staff and/or CoC/InHOUSE consultants will periodically review agency/jurisdiction compliance with this policy in the course of monitoring agency/jurisdiction compliance with privacy and security standards.

5.6 Reported Data:

Policy:

Only aggregated data not containing any PPI will be released or reported outside of the agency/jurisdiction that collected or has access to such information.

Procedure:

A. A participating agency/jurisdiction shall only release or report de-identified aggregate data that does not contain PPI.
B. Failure to comply with this policy will result in the downgrading or suspension of license access to the InHOUSE system.

5.7 Reporting Security Violations:

Policy:

If a security violation should occur, the agency/jurisdiction must notify the InHOUSE System Administrator and CoC staff of the violation within 24 hours by email and phone.

Procedure:

A. A participating agency/jurisdiction shall establish printed procedures for implementing and complying with this policy.
B. Failure to comply with this policy will result in the downgrading or suspension of license access to the InHOUSE system.
5.8 Virus Protection on User Systems:

Policy:

Each agency/jurisdiction will take all necessary precautions to prevent any destructive or malicious program (virus) from being introduced into their system that is used to access the InHOUSE system. If a virus is introduced into the agency/jurisdiction system, the agency/jurisdiction must act rapidly to resolve the issue, including completing agency-/jurisdiction-wide security checks as appropriate.

Procedure:

A. A participating agency/jurisdiction shall adopt, if it has not previously, the following standards:
   1) Industry-recognized Anti-Virus software will be installed and maintained in all user workstations.
   2) No un-scanned media will be introduced to the system.
   3) No downloading of internet programs/files will be permitted, except for necessary software or operating system updates issues by the manufacturer.
   4) Individual workstation virus definitions will be updated weekly or more often when required.
   5) Virus protection on all servers will be updated regularly.
   6) System server(s) will be scanned daily.
   7) Spyware that is included with Anti-Virus or firewall software should be loaded for added protection.

B. If infection does occur, NO ACCESS TO THE InHOUSE SYSTEM WILL BE ALLOWED BY ANY USER UNTIL THE ENTIRE SYSTEM IS CLEANED AND DECLARED SECURE BY THE SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR.
Maintaining Data Integrity:

6.0 Weekly Data Entry:

Policy:

Data entry by an agency/jurisdiction must take place, at minimum, on a weekly basis. Participating agencies/jurisdictions are responsible for assuring that the reportable HUD data is as complete and accurate as possible.

Procedure:

A. The Technical Administrator will run weekly custom reports to identify missing data elements required for HUD reporting.
B. The agency/jurisdiction will have established a procedure to address report results and enter missing data.

6.1 Monthly ROI Monitoring:

Policy:

A participating agency/jurisdiction will run a monthly report to identify upcoming ROI expiration dates for active client records in the InHOUSE system. Staff will make all reasonable efforts to obtain a new ROI and enter in the InHOUSE system prior to the expiration of the existing ROI.

Procedure:

A. The Technical Administrator will run a monthly report to identify active clients with an ROI expiring in the next month for all programs that operate at least three times per week except Shelter Plus Care.
B. The Technical Administrator for Shelter Plus Care and all programs operating less frequently than three times per week will run a monthly report to identify active clients with an ROI expiring in the next two months to allow ample time to secure renewal of ROI.
C. The agency/jurisdiction will have established a procedure to obtain new ROIs from these active clients and enter the new ROI information into the InHOUSE system prior to the expiration of the existing ROI.
6.2 Previously Obtained Data without an ROI:

Policy:

If an agency/jurisdiction possesses a current ROI on an active client, historical data may be entered for the program year.

If no current ROI is possessed, agency/jurisdiction may enter client data and close it to others in limited circumstances with the set-up and permission from the System Administrator. Entry of such data needs to be completed correctly to minimize risk to the InHOUSE and secure other system data for HUD-mandated homeless counts.

Agency/jurisdiction is responsible for the costs of manual or electronic entry of historical data.

Procedure:

A. The System Administrator must approve all agency/jurisdictions seeking to enter historical data.

B. All staff designated to manually input or oversee input of historical data must successfully complete Additional User Training to learn proper techniques to accurately enter such data. Availability of the Additional User Training is subject to the System Administrator’s availability.

C. All agency/jurisdictions seeking to electronically transfer and upload historical data must partner with the System Administrator for guidance in mapping all data fields and other tasks required by the System Administrator to ensure an efficacious upload of data.
Training:

7.0 Privacy and Security Certification Training:

Policy:

Any agency/jurisdiction staff or designees conducting any intake, data entry, or other data processing functions must complete Privacy and Security Certification Training and become certified. Upon initial implementation of an agency/jurisdiction, Privacy and Security Certification Training will be provided by CoC staff. All subsequent Privacy and Security Certification Training of new agency/jurisdiction staff for the InHOUSE system will be completed by either attending a Council-sponsored Certification Training or by one-on-one training sessions conducted by the agency/jurisdiction's InHOUSE manager or Policy and Procedure Administrator using Alameda Countywide Homeless Continuum of Care Council-provided Training and Certification materials. The Council-sponsored Privacy and Security Certification Trainings, conducted by CoC staff, will occur regularly, and will be open to all new agency/jurisdiction staff.

Procedure:

A. Upon initial implementation, agency/jurisdiction will identify all relevant staff, volunteers, interns, and contractors who must complete Privacy and Security Certification training and submit the list of names to the System Administrator upon request.

B. CoC staff will schedule and provide Privacy and Security Certification training to all initial InHOUSE users and intake staff.

C. Upon completion of the Privacy and Security Certification Training, the Council will notify the Implementation Team Lead and agency executive director/jurisdictional lead staff of the certification status of its staff. Certification will be mailed for staff successfully completing the Privacy and Security Certification.

D. Staff who do not successfully complete the Certification (by failing to pass the Certification test) will be rescheduled into a future Privacy and Security Certification Training.

E. Upon completion of initial implementation, CoC staff will provide the agency/jurisdiction Policies and Procedures Administrator with a master set of training materials to be used (copied) for subsequent Privacy and Security Certification Training of new agency/jurisdiction staff.

D. CoC updates made to Privacy and Security Certification Training materials will be sent to the agency/jurisdiction Policies and Procedures Administrator.
E. The agency/jurisdiction Policies and Procedures Administrator must sign-off on the successful completion of Privacy and Security Certification Training for each new user trained by the agency/jurisdiction. The Policies and Procedures Administrator will provide verification to the InHOUSE System Administrator, including the names and contact information of all individuals who completed the Privacy and Security Certification Training, a completed Certification test, and a signed Privacy Agreement. Council staff will correct the test and complete the Certification before a user access license to the InHOUSE system will be issued.

F. The agency/jurisdiction Policies and Procedures Administrator must sign-off on the successful completion of any supplemental Privacy and Security Training conducted by the agency/jurisdiction for users and provide such verification to the InHOUSE System Administrator, including the names and contact information of all individuals who completed supplemental Privacy and Security Training.
7.1 ServicePoint User Training:

Policy:

Upon initial implementation of an agency/jurisdiction, CoC staff will provide ServicePoint User Training. All subsequent ServicePoint User Training of new agency/jurisdiction staff for the InHOUSE system will be completed by either attending a Council-sponsored ServicePoint User Training or by one-on-one training sessions conducted by the agency/jurisdiction's InHOUSE manager or Technical Administrator using Alameda Countywide Homeless Continuum of Care Council-provided User Training materials. The Council-sponsored ServicePoint User Trainings, conducted by CoC staff, will occur regularly, and will be open to all new agency/jurisdiction staff. In addition, the Council will convene future user trainings to address large system-wide topics, such as new ServicePoint modules or major software upgrades.

Procedure:

A. Upon initial implementation, agency/jurisdiction will identify relevant staff, volunteers, interns, and contractors who must complete ServicePoint User Training and submit the list of names to the System Administrator upon request.

B. CoC staff will schedule and provide ServicePoint User Training to all initial InHOUSE users.

C. Upon completion of initial implementation, CoC staff will provide the agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator with a master set of training materials to be used (copied) for subsequent ServicePoint User Training of new agency/jurisdiction staff.

D. CoC updates made to ServicePoint User Training materials will be sent to the agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator.

E. The agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrator must sign-off on the successful completion of ServicePoint User Training for each new user and provide such verification to the InHOUSE System Administrator before a user access license to the “live” InHOUSE system will be issued.
Training:

7.2 ServicePoint Technical Administrator Training:

Policy:

Upon initial implementation of an agency/jurisdiction, ServicePoint Technical Administrator training will be provided by CoC staff.

Should a change occur in the staffing of the Technical Administrator role at an agency/jurisdiction, the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager will confer with the InHOUSE System Administrator as to the plan for training the new Technical Administrator.

Procedure:

A. Upon determination of a change of Technical Administrator at an agency/jurisdiction, the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager will notify the InHOUSE System Administrator of the upcoming change. Together, they will determine the plan for training the new Technical Administrator.
Reporting:

8.0 Agency/Jurisdiction Reporting Technology Solutions:

Policy:

CoC staff and consultants will continue to secure appropriate reporting technology, software and training for InHOUSE partner agencies such that agency/jurisdiction can internally generate agency-specific and some system-wide reports.

8.1 Agency/Jurisdiction APR Reporting:

Policy:

An agency/jurisdiction can generate its own program’s APR reporting using the InHOUSE ServicePoint software.

8.2 Agency/Jurisdiction Custom Reporting:

Policy:

Agencies/jurisdictions are responsible for their own custom reporting of agency/program data. It is the goal of the CoC to provide additional custom reporting options to agencies and jurisdictions. CoC is currently awaiting the release of a new reporting solution by Bowman Internet System targeted for January 2005. Following the release of that product, CoC will evaluate its utility to agency/jurisdiction’s needs and either purchase that product or secure other software as a reporting solution. When the final reporting solution is identified, the InHOUSE System Administrator will provide the relevant information and training.
Reporting:

8.3 Reports for Collaboratives:

Policy:

A reporting solution for collaborative grants currently resides with the InHOUSE System Administrator who can prepare collaborative reports at the agency/jurisdiction’s request. Specific software solutions that will allow collaborative partners to generate reports themselves are in process, but are not available at this time.

8.4 System-wide Reporting:

Policy:

Until specific software solutions are available to enable participating agency/jurisdictions to generate aggregate system-wide reports, the Council will generate annual and periodic data for public use.
InHOUSE System Maintenance/Upgrades:

9.0 Upgrading ServicePoint Software:

Policy:

Periodically it will be necessary to upgrade ServicePoint software. This upgrade will be done by Bowman Internet Systems, the software vendor. The InHOUSE System Administrator will coordinate system upgrades with Bowman Systems and make the necessary notifications to all participating users.

Procedure:

A. System software upgrades will be scheduled in advance and notification will be made to all participating users via the ServicePoint System News and notification to agency/jurisdiction Technical Administrators. Every effort will be made to minimize system downtime.
InHOUSE System Governance and CoC Roles and Responsibilities:

10.0 System Governance and Oversight:

Policy:

The Executive Committee of the Alameda Countywide Homeless Continuum of Care Council will provide system governance and oversight of policies, procedures, and significant concerns about the InHOUSE system. Issues affecting the entire user system or large population segments will be vetted in appropriate community-wide forums which may include Council meetings, focus groups, or public comments periods.

Procedure:

A. CoC Council staff and consultants will identify the most appropriate forum from which to solicit comment and input about policy decisions and implementation documents.

B. Staff will publicize and invite relevant parties and specify the scope of conversation/comments and the length of the comment period.

C. Revisions of this Policy and Procedures document may be necessary from time to time. Supplemental and/or replacement pages may be distributed. A full community-wide review and revision will occur in July 2006 and periodically thereafter.

D. The Executive Committee of the Council will approve revisions to the Policies and Procedures contained in this document, this document as amended, and any other documents that establish policy.

E. Appeals to published policies and procedures after the comment period may be made by any party to the Executive Committee of the Council. Appeals must be in writing and will then be scheduled for review by the Executive Committee or a special committee of the Executive Committee.
10.1 InHOUSE System Grievance and Security Committee:

Policy:

An InHOUSE System Grievance and Security Committee will be created and meet as needed to address reported agency/jurisdiction client grievances and reported/suspected system security violations. Client grievances that will be considered by this committee are limited to denial of access to or correction of data in the InHOUSE system, or violations of their specific written release of information consent for the InHOUSE system. The committee will consist of CoC Staff, and uninvolved non-conflicted Jurisdiction Staff, and uninvolved non-conflicted Agency staff that are members of or appointed to the CoC Executive Committee. A Consumer will also participate when available.

Procedure:

A. In the case of reported/suspected security violations, a formal letter will be sent to the license holder (with copies to the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager, Policies and Procedures Administrator and Technical Administrator) detailing the reported violation and requesting corrective action.

B. Written notification of corrective action, detailing the plan for rectifying the security violation, must be sent from the agency/jurisdiction InHOUSE Manager or Policies and Procedures Administrator to designated CoC Staff or InHOUSE System Administrator.

C. The plan must include monitoring as part of the corrective action.

D. Failure to comply with the plan will result in downgrading of license access, and possible suspension or revocation of licenses.

E. Failure to respond to a notification by the InHOUSE System Grievance and Security Committee within 10 working days will result in downgrading of license access, suspension or revocation of licenses.

F. Eligible client grievances will only be considered following completion of the entire agency/jurisdiction grievance process.
InHOUSE System Governance and CoC Roles and Responsibilities:

10.2 Right to Deny Access:

Policy:

The access of a participating agency/jurisdiction and/or user(s) may be suspended for suspected violation of security protocols. The access of a participating agency/jurisdiction and/or user(s) may be suspended or revoked for actual violation of security protocols.

10.3 CoC Roles and Responsibilities:

**Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee will provide oversight and governance, including financial oversight, and ensure that InHOUSE (including Phase 1 and Phase 2) is implemented in a manner consistent with the vision established in the HMIS Planning Committee.

1. Approve annual budget for InHOUSE, including staffing.
2. Approve the annual InHOUSE workplan, including scheduling for implementation.
3. Approve contracts and principal documents.
4. Receive and review monthly written financial reports.
5. Receive and review monthly written reports on progress and issues.

**Stakeholder Community**

The Stakeholder Community will provide input to community-wide or population-specific policy level decisions affecting the full implementation.

1. Receive regular e-mail updates on InHOUSE developments, major issues, implementation schedule and progress.
2. Provide input through email/mail reviews of InHOUSE documents and implementation process.
3. Participate in forums as requested.
CoC Staff

The CoC staff and/or project-based consultants will manage and oversee the entire InHOUSE implementation and on-going operations.

1. Prepare annual InHOUSE budget for Executive Committee approval.
2. Prepare the annual InHOUSE work plan.
3. Prepare contracts and documents.
4. Prepare monthly written financial reports.
5. Prepare monthly written reports on progress and issues and annual reports including budget, project status, and work plan.
6. Distribute InHOUSE documents and implementation processes for review.
7. Arrange and staff regular HMIS forums.
8. Develop InHOUSE configuration, implement and operate the InHOUSE system on a day-to-day basis, including providing training and technical assistance.
9. Maintain relationship with the software vendor, negotiate any contractual changes and provide significant input on proposed software solutions.
10. Work with participating agencies.
11. Work with the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to ensure InHOUSE meets all relevant federal mandates and is in accordance with HUD HMIS priorities.
12. Work with and coordinate with Bay Area Counties and other HMIS interested groups.
InHOUSE System Governance and CoC Roles and Responsibilities:

10.3 CoC Roles and Responsibilities: (continued)

InHOUSE System Administrator
The InHOUSE System Administrator will manage the day-to-day software application, oversee the agency-specific implementation and compliance, and liaison between the agency/jurisdiction and the software vendor.

1. Perform initial agency setup and configuration within the system.

2. Administer and manage user accounts, logins and passwords for local agency administrators.

3. Update training modules (including training materials) for agency administrators.

4. Provide technical assistance within the continuum and facilitate trouble-shooting and problem resolution.

5. Perform data quality review on an ongoing basis.

6. Review and monitor across user agencies to ensure security, confidentiality and quality of the information within the system and adherence to standard policy and procedures.

7. Coordinate and manage all system upgrades with the software vendor and users.

8. Create and run all required custom and collaborative reports.

9. Liaison with system software vendor to resolve technical issues.
Work Flow Procedures:

11.0 Data Element Definitions:

A few key data elements are defined because no definition exists from HUD and the element is critical within the system of care locally.

Definitions:

A. The following is the proposed definition for “earned Income” within the InHOUSE HMIS system. When more rigid standards apply for a specific funding stream, particularly for employment programs, the more rigid standard shall supercede this definition and apply for that program or programs.

Earned Income
Earned income is verifiable financial compensation that is received in exchange for someone’s time and labor, regardless of duration, permanency, or subsidized or transitional nature of the relationship. This includes:
• Full Time Employment – A job in which an employee works thirty-five (35) or more (usually 40) hours during a typical workweek.
• Part Time Employment – A job in which an employee works between 1 to 34 hours during a typical workweek.
• Temporary Employment – A job that lasts for a limited time whereby an employee generally works less than a year on one assignment, regardless of the number of hours worked per week.
• Day Labor – A job in which an employee is hired and paid one day at a time, with no promise that more work will be available in the future.

Verifiable: Able to be confidently validated through means such as copy of a check stub, a payment voucher, letter of hire, or conversation with an employer. While not all programs require the verification of earned income, in order to be counted as earned income, the source must be able to be verified.

Financial: cash or other legal tender such as checks. This does NOT include barter-like arrangements where cash or other legal tender is not exchanged. For example, an arrangement where a client works in exchange for room, utilities, and/or meals can not be counted as a financial compensation since no cash exchange is made between the two parties.

Regardless of duration, permanency, or subsidized or transitional nature: Determining earned income is not dependant on whether the individual has worked a specified number of days; whether the employment is seasonal, temporary, or permanent; or whether the job is a supported employment opportunity or subsidized in any way. This is the biggest variant from other “employment” or “earned income” definitions in other programs.
B. **Other Income**

Other income not meeting the above definition can be reported as income in the “other” category with the specific source and amount identified on the Intake and in InHOUSE. This may include panhandling, recycling, live-in barter or “work for rent” arrangements, and other informal activities.

### 11.1 Client Search Prior to Intake:

**Policy:**

Prior to conducting an Intake for a new program entry, staff of each participating agency/jurisdiction will obtain and print the most current Basic Intake or Basic Eligibility information (if available) for each client. Agency/jurisdiction staff will verify the information and then conduct the remaining Intake questions with the client.

**Procedure:**

A. Staff of each participating agency/jurisdiction will, prior to conducting an intake, log into InHOUSE and search for the client.

B. Upon locating the specific client, the agency/jurisdiction will print the Basic Intake or Basic Eligibility for the client.

C. The agency/jurisdiction staff will then review the printed details with the client to insure accuracy and complete any unanswered questions.

D. The agency/jurisdiction staff will then complete the remaining Intake sections or forms for each new Intake.

E. Should the client not be found to exist within InHOUSE, the agency/jurisdiction staff would conduct a complete Intake set.

### 11.2 Entry Procedures:

**Policy:**

Every household member receiving any type of service (e.g., a meal, a bed, any type of counseling, medical services, housing, or any other service) must have a completed intake and be entered into the InHOUSE system.

**Procedure:**

First ask the question as printed on the Intake form. If the client is unsure of what is being asked, restate the question, as needed, to insure understanding.
11.3 Update Procedures:

Housing Assessment Policy:

Every housing change for a household must be recorded and entered into InHOUSE.

Procedure:

A. A Housing Assessment form will be completed by agency/jurisdictions staff each time a household moves in or out of permanent housing.
B. Data from the form will be entered into InHOUSE.
C. Data entry will follow the InHOUSE Policy and Procedure expectation of once per week.

Annual Update Policy:

Every client that is in a program one year or longer must have his/her record annually updated with information prescribed by HUD and this community, which minimally includes income, non-cash benefits, and disabilities. A Housing Assessment update will also be completed on the Head of Household’s record (if applicable).

Procedure:

A. Each agency/jurisdiction will run the Annual Update Report (ART) to generate a list of clients in need of an Annual Update. Clients will appear on the ART report if they have not had a new program entry or update (by any other agency) within the last twelve months.
B. Each agency/jurisdiction will complete a new Release of Information (v. 5.1) and Annual Update for each client who appears on the Annual Update Report. The Annual Update will be completed annually for each client.
D. The agency/jurisdiction will enter an Annual Update service, in InHOUSE, on the Head of Household’s record. When entering the service, also select any other family members that received the service at the same time as the Head of Household.
E. The Annual Update service will be entered for the program that performed the Annual Update and/or collected the data.
11.4 Exit Procedures:

Policy:

Persons will be exited from Outreach and Drop In Center programs when:
- the person moves to any location where the program will not continue working with the individual, such as a residential treatment program, jail, permanent housing, or some shelter situations where the program does not continue working with the individual, OR
- the person has had no contact within the prior six months.

Approved: Performance Management Committee, Oct. 2010

Procedure:

A. Identify the last date of contact with a client. Reports in InHOUSE HMIS can help identify the date of last contact if services are being entered.

B. Administratively complete the exit form utilizing the most recent data in the case file, client records, or from client interview.

C. Date the the exit back to the date of last contact and complete the correct data entry procedures for exiting a client from a program.

D. For the best data quality, at every contact, attempt to update someone’s housing situation and income in the case notes so that at exit to the last date of contact, the case notes will reflect the person’s housing and income situations at the time. This will most accurately reflect the person’s situation and will also mitigate numerous “unknown” and “refused” responses at exit.

11.5 Exit Dates:

Policy:

The exit must be dated back to the date of last contact for every client exit.
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Appendix I – Glossary
Overview and Purpose

The Alameda Countywide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) known as InHOUSE is a data collection application that maintains information regarding the characteristics and service needs of individuals. InHOUSE, implemented in June 2005 is an acronym for Information about Homelessness, Outcomes, and Service Engagement. The InHOUSE database system facilitates effective and streamlined services to individuals-served as well as creating information that communities can use to determine the use and effectiveness of services.

The InHOUSE system is designed to benefit multiple stakeholders, including persons using homeless and/or at-risk of homelessness-targeted services, provider agencies, jurisdictions, other systems of care, funders and the community. Improved knowledge gained from InHOUSE about various communities with special needs and their service usage aides with providing a more effective and efficient service delivery system. By community partner agreement, the InHOUSE database operates as a shared system: permission granted by an individual-served allows for all HMIS-entering Covered Homeless Organizations (CHOs) to have viewership of client level data (excluding Case Management tasks).

Geographic Area

The InHOUSE data system serves all 14 cities within Alameda County, including unincorporated jurisdictions.

Alameda County Continuum of Care (CoC) Responsibilities

The Alameda County CoC is responsible for:
• Designating a single information system as the official HMIS software for the geographic area.

• Designating an HMIS Lead to operate the HMIS.

• Providing for governance of the HMIS Lead, including:
  o The requirement that the HMIS Lead enter into written HMIS Participation Agreements with each Contributing HMIS Organization (CHO) requiring the CHO to comply with federal regulations regarding HMIS and imposing sanctions for failure to comply; and
  o The participation fee, if any, charged by the HMIS;

• Maintaining documentation evidencing compliance with this part and with the governance charter; and

• Reviewing, revising and approving the policies and plans required by federal regulation.

• Monitors milestones and makes high level decisions on HMIS

• Creates and updates the Data Quality Plan

Organizational Relationships

Performance Management Committee Responsibilities:

  o Membership comprised of:
    ▪ CoC representatives
    ▪ EveryOne Home
    ▪ HMIS Lead Staff
    ▪ Health and Human Services staff
    ▪ Participating Agency staff
    ▪ Jurisdictional Staff

  o Conducts regular monthly meetings

  o Makes all final decisions on
    ▪ Planning
    ▪ Participation
- Coordination of HMIS/ data resources
  - Coordination of Data Integration- either with outside industries’ data storage systems or with participating agencies’ internal data collection systems
  - Determination of long term policies and procedures
  - Makes recommendation on software application/ vendor as needed
  - Supports and protects the rights and privacy of clients
  - Reviews quarterly Outcomes Reports
  - Develops Communitywide Outcomes Measures and Goals
  - A list of the current members of the Performance Management Committee is available from the EveryOne Home Executive Director or the Alameda County Housing & Community Development Department

**HMIS Lead Agency Duties and Responsibilities**

- Responds to Performance Management Committee directives
- Oversees the day-to-day operation of HMIS
- Provides staffing for HMIS
- Provides technical support to participating agencies
- Provides training on privacy, and software related issues
- Regularly reviews data quality (monthly)
- Coordinates and submits Housing Inventory Chart, and Annual Homeless Assessment Reports
- In conjunction with EveryOne Home, coordinates and submits Point in Time Count and Notice of Funding Availability Application
- Supports HMIS by providing ongoing funding
- Monitoring data quality and taking necessary actions to maintain input of high-quality data from all HMIS-utilizing agencies
- The HMIS Lead must submit a security plan, an updated data quality plan, and a privacy policy to the CoC for approval within 6 months after the effective date of the HUD final rule establishing the requirements of these plans. The HMIS Lead
must review and update the plans and policy at least annually. During this process, the HMIS Lead must seek and incorporate feedback from the CoC and applicable entities. The HMIS Lead must implement the plans and policy within 6 months of the date of approval by the Alameda County CoC.

- Adopt written policies and procedures for the operation of the HMIS that apply to the HMIS Lead, its CHOs, and the Continuum of Care.
- Policies and procedures must comply with all applicable Federal law and regulations, and applicable state or local governmental requirements
- Solicits HMIS User feedback – including operational milestones, system functionality and ease of use, and progress

**HMIS Policy Group Responsibilities**

The HMIS Policy Group Committee will work with the HMIS Lead to:

- Coordinate and prepare written HMIS policies and procedures in accordance with §580.31 for all CHO/agencies, for review, update and adoption by the Performance Management Committee
- Develop, annually review, and, as necessary, revise for Performance Management Committee approval a privacy plan, security plan, and data quality plan for the HMIS, as well as any other HMIS policies and procedures required by HUD

**HMIS User Group Responsibilities**

The HMIS Policy Group Committee will work with the HMIS Lead to:

- Provides recommendations on use of software and software enhancements
- Trouble-shoot frequent data quality errors
- Recommends modifications to HMIS staff created reports

**HMIS End-User Responsibilities**
Comply with federal regulations regarding HMIS

- Provides data entry in manner that meets standards established in Data Quality Plan
- Attends trainings, as needed
- Comply with Federal, state, and local laws that require additional privacy or confidentiality protections
- Takes all necessary measures to ensure security and confidentiality of client information
- Reports security incidents in compliance with Security Plan
Alameda Countywide HMIS

InHOUSE Partner MOU

InHOUSE: Information about Homelessness, OUtcomes, and Service Engagement

The Alameda Countywide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) known as InHOUSE is an information system that maintains information regarding the characteristics and service needs of Clients. InHOUSE will facilitate more effective and streamlined services to Clients and create information that communities can use to determine the use and effectiveness of services.

The InHOUSE system is designed to benefit multiple stakeholders, including persons using homeless-targeted services, provider agencies, jurisdictions, other systems of care, funders and the community. Improved knowledge gained from InHOUSE about various communities with special needs and their service usage will lead to a more effective and efficient service delivery system.

EveryOne Home (EveryOne Home) has been designated through a broad community planning process to oversee the planning, funding, implementation and on-going operation of the InHOUSE system.

__________________________________________ ("Agency" or “Jurisdiction”) has elected to participate in the InHOUSE system.

Agency/Jurisdiction and EveryOne Home agree as follows:

1. General Understandings:

   a. In this Agreement, the following terms will have the following meanings:

      (i) "Client" refers to a consumer of services.

      (ii) "Agency" or “Agency/Jurisdiction” refers generally to any Agency or Jurisdiction participating in the InHOUSE system in accordance with a current InHOUSE Partner Memorandum Of Understanding.

      (iii) “Agency staff” refers to paid employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors, and associates of Agencies and Jurisdictions using InHOUSE.

      (iv) “EveryOne Home staff” refers to the EveryOne Home Director, other EveryOne Home employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors, and associates performing tasks pertaining to InHOUSE on behalf of the EveryOne Home.

      (v) “InHOUSE” refers to Information about Homelessness, OUtcomes and Service Engagement, the Alameda Countywide HMIS system.

      (vi) “Enter(ing)” or “entry” refers to the input of any Client information into InHOUSE.

      (vii) “Shar(e)(ing),” or “Information Shar(e)(ing)” refers to the sharing of basic Intake information which has been entered in InHOUSE with another Partner Agency/Jurisdiction.

      (viii) “HUD Compliance Committee” refers to the EveryOne Home’s governing body responsible for advising about and overseeing the implementation and operation of the InHOUSE HMIS. The HUD Compliance Committee is composed of representatives from EveryOne Home, other stakeholders, and subject-specific members. A list of the current members of the HUD Compliance Committee is available from the EveryOne Home Director.
“Identified or Confidential Data” refers to Client data containing Protected Personal Identifiers that can be used to identify a specific Client.

“Deidentified Data” refers to data that has Client-specific information removed, allowing use of the data without identifying a specific Client. Also referred to as “non-identifying” or “aggregate” information.

b. Agency/Jurisdiction understands that when it enters information into InHOUSE, such information will be available to the EveryOne Home staff or contractors who may review the data to administer InHOUSE; to conduct analysis; and to prepare reports which may be submitted to others in de-identified aggregate form without individual identifying Client information.

c. Agency/Jurisdiction understands that Client will have the ability to indicate whether basic Intake information Agency/Jurisdiction entered into InHOUSE may be shared with and accessible to Partner Agencies/Jurisdictions in the InHOUSE system. Agency/Jurisdiction is responsible for designating within InHOUSE, according to Client’s desire, whether Intake information may or may not be shared.

d. Correspondence with other communities about the InHOUSE system or the Countywide HMIS will be directed to and originate from the EveryOne Home Director.

2. Supplemental Documents:

Three additional documents further lay out expectations and agreements among the parties using the InHOUSE system. These include the InHOUSE Policies and Procedures Manual, the InHOUSE User Agreement, and the Privacy Agreement. These documents are distinct yet supplemental to this agreement to allow updating of said documents from time to time according to the system governance guidelines in the Policies and Procedure Manual.

a. **InHOUSE Policies and Procedures Manual** details the policy and implementation steps for roles and responsibilities, privacy requirements, notification of privacy protections, access privileges, breach of confidentiality and/or security, client rights, maintenance of system security and data integrity, training requirements, reporting of data, and system governance.

b. **InHOUSE User Agreement** specifically details the obligations and responsibilities of each User of the InHOUSE system. Each InHOUSE User must agree to abide by and sign the User Agreement.

c. **Privacy Agreement** details the obligations and responsibilities of each person who collects data for and/or utilizes sensitive data generated from InHOUSE. Anyone who collects data for or works with data generated by the InHOUSE system that contains Protected Personal Identifiers must agree to abide by and sign the Privacy Agreement.

Agency/Jurisdiction and EveryOne Home staff will abide by the InHOUSE Policies and Procedure Manual, the InHOUSE User Agreement, and the Privacy Agreement at all times. Agency/Jurisdiction will monitor its staff in such a way as to reasonably insure compliance with the Policies and Procedure Manual, the User Agreement, and the Privacy Agreement by its entire staff.
4. **Additional Confidentiality Protections:**
   a. The Agency/Jurisdiction will uphold applicable federal and state confidentiality regulations and laws that protect Client records.

   b. The Agency/Jurisdiction shall only release client records with signed consent by the client or in accordance with applicable law.

   c. Parties to this Agreement will not share medical, HIV/AIDS, mental health, substance use, details about a disability, or any violence-related information without a separate written consent by the client for the release of such information.

   d. The Agency/Jurisdiction shall verbally explain to a Client about the InHOUSE database and the terms of consent and shall arrange for a qualified interpreter or translator in the event that Client is not literate in English or has difficulty understanding the consent form.

5. **Storage of Data:**
The Agency/Jurisdiction understands the file server, which will contain all Client information, including encrypted identifying Client information, will be located at Bowman Internet System, Inc. offices at 400 Travis Street, Suite 1900, Shreveport, LA 71101.

6. **Readiness for Implementation and Use of InHOUSE:**
Agency/Jurisdiction must complete specific tasks listed below for implementation of InHOUSE. The primary readiness tasks are noted below. EveryOne Home staff must verify completion of all Readiness tasks. Failure to complete all readiness tasks at Agency/Jurisdiction may result in delay of the implementation.

   a. **Technological Readiness Assessment:** Agency/jurisdiction will correct all mandatory findings identified in their Technological Readiness Assessment.

   b. **Privacy Notice:** Agency/Jurisdiction must create or adapt an existing privacy notice detailing the Use and Disclosure of Client data within InHOUSE.

   c. **Workflow Document:** Agency/Jurisdiction must produce a Workflow Document as detailed by EveryOne Home Staff.

   d. **Privacy and Security Certification Training:** All Agency/Jurisdiction staff that conduct Intake functions or handle data containing Protected Personal Identifiers must successfully complete the InHOUSE Privacy and Security Certification Training before conducting Intakes (including paper-based forms) for InHOUSE or handling such data.

   e. **ServicePoint User Training:** All users of the InHOUSE system must complete an InHOUSE ServicePoint User Training (after completing the Privacy and Security Certification Training) before being given access to a User license.

   f. **Agency/Jurisdiction-specific Set-up Information:** Agency/Jurisdiction will complete all programmatic diagramming, selection of picklists, identification of custom data fields, and other items as requested by the System Administrator in order to be set up in the software.
7. **No Conditioning of Services:**
Agency/Jurisdiction will not make sharing of Client Intake information in InHOUSE a condition for receiving any services.

8. **Restrictions on Release of Information from InHOUSE:**
Agency/Jurisdiction agrees not to release any Client identifying information received from InHOUSE to any other person or organization without written informed Client consent, or as required by law.

9. **Availability and Assistance:**
   a. All requests for troubleshooting or other assistance regarding the software or system utilization shall be directed to the EveryOne Home’s InHOUSE System Administrator.
   
   b. InHOUSE staff will be reasonably available during the EveryOne Home’s weekday business hours for technical assistance (i.e. troubleshooting and report generation).
   
   c. Requests for assistance will be addressed within two working days from receipt of the request. Concerns, complaints, or other communication about the competency and/or responsiveness of InHOUSE staff shall be directed to the EveryOne Home Director.
   
   d. Partner Agency/Jurisdiction shall not direct any inquiries directly to the software vendor.

10. **Records:**
Agency/Jurisdiction and the EveryOne Home will maintain records of any disclosures of Client identifying information for a period of three years after such disclosure. Upon written request of a Client, Agency/Jurisdiction and EveryOne Home staff will provide an accounting of all such disclosures within the prior three-year period. The EveryOne Home will have access to an audit trail from InHOUSE to produce an accounting of disclosures made from one Agency/Jurisdiction to another.

11. **Use of InHOUSE:**
   a. Agency/Jurisdiction and EveryOne Home Staff will use InHOUSE for its legitimate business purposes only.
   
   b. The Agency/Jurisdiction shall use Client information in the InHOUSE system, as provided to the Agency/Jurisdiction, to assist the Agency/Jurisdiction in providing adequate and appropriate services to the Client.
   
   c. Agency/Jurisdiction and its staff will not access identifying information for any individual for whom services are neither sought nor provided by the Agency/Jurisdiction. Agency/Jurisdiction may access identifying information for its Clients and may request access to statistical, non-identifying information on both its Clients and Clients served by other InHOUSE participating agencies.
   
   d. The transmission of material in violation of any federal or state regulations is prohibited. This includes, but is not limited to, copyright material, material legally judged to be threatening or obscene, and material considered protected by trade secret.
12. Fee:
   a. The EveryOne Home will cover the majority of Agency/Jurisdiction-specific costs (e.g. licenses) and system administration costs (e.g. InHOUSE staff) beginning July 1, 2005.
   b. Agency/Jurisdiction is responsible for costs associated with connectivity to the internet, hardware that is compliant with software, privacy and security requirements, staff time for InHOUSE training activities, and staff data entry time.
   c. While the EveryOne Home has every intention of maintaining this funding arrangement, the EveryOne Home reserves the right to charge the Agency/Jurisdiction fees to cover funding shortfalls and/or agency/jurisdiction-specific costs in excess of planned allocations.
   d. Any fees not specific to an Agency/Jurisdiction requiring support in excess of planned allocations will be proposed by the HUD Compliance Committee of EveryOne Home, presented to the InHOUSE partners for comments, and adopted by the HUD Compliance Committee following review of partner feedback and InHOUSE financials. Agency/Jurisdiction will have sufficient time to identify appropriate resources.

13. Damage to InHOUSE:
Agency/Jurisdiction shall take due diligence not to cause in any manner, or way, corruption of InHOUSE, and Agency/Jurisdiction agrees to be responsible for any damage it may cause.

14. Community Stakeholders:
EveryOne Home Staff will consult with the EveryOne Home, Partner Agencies/Jurisdictions, and other stakeholders from time to time regarding community-wide issues such as revision to policy, procedures, and forms.

15. Grievance:
Written Agency/Jurisdiction complaints that are not resolved within the Agency/Jurisdiction may be forwarded to the InHOUSE Grievance and Security Committee of the HUD Compliance Committee, which will try to reach a voluntary resolution of the complaint.

16. Limitation of Liability and Indemnification:
   a. No party to this Agreement shall assume any additional liability of any kind due to its execution of this Agreement. The parties intend that each party shall remain liable, to the extent provided by law, regarding its own acts and omissions; but that no party shall assume additional liability on its own behalf or liability for the acts of any other person or entity except for the acts and omissions of their own employees, volunteers, agents or contractors through participation in InHOUSE. The parties specifically agree that this agreement is for the benefit of the parties only and this agreement creates no rights in any third party.
   b. To the fullest extent permitted by law, Agency/Jurisdiction agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold EveryOne Home, its agents, officials, and staff harmless from and against any and all claims, losses, damages, liabilities, and expenses, including legal fees and disbursements paid or incurred, arising from any breach of this Agreement or any of Agency/Jurisdiction’s obligations under this Agreement.
c. To the fullest extent permitted by law, EveryOne Home agrees to indemnify, defend, and hold Agency/Jurisdiction, its agents, officials, and staff harmless from and against any and all claims, losses, damages, liabilities, and expenses, including legal fees and disbursements paid or incurred, arising from any breach of this Agreement or any of Agency/Jurisdiction’s obligations under this Agreement.

d. The EveryOne Home shall not be held liable to any member Agency/Jurisdiction for any cessation, delay or interruption of hosting or software services, nor for any malfunction of hardware, software or equipment. Liability and complaints regarding the EveryOne Home’s responsiveness to technical assistance requests shall be directed to the HUD Compliance Committee.

17. Additional Terms and Conditions:

a. Agency/Jurisdiction will abide by such rules and regulations promulgated by HUD and/or the EveryOne Home and/or the HUD Compliance Committee regarding administration of InHOUSE.

b. Agency/Jurisdiction and EveryOne Home intend to abide by applicable law. Should any term of this Agreement be inconsistent with applicable law, or should additional terms be required by applicable law, Agency/Jurisdiction and EveryOne Home agree to modify the terms of this agreement so as to comply with applicable law. No such change to particular sections will impact the validity or standing of other parts of the Agreement.

c. Neither EveryOne Home nor Agency/Jurisdiction will transfer or assign any rights or obligations regarding Alameda Countywide HMIS without the written consent of either party.

18. Termination:
This Agreement will be in force until terminated by either party. Either party may terminate this agreement at will with 60 day written notice. Either party may terminate this agreement immediately upon a material breach of this Agreement by the other party, including but not limited to the breach of InHOUSE security or confidentiality by Agency/Jurisdiction. Exercising termination rights may affect Agency/jurisdiction’s eligibility for federal funding including those that are locally administered (e.g. SHP, ESG, CDBG, CSBG, and HOPWA).

d. If this Agreement is terminated, Agency/Jurisdiction will no longer have access to InHOUSE. EveryOne Home and the remaining Partner Agencies/Jurisdictions will maintain their right to use all of the Client information previously entered by Agency/Jurisdiction except to the extent a restriction is imposed by Client or law.

e. Upon termination, EveryOne Home will notify representatives of the jurisdiction(s) in which the Agency/Jurisdiction provides services.

f. If this Agreement is terminated, the EveryOne Home and remaining Partner Agencies/Jurisdictions shall maintain their right to use all Client data previously entered by the terminating Partner Agency/Jurisdiction; this use is subject to any restrictions requested by the Client and by the Policies and Procedures Manual.

g. Upon termination, copies of Agency/Jurisdiction data will be provided to the Agency/Jurisdiction. Data will be provided on CDs or other mutually agreed-upon media.
h. Unless otherwise specified in writing, copies of data will be delivered to Agency/Jurisdiction within twenty-one (21) calendar days of receipt of written requests for data copies.

i. If termination is being pursued by EveryOne Home due to breach of contract, Agency/Jurisdiction will receive notice of breach and have the right to address and correct said breach. Only in the absence of appropriate and reasonable intervention and resolution by Agency/Jurisdiction will termination of Agency/Jurisdiction participation be completed by EveryOne Home.

Signed,

________________________________________  __________________________
Signature of Executive Director/Manager  Date

________________________________________
Print Executive Director/Manager Name

________________________________________
Agency/Jurisdiction Name

________________________________________  ________________  ________________  ________________
Street and/or Mailing Address  City  State  Zip Code

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department Director  Date
Linda M. Gardner

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of EveryOne Home Director  Date
Elaine deColigny
Information about Homelessness, OUtcomes and Service Engagement
...the Alameda Countywide Homeless Management Information System

InHOUSE Privacy Agreement

While I am not currently a licensed user of the Alameda County InHOUSE system, I am collecting HUD mandated data for entry into that system and/or utilizing collected data that contains sensitive personal information about clients. As a data collection participant, I agree to uphold the confidentiality and privacy standards set forth in this document, excerpted from the HUD HMIS Standards and the Alameda County-wide InHOUSE Policies and Procedures Manual.

Please initial each statement below to indicate your agreement:

_____ I recognize I have access to confidential client information collected for the InHOUSE system.

_____ I recognize that I am bound to keep confidential all protected personal information with which I come in contact in the course of carrying out my job responsibilities.

_____ I recognize that the improper disclosure of confidential and protected personal information, by anyone, could result in violation of the laws, violation of a client’s legal rights and could jeopardize the security of the InHOUSE system.

_____ I recognize that any improper disclosure or violation of confidential or protected information may result in disciplinary action and/or termination from any contracts/agreements with the Alameda County-wide Continuum of Care Council with which my employer may be associated, and possible termination of my employment.

_____ I agree to make no disclosure, except to authorized agency staff as necessary to the performance of my job duties, to anyone of any data in, to go in, or from the InHOUSE system.

_____ I will not solicit information from Clients unless the information is required for a legitimate business purpose such as to provide services to the Client.

_____ I will not decline services to a Client or potential Client if that person refuses to share their personal information with other agencies via InHOUSE.

_____ Upon Client written request, I will ensure a Client receives a copy of the Client’s own information maintained within InHOUSE. Information compiled in reasonable anticipation of or for use in a civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding need not be provided to Client.

_____ I will permit Clients to file a written complaint regarding the use or treatment of their information within InHOUSE. Client may file a written complaint within the Agency Grievance Procedure. Client may not be retaliated against for filing a complaint.

_____ I understand that all InHOUSE information (hard copies and soft copies) must be kept secure and confidential at all times. When no longer needed, the information must be destroyed according to written Policy and Procedures to maintain confidentiality.

I understand and agree to comply with all the confidentiality statements listed above. I agree to maintain strict confidentiality of information obtained for the InHOUSE system. This information will be used only for the legitimate client service and administration of the agency named below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InHOUSE Participant Signature</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Agency/System Administrator --- Agency --- Date

01.05.04
DATE: March 1, 2006
SUBJECT: Privacy and Confidentiality

1. To protect the privacy of agency clients
2. To comply with applicable laws and regulations.
3. To insure fair information practices as to:
   a. Openness
   b. Accountability
   c. Collection limitations
   d. Purpose and use limitations
   e. Access and correction
   f. Data Quality
   g. Security

STATEMENT OF POLICY:

1) Compliance Agency privacy practices will comply with all applicable laws governing HMIS client privacy/confidentiality. Applicable standards include, but are not limited to the following.
   b) HIPAA - the Health Insurance Portability Act.
   d) Alameda County-wide Continuum of Care InHOUSE Policy and Procedures manual.
   e) Alameda County-wide Continuum of Care InHOUSE partner agency sharing agreement(s).

NOTE: HIPAA statutes are more restrictive than the HMIS FR 4848-N-02 standards and in cases where both apply, HIPAA over-rides the HMIS FR 4848-N-02 standards. In cases where an agency already has a confidentiality policy designed around the HIPAA standards, that policy can be modified to include the HMIS data collection, or can be amended to create one set of standards for clients covered under HIPAA, and a second set of standards for those covered only under HMIS FR 4848-N-02. Agencies should indicate in their Privacy Notice which standards apply to their situation.
2) **Use of Information**  

PPI (protected personal information which can be used to identify a specific client) can be used only for the following purposes:

a) To provide or coordinate services to a client.
b) For functions related to payment or reimbursement for services.
c) To carry out administrative functions such as legal, audit, personnel planning, oversight and management functions.
d) For creating de-personalized client identification for unduplicated counting.
e) Where disclosure is required by law.
f) To prevent or lessen a serious and imminent threat to the health or safety of an individual or the public.
g) To report abuse, neglect, or domestic violence as required or allowed by law.
h) Contractual research where privacy conditions are met (including a written agreement).
i) To report criminal activity on agency premises.
j) For law enforcement purposes in response to a properly authorized request for information from a properly authorized source.

**NOTE:** HMIS FR 4848-N-02 standards list items a-d above as allowable reasons for disclosing PPI but make provisions for additional uses to meet individual agency obligations. In some cases these uses (e-j above) have additional conditions, and HMIS FR 4848-N-02 4.1.3 should be consulted if any of these optional items are to be included in an agency's policy. It also states that “except for first party access to information and required disclosures for oversight and compliance auditing, all uses and disclosures are permissive and not mandatory.”

**NOTE:** If a client refuses to release PPI and such information is needed/required in order to provide services, the client's refusal may necessitate denial of service. Agencies may choose to make provisions for such denial of services in their policy.

3) **Collection and Notification**  

Information will be collected only by fair and lawful means with the knowledge or consent of the client.

a) PPI will be collected only for the purposes listed above, and entered into InHOUSE.
b) Clients will be made aware that personal information is being collected and recorded and will be asked to express written consent to have their basic intake information shared in the InHOUSE system.
c) A written sign will be posted in locations where PPI is collected. This written notice will read:

"We collect personal information directly from you for reasons that are discussed in our Privacy Notice. We may be required to collect some personal information by law or by organizations that give us money to operate this program. Other personal information that we collect is important to run our programs, to improve services for homeless persons, and to better understand the needs of homeless persons. We only collect information that we consider to be appropriate.

The collection and use of all personal information is guided by strict standards of confidentiality. Our Privacy Notice is posted. A copy of our Privacy Notice is available to all clients upon request."

d) This sign will be explained in cases where the client is unable to read and/or understand it.

**NOTE:** Under HMIS FR 4848-N-02, agencies are permitted to require a client to express consent to collect PPI verbally or in writing, however this is optional and not a requirement of the statute.
4) **Data Quality**  
   PPI data will be accurate, complete, timely, and relevant.
   a) All PPI collected will be relevant to the purposes for which it is to be used.
   b) Identifiers will be removed from data that is not in current use after 7 years (from date of creation or last edit) unless other requirements mandate longer retention.
   c) Data will be entered in a consistent manner by authorized users.
   d) Data will be entered in as close to real-time data entry as possible.
   e) Measures will be developed to monitor data for accuracy and completeness and for the correction of errors.
      i) The agency runs reports and queries monthly to help identify incomplete or inaccurate information.
      ii) The agency monitors the correction of incomplete or inaccurate information.
      iii) By the 15th of the following month all monitoring reports will reflect corrected data.
   f) Data quality is subject to routine audit by System Administrators who have administrative responsibilities for the database.

5) **Privacy Notice, Purpose Specification and Use Limitations**  
The purposes for collecting PPI data, as well as it uses and disclosures will be specified and limited.
   a) The purposes, uses, disclosures, policies, and practices relative to PPI data are to be outlined in this agency Privacy Notice.
   b) The agency Privacy Notice will comply with all applicable regulatory and contractual limitations.
   c) The agency Privacy Notice will be made available to agency clients, or their representative, upon request and explained/interpreted as needed.
   d) Reasonable accommodations will be made with regards to the Privacy Notice for persons with disabilities and non-English speaking clients as required by law.
   e) PPI will be used and disclosed only as specified in the Privacy Notice, and only for the purposes specified therein.
   f) Uses and disclosures not specified in the Privacy Notice can be made only with the consent of the client.
   g) The Privacy Notice will be posted on the agency web site.
   h) The Privacy Notice will reviewed and amended as needed.
   i) Amendments to or revisions of the Privacy Notice will address the retroactivity of any changes.
   j) Permanent documentation will be maintained of all Privacy Notice amendments/revisions.
   k) All access to, and editing of PPI data will be tracked by an automated audit trail, and will be monitored for violations use/disclosure limitations.

**NOTE:** Items above are required by HMIS FR 4848-N-02 and/or MSHMIS policy, but agencies can restrict and limit the use of PPI data further by requiring express client consent for various types of uses/disclosures, and/or by putting restriction or limits on various kinds of uses/disclosures.
6) **Record Access and Correction**  Provisions will be maintained for the access to and corrections of PPI records.

a) Clients will be allowed to review their InHOUSE record within 5 working days of a request to do so.

b) During a client review of their record, an agency staff person must be available to explain any entries the client does not understand.

c) The client may request to have their record corrected so that information is up-to-date and accurate to ensure fairness in its use.

d) When a correction is requested by a client, the request will be documented and the staff will make a corrective entry if the request is valid.

e) A client may be denied access to their personal information for the following reasons:

   i) Information is compiled in reasonable anticipation of litigation or comparable proceedings;

   ii) Information about another individual other than the agency staff would be disclosed,

   iii) Information was obtained under a promise of confidentiality other than a promise from this provider and disclosure would reveal the source of the information

   iv) The disclosure of information which would be reasonably likely to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual.

f) A client may be denied access to their personal information in the case of repeated or harassing requests for access or correction. However, if denied, documentation will be provided regarding the request and reason for denial to the individual and be made a part of the client's record.

g) A grievance process may be initiated if a client feels that their confidentiality rights have been violated, if access has been denied to their personal records, or if they have been put at personal risk, or harmed.

h) Any client grievances relative to the InHOUSE system will be processed/resolved according to agency grievance policy.

i) A copy of any client grievances relative to InHOUSE data or other privacy/confidentiality issues and agency response are forwarded to CoC staff.

j) If a client is unsatisfied with the resolution of their grievance at the agency level, the client may request mediation at the system level.
7) **Accountability**  Processes will be maintained to insure that the privacy and confidentiality of client information is protected and staff is properly prepared and accountable to carry out agency policies and procedure that govern the use of PPI data.

   a) Grievances may be initiated through the agency grievance process for considering questions or complaints regarding privacy and security policies and practices. All users of the InHOUSE system must sign a Users Agreement that specifies each staff persons’ obligations with regard to protecting the privacy of PPI and indicates that they have received a copy of the agency's Privacy Notice and that they will comply with its guidelines.

   b) All staff, interns, volunteers or associates collecting PPI intended for, or viewing data generated by InHOUSE must successfully complete Council-sponsored privacy and security certification training.

   c) A process will be maintained to document and verify completion of training requirements.

   d) A process will be maintained to monitor and audit compliance with basic privacy requirements including but not limited to auditing clients entered against signed InHOUSE Consent Releases. At minimum, a quarterly Compliance Review will be conducted and documented.

   e) A copy of any staff grievances initiated relative to privacy, confidentiality, or InHOUSE system data will be forwarded to CoC Staff.

   f) Regular user meetings will be held and issues concerning data security, client confidentiality, and information privacy will be discussed and solutions will be developed.

8) **Sharing of Information**  Basic Intake data may be shared with partnering agencies only with client approval

   a) All routine data sharing practices with partnering agencies will be documented and governed by the CoC MOU Agreement that defines the agency-determined sharing practice.

   b) Resident name and social security number are viewable in InHOUSE without express written consent for the purpose of searching for a client in the software. Procedures are available to not enter name and/or social security number from the searchable field.

   c) A completed InHOUSE Client Release of Information (ROI) Form is needed before information may be shared electronically.

      i) The InHOUSE release is to inform the client about what is shared and with whom it is shared.

      ii) The client accepts or rejects the sharing plan.

      iii) Revisions to the consent for sharing the Basic intake may be requested by the resident during the standard business hours. Changes will not be retroactive.

   d) Clients will be informed about and understand the benefits, risks, and available alternatives to sharing their information prior to signing an ROI, and their decision to grant permission shall be voluntary.

   e) Clients who choose not to authorize sharing of information cannot be denied services for which they would otherwise be eligible.

   f) All Client Authorization for ROI forms related to the InHOUSE system will be placed in a file to be located on premises and will be made available to the CoC Staff for periodic audits.

   g) InHOUSE-related Authorization for ROI forms will be retained for a minimum period of three (3) years, after which time the forms will be discarded in a manner that ensures client confidentiality is not compromised.

   h) No confidential/restricted information received from the InHOUSE system will be shared with any organization or individual without proper written consent by the client, unless otherwise permitted by applicable regulations or laws.
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i) Restricted information, including progress notes and psychotherapy notes about the diagnosis, treatment, or referrals related to a medical health, disabilities, mental health disorder, drug or alcohol use, HIV/AIDS, and any violence-related concerns shall not be shared with other participating Agencies without the clients written, informed consent as documented on the Agency Authorization for Release of Restricted Information Form.

i) Sharing of restricted information is not covered under the general InHOUSE Client ROI.

ii) Sharing of restricted information must also be planned and documented through a fully executed Authorization for Release of Restricted Information Form.

j) If a client has previously given permission to share information and then chooses to revoke that permission by completing a new ROI, the InHOUSE Basic Intake will be closed to further sharing.

k) All client ROI forms will include an expiration date, and once a Client ROI expires, any new information entered will be closed to sharing unless a new Client ROI is signed by the client and entered in the InHOUSE system.

9) System Security System security provisions will apply to all systems where PPI is stored: agency's networks, desktops, laptops, mini-computers, mainframes and servers.

a) Password Access:

i) Only individuals who have completed Privacy and Security Certification and Software Training may be given access to the InHOUSE system through User IDs and Passwords,

ii) Temporary default passwords will be changed on first use.

iii) Access to PPI requires a user name and password at least 8 characters long and using at least one number and one letter.

iv) Passwords will not use or include the users name or the vendor name, and will not consist entirely of any word found in the common dictionary or any of the above words spelled backwards.

v) User Name and password may not be stored or displayed in any publicly accessible location.

vi) Passwords must be changed routinely.

vii) Users must not be able to log onto more than one workstation or location at a time.

viii) Individuals with User IDs and Passwords will not give or share assigned User IDs and Passwords to access the InHOUSE system with any other person, organization, governmental entity, business.

b) Virus Protection and Firewalls:

i) Commercial anti-virus protection software will maintained to protect all agency network systems and workstations from virus attack.

ii) Virus protection will include automated scanning of files as they are accessed by users.

iii) Virus Definitions will be updated regularly.

iv) All workstations will be protected by a firewall either through a workstation firewall or a server firewall.

c) Physical Access to Systems where InHOUSE Data is Stored

i) Computers stationed in public places must be secured when workstations are not in use and staff is not present.

ii) After a short period of time a pass word protected screen saver will be activated during time that the system is temporarily not in use.

iii) For extended absence from a workstation, staff must log off the computer.

d) Stored Data Security and Disposal:

i) All InHOUSE data downloaded onto a data storage medium must be maintained and stored in a secure location, not accessible to non-licensed users of the InHOUSE system.

ii) Data containing PPI will not be downloaded to any remote access site at any time for any reason, nor transmitted outside the physical agency by any means whatsoever.

iii) Data stored on a portable medium will be secured when not in use and will never be
taken off site at any time for any reason.
iv) Data downloaded for purposes of statistical analysis will exclude PPI whenever possible.

iii) InHOUSE data downloaded onto a data storage medium must be disposed of by reformatting as opposed to erasing or deleting. This includes hard drives.
iv) A data storage medium will be reformatted a second time before the medium is reused or disposed of.

e) System Monitoring
i) User access to the InHOUSE Live Web Site will be monitored using the computer access logs located on each computer's explorer "history" button, or via a central server report.

f) Hard Copy Security:
i) Any paper or other hard copy containing PPI that is either generated by or for InHOUSE including, but not limited to report, data entry forms and signed consent forms will be secured.

ii) Agency staff will supervise at all time hard copy with identifying information generated by or for the InHOUSE system when the hard copy is in a public area. If the staff leaves the area, the hard copy must be secured in areas not accessible by the public.

iii) All written information pertaining to the user name and password must not be stored or displayed in any public accessible location.

g) Authorized Location Access:
i) Access to the InHOUSE system is allowed only from authorized agency locations.

10) Agency HMIS/InHOUSE Grievance Policy  (Add details of agency HMIS grievance policy in this section. Refer to HUD Final Data Standards pp. 45930-45931, Section 4.2.5 Access and Correction and Section 4.2.6 Accountability. Your policy may be the same as for other programs. If so, simply include present policy.)

NOTE : Various important aspects of system security are the contracted responsibility of Bowman Systems and are therefore not covered in agency policy. These involve procedures and protections that take place at the site of the central server and include data backup, disaster recovery, data encryption, binary storage requirements, physical storage security, public access controls, location authentication, etc.
PROCEDURES:

NOTE: Procedures and roles relative to this policy should be defined in a procedure section. These may vary significantly from agency to agency but may include the following:

1. Participating agencies may integrate InHOUSE into the agency's existing Privacy Notice. If the agency does not have an existing Privacy Notice agencies may adopt the HMIS Privacy Notice example or use it as a model. The Privacy Notice must reflect the agency's privacy policy.

2. Copies of the Participation Agreement (MOU and the User Agreement/Code of Ethics may be attachments to your Policy. In addition to customizing the sample policy provided above, the agency should describe:
   a. Who will have what Access Levels on InHOUSE ServicePoint.
   b. How access to the room(s) where the InHOUSE system is being used will be controlled.
   c. Procedures for acquiring client consent.
      i. The Agency’s Privacy Notice should be posted.
      ii. How the Privacy Notice will be explained.
      iii. How and when the InHOUSE Consent Release of Information will be introduced to clients.
      iv. A copy of the second Release required for sharing restricted information
What is the InHOUSE System?

What is InHOUSE and Why Should I Use It?

InHOUSE is a computer program to help

- Secure files electronically
- Ensure these programs continue receiving funding to keep them open
- Reduce the information you have to repeat and answer at multiple agencies

The InHOUSE system is used by many agencies throughout the county which provide services to homeless and low-income persons. A list of participating agencies is noted on the back of this page. As participating agencies may change, individuals may obtain a current list of participating agencies at any time.

Funders, cities, and other homeless planning groups require InHOUSE to provide various information about persons-served, services provided and outcomes achieved. In addition, this data is used for research purposes (including coordination with other systems of care), analysis about programs, specific service types, targeting of services, understanding best practices and improvements needed, or other uses to enhance the homeless and housing service delivery system.

Keeping your information in the InHOUSE system helps us pool your data with others for these reports. This helps continue funding and improve the services and programs for you and other homeless and low-income households.

When you request or receive services from some programs of **Agency Name** information collected about your household is entered into the InHOUSE system. Your name, date of birth, gender and social security number are viewable in the system. All Intake answers, program entries and exits are shared with all participating agencies, so you may not need to completely fill out a new intake every time you receive services from other agencies.

You have the right to receive a copy of all information collected about you and shared

### What information is shared about me?

My age, date of birth, gender, race, ethnicity, marital status, veteran status, education, if I have a disability, employment information, household relationships, living situation, income amount and type, benefits information, if I have health coverage income amount and type, benefits information, disability information, pregnancy status, legal information, services needed and provided, and outcomes of services provided.

Information about me will ONLY be viewable by the participating agencies listed on the back of this page.

between the participating agencies. You may also amend and correct information collected about you which may be incorrect.
The agencies listed below utilize the InHOUSE system. All or some of the programs in these agencies participate in the InHOUSE system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abode Services</th>
<th>City of Berkeley Shelter + Care Programs</th>
<th>Homeless Action Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>City of Oakland Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Homeless Families Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County HCD Shelter + Care Programs, RISE Project, Linkages</td>
<td>Matilda Cleveland Program, Families in Transition, Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative, Homeless Families Support Network</td>
<td>HOPE Project Mobile Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Housing Department MHSA Housing programs, Shelter referral and SHP programs</td>
<td>Covenant House</td>
<td>Housing Resource Centers and their partner agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative</td>
<td>Davis Street Family Resource Center</td>
<td>LifeLong Medical Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health, Inc.</td>
<td>East Bay Community Law Center Eviction Prevention Housing Clinic</td>
<td>Operation Dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark of Refuge</td>
<td>East Bay Community Recovery Program</td>
<td>Options Recovery Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Legal Aid</td>
<td>FACT program and Homelessness Prevention and Housing Services</td>
<td>Rubicon Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYC</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project</td>
<td>Second Chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Drop-in Center</td>
<td>EveryOne Home</td>
<td>St. Mary's Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Food &amp; Housing Project</td>
<td>FESCO</td>
<td>Swords to Plowshares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita House, Inc.</td>
<td>First Place for Youth</td>
<td>Volunteers of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSS</td>
<td>Fred Finch Youth Center</td>
<td>YEAH!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children</td>
<td>Goodwill Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Women's Daytime Drop-in Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Workforce Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211 Information and Referral Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Alameda Countywide InHOUSE
### CLIENT RELEASE of INFORMATION AUTHORIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Print Client Name:** __________________________________________

**Children’s Names:** __________________________________________

____ (Initial Here)  I have received and reviewed the “What is the InHOUSE System” information sheet. I understand that my name, date of birth, gender and Social Security Number are viewable in the system.

### Consent to VIEW Data:

By signing below, I agree that my answers, program entries, and exit information may be seen by the InHOUSE participant agencies (listed on the back of this form) for myself and (if applicable) my minor children.

I know that the agencies in the system (listed on the back of this form) must follow strict privacy laws. The agencies in the system may change from time to time. I understand that this acknowledgement is valid for three (3) years. I understand that my name, date of birth, gender and Social Security Number are viewable in the system. I understand that my data will be used in reporting and in research or analysis about programs, specific service types, targeting of services, understanding best practices and improvements needed, or other uses to improve the homeless and housing service delivery system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Client or Guardian</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Representative</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Representative Printed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### FOR STAFF USE ONLY:

If your client believes that sharing any information beyond this agency may put him/herself or a family member at risk, the following option may be offered after discussion with a case manager.

- Displayed Name and SSN Restriction.

Enter the following initials instead of the client name(s) into ServicePoint. The SSN will not be viewable system-wide.

- First Name Initial _____ Last Name Initial _____ for __________________________
- First Name Initial _____ Last Name Initial _____ for __________________________
- First Name Initial _____ Last Name Initial _____ for __________________________
- First Name Initial _____ Last Name Initial _____ for __________________________
- First Name Initial _____ Last Name Initial _____ for __________________________

### Special Data Entry Instructions:

1. Enter **initials only and no SSN** when creating new record
2. Only enter SSN and Full Name on Standard Intake assessment
Participants of InHOUSE

The agencies listed below utilize the InHOUSE system.
All or some of the programs in these agencies participate in the InHOUSE system.

Abode Services
Affordable Housing Associates
Alameda County HCD
Shelter + Care Programs, RISE Project, Linkages
Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Housing Department
MHSA Housing programs, Shelter referral and SHP programs
Alameda Point Collaborative
Anka Behavioral Health, Inc.
Ark of Refuge
Bay Area Legal Aid
BAYC
Berkeley Drop-in Center
Berkeley Food & Housing Project
Bonita House, Inc.
BOSS
Building Futures with Women and Children

City of Berkeley
Shelter + Care Programs
City of Oakland
Department of Human Services
Matilda Cleveland Program,
Families in Transition,
Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative,
Homeless Families Support Network
Covenant House
Davis Street Family Resource Center
East Bay Community Law Center
Eviction Prevention Housing Clinic
East Bay Community Recovery Program
FACT program and Homelessness Prevention and Housing Services
East Oakland Community Project
EveryOne Home
FESCO
First Place for Youth
Fred Finch Youth Center
Goodwill Industries, Inc.

Homeless Action Center
Homeless Families Program
HOPE Project Mobile Clinic
Housing Resource Centers and their partner agencies
LifeLong Medical Care
Operation Dignity
Options Recovery Services
Rubicon Programs
Second Chance
St. Mary's Center
Swords to Plowshares
Volunteers of America
YEA!
Women's Daytime Drop-in Center
The Workforce Collaborative
211 Information and Referral Program
4.1. HMIS Privacy Standards: Definitions and Scope

4.1.1. Definition of Terms

Protected Personal Information (PPI)
Any information maintained by or for a Covered Homeless Organization about a living homeless client or homeless individual that:

1. Identifies, either directly or indirectly, a specific individual;
2. can be manipulated by a reasonably foreseeable method to identify a specific individual; or
3. can be linked with other available information to identify a specific individual.

Covered Homeless Organization (CHO)
Any organization (including its employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors, and associates) that records, uses or processes PPI on homeless clients for an HMIS.

Processing
Any operation or set of operations performed on PPI, whether or not by automated means, including but not limited to collection, maintenance, use, disclosure, transmission and destruction of the information.

HMIS Uses and Disclosures
The uses and disclosures of PPI that are allowed by these standards.
4.2. Privacy-Requirements

- All CHO's must comply with the baseline privacy requirements described here with respect to: data collection limitations; data quality; purpose and use limitations; openness; access and correction; and accountability.

- A CHO may adopt additional substantive and procedural privacy protections that exceed the baseline requirements for each of these areas.

- A CHO must comply with federal, state and local laws that require additional confidentiality protections.

- All additional protections must be described in the CHO's privacy notice.

- A CHO must comply with all baseline privacy protections and with all additional privacy protections included in its privacy notice.

- A CHO may maintain a common data storage medium with another organization (including but not limited to another CHO) that includes the sharing of PPI.

- When PPI is shared between organizations, responsibilities for privacy and security may reasonably be allocated between the organizations.

- Organizations sharing a common data storage medium and PPI may adopt differing privacy and security policies as they deem appropriate, administratively feasible, and consistent with these HMIS privacy and security standards, as long as these privacy and security policies allow for the unduplication of homeless clients at the CoC level.
4.2.1. Collection Limitation

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO may collect PPI only when appropriate to the purposes for which the information is obtained or when required by law.
- A CHO must collect PPI by lawful and fair means and, where appropriate, with the knowledge or consent of the individual.
- A CHO must post a sign at each intake desk (or comparable location) that explains generally the reasons for collecting this information.
- Consent of the individual for data collection may be inferred from the circumstances of the collection.
- Providers may use the following language to meet this standard:

"We collect personal information directly from you for reasons that are discussed in our privacy statement. We may be required to collect some personal information by law or by organizations that give us money to operate this program. Other personal information that we collect is important to run our programs, to improve services for homeless persons, and to better understand the needs of homeless persons. We only collect information that we consider to be appropriate."

Additional Privacy Protections.

A CHO may, in its privacy notice, commit itself to additional privacy protections consistent with HMIS requirements, including, but not limited to:

(1) Restricting collection of personal data, other than required HMIS data elements;

(2) Collecting PPI only with the express knowledge or consent of the individual (unless required by law); and

(3) Obtaining oral or written consent from the individual for the collection of personal information from the individual or from a third party.

4.2.2. Data Quality

Baseline Requirement.

- PPI collected by a CHO must be relevant to the purpose for which it is to be used. To the extent necessary for those purposes, PPI should be accurate, complete and timely,
- A CHO must develop and implement a plan to dispose of or, in the alternative, to remove identifiers from, PPI that is not in current use seven years after the PPI was created or last changed (unless a statutory, regulatory, contractual, or other requirement mandates longer retention). Standards for destroying information are provided in Section 4.3.
4.2.3. **Purpose Specification and Use Limitation**

**Baseline Requirement**

- A CHO must specify in its privacy notice the **purposes** for which it collects PPI and must describe all uses and disclosures.
- A CHO may use or disclose PPI only if the use or disclosure is allowed by this standard and is described in its privacy notice.
- A CHO may infer consent for all uses and disclosures specified in the notice and for uses and disclosures determined by the CHO to be compatible with those specified in the notice.
- Except for first party access to information and any required disclosures for oversight of compliance with HMIS privacy and security standards, all uses and disclosures are permissive and not mandatory.
- **Uses and disclosures not specified in the privacy notice can be made only with the consent of the individual or when required by law.**

**Additional Privacy Protections.**

A CHO may, in its privacy notice, commit itself to additional privacy protections consistent with HMIS requirements, including, but not limited to:

1. **Seeking either oral or written consent for some or all processing when individual consent for a use, disclosure or other form of processing is appropriate;**

2. **Agreeing to additional restrictions on use or disclosure of an individual's PPI at the request of the individual if the request is reasonable. The CHO is bound by the agreement, except if inconsistent with legal requirements;**

3. Limiting uses and disclosures to those specified in its privacy notice and to other uses and disclosures that are necessary for those specified;

4. Committing that PPI may not be disclosed directly or indirectly to any government agency (including a contractor or grantee of an agency) for inclusion in any national homeless database that contains personal protected information unless required by statute;

5. Committing to maintain an audit trail containing the date, purpose and recipient of some or all disclosures of PPI;

6. Committing to make audit trails of disclosures available to the homeless individual; and

7. Limiting disclosures of PPI to the minimum necessary to accomplish the purpose of the disclosure.
4.2.4. **Openness**

**Baseline Requirement.**

- A CHO must publish a privacy notice describing its policies and practices for the processing of PPI and must provide a copy of its privacy notice to any individual upon request.

- If a CHO maintains a public web page, the CHO must post the current version of its privacy notice on the web page.

- A CHO may, if appropriate, omit its street address from its privacy notice.

- A CHO must post a sign stating the availability of its privacy notice to any individual who requests a copy.

- A CHO must state in its privacy notice that the policy may be amended at any time and that amendments may affect information obtained by the CHO before the date of the change. An amendment to the privacy notice regarding use or disclosure will be effective with respect to information processed before the amendment, unless otherwise stated. All amendments to the privacy notice must be consistent with the requirements of these privacy standards. A CHO must maintain permanent documentation of all privacy notice amendments.

- CHOs are reminded that they are obligated to provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities throughout the data collection process. This may include but is not limited to, providing qualified sign language interpreters, readers or materials in accessible formats such as Braille, audio, or large type, as needed by the individual with a disability. See 24 CFR 8.6; 28 CFR 36.303. Note: This obligation does not apply to CHOs who do not receive federal financial assistance and who are also exempt from the requirements of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act because they qualify as "religious entities" under that Act.

- CHOs that are recipients of federal financial assistance shall provide required information in languages other than English that are common in the community, if speakers of these languages are found in significant numbers and come into frequent contact with the program. See HUD Limited English Proficiency Recipient Guidance published on December 18, 2003 (68 FR 70968).

**Additional Privacy Protections.**

A CHO may, in its privacy notice, commit itself to additional privacy protections consistent with HMIS requirements, including, but not limited to:

1. making a reasonable effort to offer a copy of the privacy notice to each client at or around the time of data collection or at another appropriate time;
2. giving a copy of its privacy notice to each client on or about the time of first data collection. If the first contact is over the telephone, the privacy notice may be provided at the first in-person contact (or by mail, if requested); and/or
3. adopting a policy for changing its privacy notice that includes advance notice of the change, consideration of public comments, and prospective application of changes.
4.2.5. Access and Correction

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must allow an individual to inspect and to have a copy of any PPI about the individual. A CHO must offer to explain any information that the individual may not understand.
- A CHO must consider any request by an individual for correction of inaccurate or incomplete PPI pertaining to the individual.
- A CHO is not required to remove any information but may, in the alternative, mark information as inaccurate or incomplete and may supplement it with additional information.
- In its privacy notice, a CHO may reserve the ability to rely on the following reasons for denying an individual inspection or copying of the individual's PPI:
  1. Information compiled in reasonable anticipation of litigation or comparable proceedings;
  2. Information about another individual (other than a health care or homeless provider);
  3. Information obtained under a promise of confidentiality (other than a promise from a health care or homeless provider) if disclosure would reveal the source of the information; or
  4. Information, the disclosure of which would be reasonably likely to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual.
- A CHO can reject repeated or harassing requests for access or correction.
- A CHO that denies an individual's request for access or correction must explain the reason for the denial to the individual and must include documentation of the request and the reason for the denial as part of the protected personal information about the individual.

Additional Privacy Protections.

A CHO may, in its privacy notice, commit itself to additional privacy protections consistent with HMIS requirements, including, but not limited to:

1. Accepting an appeal of a denial of access or correction by adopting its own appeal procedure and describing the procedure in its privacy notice;
2. Limiting the grounds for denial of access by not stating a recognized basis for denial in its privacy notice;
3. Allowing an individual whose request for correction has been denied to add to the individual's information a concise statement of disagreement. A CHO may agree to disclose the statement of disagreement whenever it discloses the disputed PPI to another person. These procedures must be described in the CHO's privacy notice; and/or
4. Providing to an individual a written explanation of the reason for a denial of an individual's request for access or correction.
4.2.6. **Accountability**

*Baseline Requirement.*

- A CHO must establish a procedure for accepting and considering questions or complaints about its privacy and security policies and practices.
- A CHO must require each member of its staff (including employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors and associates) to sign (annually or otherwise) a confidentiality agreement that acknowledges receipt of a copy of the privacy notice and that pledges to comply with the privacy notice.

*Additional Privacy Protections.*

A CHO may, in its privacy notice, commit itself to additional privacy protections consistent with HMIS requirements, including, but not limited to:

1. **Requiring each member of its staff (including employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors and associates) to undergo (annually or otherwise) formal training in privacy requirements;**
2. **Establishing a method, such as an internal audit, for regularly reviewing compliance with its privacy policy;**
3. **Establishing an internal or external appeal process for hearing an appeal of a privacy complaint or an appeal of a denial of access or correction rights; and/or**
4. **Designating a chief privacy officer to supervise implementation of the CHO's privacy standards.**
4.3. Security Standards

This section describes the standards for system, application and hard copy security. All CHO's must comply with the baseline security requirements. A CHO may adopt additional security protections that exceed the baseline requirements if it chooses.

4.3.1. System Security

Applicability.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must apply system security provisions to all the systems where personal protected information is stored, including, but not limited to, a CHO's networks, desktops, laptops, mini-computers, mainframes and servers.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by applying system security provisions to all electronic and hard copy information that is not collected specifically for the HMIS.
- A CHO may also seek an outside organization to perform an internal security audit and certify system security.

User Authentication.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must secure HMIS systems with, at a minimum, a user authentication system consisting of a username and a password.
- Passwords must be at least eight characters long and meet reasonable industry standard requirements. These requirements include, but are not limited to:
  1. Using at least one number and one letter;
  2. Not using, or including, the username, the HMIS name, or the HMIS vendor's name; and/or
  3. Not consisting entirely of any word found in the common dictionary or any of the above spelled backwards.
- Using default passwords on initial entry into the HMIS application is allowed so long as the application requires that the default password be changed on first use.
- Written information specifically pertaining to user access (e.g., username and password) may not be stored or displayed in any publicly accessible location.
- Individual users must not be able to log on to more than one workstation at a time, or be able to log on to the network at more than one location at a time.
Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by including one of each of the following kinds of characters in the password:
  1. upper and lower-case letters;
  2. numbers; and/or
  3. symbols.

- A common solution to creating complex passwords is to use phrases instead of individual words as passwords, capitalize each new word in the phrase, and substitute numbers and symbols for letters in any given word.

For example, the phrase "secure password" can be modified to "$3cur3P@$wOrd" by replacing the letter "s" with "$", the letter "e" with the number "3," the letter "a" with "@" and the letter "o" with the number "O," and eliminating spaces between words.

Virus Protection.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must protect HMIS systems from viruses by using commercially available virus protection software.

- Virus protection must include automated scanning of files as they are accessed by users on the system where the HMIS application is housed.

- A CHO must regularly update virus definitions from the software vendor.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by automatically scanning all files for viruses when the system is turned on, shut down or not actively being used.
Firewalls.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must protect HMIS systems from malicious intrusion behind a secure firewall.
- Each individual workstation does not need its own firewall, as long as there is a firewall between that workstation and any systems, including the Internet and other computer networks, located outside of the organization.

For example, a workstation that accesses the Internet through a modem would need its own firewall.

A workstation that accesses the Internet through a central server would not need a firewall as long as the server has a firewall.

Firewalls are commonly included with all new operating systems.

Older operating systems can be equipped with secure firewalls that are available both commercially and for free on the Internet.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by applying a firewall to all HMIS workstations and systems.

Public Access.

Baseline Requirement.

- HMIS that use public forums for data collection or reporting must be secured to allow only connections from previously approved computers and systems through Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) certificates, or extranets that limit access based on the Internet Provider (IP) address, or similar means.
- A public forum includes systems with public access to any part of the computer through the Internet, modems, bulletin boards, public kiosks or similar arenas. Further information on these tools can be found in the HMIS Consumer Guide and the HMIS Implementation Guide, both available on HUD's Web site.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by using PKI certificates and extranets that limit access based on the IP address.
- A very secure system would not house any HMIS data on systems that are accessible to the general public.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must staff computers stationed in public areas that are used to collect and store HMIS data at all times.
- When workstations are not in use and staff are not present, steps should be taken to ensure that the computers and data are secure and not usable by unauthorized individuals.
- After a short amount of time, workstations should automatically turn on a password protected screen saver when the workstation is temporarily not in use. Password protected screen savers are a standard feature with most operating systems and the amount of time can be regulated by a CHO.
- If staff from a CHO will be gone for an extended period of time, staff should log off the data entry system and shut down the computer.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by automatically logging users off of the HMIS application after a period of inactivity and automatically logging users off of the system after a period of inactivity.
- Most server operating systems come equipped with the needed software to automatically perform these functions. If staff from a CHO will be gone for an extended period of time, staff should store the computer and data in a locked room.

Disaster Protection and Recovery.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must copy all HMIS data on a regular basis to another medium (e.g., tape) and store it in a secure off-site location where the required privacy and security standards would also apply.
- A CHO that stores data in a central server, mini-computer or mainframe must store the central server, mini-computer or mainframe in a secure room with appropriate temperature control and fire suppression systems.
- Surge suppressors must be used to protect systems used for collecting and storing all the HMIS data.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by providing, among other options, fire and water protection at the off-site location that houses the storage medium.
- A CHO may also seek an outside organization to conduct a disaster protection audit.
Disposal.

Baseline Requirement.

- In order to delete all HMIS data from a data storage medium, a covered homeless organization must reformat the storage medium. A CHO should reformat the storage medium more than once before reusing or disposing the medium.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by destroying media at a bonded vendor to ensure all the HMIS data is completely destroyed.

System Monitoring.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must use appropriate methods to monitor security systems.

- Systems that have access to any HMIS data must maintain a user access log.

Many new operating systems and web servers are equipped with access logs and some allow the computer to email the log information to a designated user, usually a system administrator.

- Logs must be checked routinely.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by checking user access logs routinely for inappropriate access, hardware and software problems, errors and viruses, or purchasing one of several software applications available that track the status of individual files on computers.

These applications are used to make sure that files are not being changed when they are not supposed to be. The applications inform the system administrator if a computer has been hacked, infected with a virus, has been restarted, or if the data files have been tampered with.

4.3.2. Application Security

These provisions apply to how all the HMIS data are secured by the HMIS application software.

Applicability.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must apply application security provisions to the software during data entry, storage and review or any other processing function.

Additional Security Protections.

A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements as needed.
User Authentication.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must secure all electronic HMIS data with, at a minimum, a user authentication system consisting of a username and a password.
- Passwords must be at least eight characters long and meet reasonable industry standard requirements. These requirements include, but are not limited to:
  1. Using at least one number and one letter;
  2. Using default passwords on initial entry into the HMIS application is allowed so long as the application requires that the default password be changed on first use;
  3. Not using, or including, the username, the HMIS name, or the HMIS vendor's name; and
  4. Not consisting entirely of any word found in the common dictionary or any of the above spelled backwards.
- Written information specifically pertaining to user access (e.g., username and password) may not be stored or displayed in any publicly accessible location.
- Individual users should not be able to log on to more than one workstation at a time, or be able to log on to the network at more than one location at a time.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by including one of each of the following kinds of characters in the password:
  1. Upper and lower-case letters;
  2. Numbers; and
  3. Symbols.
- A common solution to creating complex passwords is to use phrases instead of individual words as passwords, capitalize each new word in the phrase and substitute numbers and symbols for letters in any given word.

For example, the phrase "secure password" can be modified to "$3cur3P@$wOrd" by replacing the letter "s" with "," the letter "e" with the number "3," the letter "a" with "@" and the letter "o" with the number "O," and eliminating spaces between words.
Electronic Data Transmission.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must encrypt all HMIS data that are electronically transmitted over the Internet, publicly accessible networks or phone lines to current industry standards. The current standard is 128-bit encryption.

- Unencrypted data may be transmitted over secure direct connections between two systems. A secure direct connection is one that can only be accessed by users who have been authenticated on at least one of the systems involved and does not utilize any tertiary systems to transmit the data. A secure network would have secure direct connections.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by using PKI certificates to verify the workstations involved in the electronic data transmission, and by restricting access between the workstations using IP addresses.

- A very secure system would not transmit any protected information over a public system like the Internet.

Electronic Data Storage.

Baseline Requirement.

- A CHO must store all HMIS data in a binary, not text, format.

- A CHO that uses one of several common applications [e.g., Microsoft Access, Microsoft SQL Server and Oracle] are already storing data in binary format and no other steps need to be taken.

Additional Security Protections.

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by requiring that all PPI be stored in an encrypted format using at least the current industry standard. The current standard is a 128-bit key.
4.3.3. **Hard Copy Security**

This section provides standards for securing hard copy data.

**Applicability.**

**Baseline Requirement.**

- A CHO must secure any paper or other hard copy containing personal protected information that is either generated by or for HMIS, including, but not limited to reports, data entry forms and signed consent forms.

**Additional Security Protections.**

- A CHO may commit itself to additional security protections consistent with HMIS requirements by applying hard copy security provisions to paper and hard copy information that is not collected specifically for the HMIS.

**Security.**

**Baseline Requirement.**

- A CHO must supervise at all times any paper or other hard copy generated by or for HMIS that contains PPI when the hard copy is in a public area.
- When CHO staff are not present, the information must be secured in areas that are not publicly accessible.
- Written information specifically pertaining to user access (e.g., username and password) must not be stored or displayed in any publicly accessible location.
5. Technical Standards

This section presents the technical standards that will be required for HMIS applications and for the organizations responsible for storing HMIS data. Except as otherwise provided, these standards do not specify or recommend any particular operating system, development environment, networking environment, database, hardware or other aspect of the HMIS application. This part of the Notice is primarily directed to HMIS developers and CoC system administrators.

5.1. Required HMIS Capabilities.

5.1.1. Automatic Generation of Identification Numbers and Information

Based on the data collected through the client assessment process, program staff interviews, self-administered forms or review of case management records, the HMIS application must be capable of automatically generating data for each record. This capability includes the automatic generation of:

1. Unique Personal Identification Numbers (PINs) for persons who have not been previously served within the CoC, and reassignment of PINs for persons who have been served previously within a program and/or the CoC;
2. Program Identification Information that is uniquely associated with each program within a CoC and is assigned to every service episode for each client; and,
3. Household Identification Numbers for persons who have been identified as members of a household that participated in the same service episode.

Personal Identification Numbers (PINs). A PIN is a number automatically generated by the HMIS application. All records associated with the same person should be assigned the same PIN. There is no required format for the PIN as long as there is a single unique PIN for every client served in the CoC and it contains no personally-identifying information. The PIN is used to produce an unduplicated count of all persons at three levels:

1. Within a single program;
2. Across multiple programs that share HMIS data (where programs agree to share such data); and/or
3. Across the entire CoC database, whether or not data are shared across programs within a CoC.

At each level, an HMIS must be capable of searching client records to determine if clients have been previously served. The search must involve the matching of client records using personal identifier fields (e.g., Name, Social Security Number, Date of Birth, and Gender) to retrieve a record(s) with identical or similar values in each of these fields.
Program Identification Information.

Program identification information for every program offered in a CoC consists of the following four fields:

1. Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Code. To find the 10-digit FIPS code consisting of a 2-digit state code, 3-digit county code and 5-digit place code: (1) Go to Web site http://geonames.usgs.gov/fips55.html; (2) click on "Search the FIPS55 Data Base;" (3) click on state from "State Number Code" pull down menu (this also tells you 2-digit state code); (4) type town or city name in "FIPS 55 Feature Name" box; and (5) click on "Send Query" and 3-digit county code and 5-digit place code will be shown; (2) Facility Code (to be locally determined);

2. Continuum of Care (CoC) Code (HUD-assigned); and

3. Program Type Code:
   1 = Emergency shelter (e.g., facility or vouchers)
   2 = Transitional housing
   3 = Permanent supportive housing
   4 = Street outreach
   5 = Homeless prevention (e.g., security deposit or one month's rent)
   6 = Services-only type of program
   7 = Other

The FIPS code, facility code, CoC code and program type code should be separate fields in the HMIS application. There is no requirement to merge them into a single field. For each client intake program staff are only required to enter the program type code. Programs may choose to provide more detailed response categories for the services-only type program response. However, for reporting purposes, these detailed categories must be collapsed into a single service-only type category and its associated code.

A corresponding FIPS code, facility code and CoC code should be automatically generated by the HMIS based on which facility is doing the intake. Once program identification information has been created, the HMIS must ensure that the information is associated with every service episode recorded within the CoC.
**Household Identification Numbers.**

HMIS must generate the same Household Identification Number for every person designated by program staff as being together for an episode of service. The household identification numbers assigned will be maintained in each person’s permanent record and will be unique for each service episode experienced by the client.

As discussed in previous parts of this final Notice, when a group of persons apply for services together (as a household or family), information is first recorded for the household head who is applying for services and then information is recorded for any children under 18 years of age who are applying for services with the household head. The children do not need to be present at the time the household head applies for services. The same household identification number is assigned to the adult head of household and any children who have been identified as applying for services with the head. If there are other adult members of the household (over 18 years of age) who are reported to be part of this household, a separate intake is conducted. As part of this intake, this individual is assigned the same household identification number as the other household members.
5.1.2. **Missing Value Categories**

A limited number of data elements require "don't know," "not applicable" and "refused" response categories for close-ended questions. These missing value categories and their associated codes should appear on the same list as the valid responses. For open-ended questions (e.g., name), the HMIS application should include the "don't know," "not applicable" and "refused" response categories for each field in the data element (e.g., first name, last name, middle initial and suffix).

5.1.3. **Other Response Categories**

Certain data elements may contain a response category labeled "other." When a data element contains such an option, there should also be within the same database table a separate alphanumeric field where the "other" value may be entered by program staff. For instance, a coded field that accepts the values "0=Red," "1=Yellow," or "9=Other" should have an accompanying field that accepts open-ended answers such as tangerine, blue or magenta.

5.1.4. **Response Category Codes**

Where character or numeric codes are shown next to each response category, only the character or numeric response code needs to be stored in the database. For example, "1=Yes" will be the response code on the computer screen or hard copy, but the electronic database can store "1=Yes" responses as "1" in the database. For open-ended or text answers (such as name), the full text answer or an encrypted version of it should be stored in the database.

5.1.5. **Exit Dates**

The HMIS should identify programs that have fixed lengths of enrollment. When a client enters such a program, the HMIS should automatically generate the exit date based on the entry date and the program's fixed length of enrollment. For example, an overnight emergency shelter has a fixed length of stay of one day. This information would be stored with the other program information like FIPS code and program code. When a client enrolls in an overnight emergency shelter, the HMIS will automatically set the client's exit date for the next day.

5.1.6. **Maintaining Historical Data**

An HMIS should have the ability to record client data from a limitless number of service transactions for longitudinal data analysis and assessment of client outcomes (often referred to as a "transactional" or "relational" database structure). A transactional or relational database organizes data within a set of tables from which data can be accessed or reassembled in many different ways without having to erase historical data or reorganize the database tables. For example, an HMIS may include a table that describes a client's demographic profile with columns for name, SSN, date of birth, gender, and so on. In most cases, the information in the profile table will not change. Another table may describe the client's income status: source of income, amount of income from each source, receipt of non-cash benefits, and so forth. The information in the income status table may change overtime, but all historical data should be preserved. Additional tables may include data from each service encounter by program type (e.g., mental health and/or substance abuse).
5.1.7. Data Export
Although a standard environment is not specified, any HMIS application must be capable of exporting any and all data collected into a comma-separated values text file using the following format:

- All fields in a given record are separated by a comma;
- All records within a given text file contain the same fields;
- Blank fields are signified by the comma ending the previous field (or the beginning of the line if the field is the first in the record) followed by a comma indicating the end of the empty field;
- Fields containing text information (as opposed to numeric) will be surrounded by double quotes whenever the field includes blank spaces, commas, or other symbols not part of the standard alphabet;
- The first line of the file shall be a list of the field names included in every record in the file; and
- The list of field names shall be in the same format described above.

5.2. Continuum of Care Requirements

5.2.1. Storage Requirements

- The CoC must have or designate a central coordinating body that will be responsible for centralized collection and storage of HMIS data.
- HMIS data must be collected to a central location at least once a year from all HMIS users within the CoC.
- HMIS data must be stored at the central location for a minimum of seven years after the date of collection by the central coordinating body or designee of the CoC. The seven-year requirement is the current government standard for health and medical information.

Environmental Impact
This notice does not direct, provide for assistance or loan and mortgage insurance for, or otherwise govern or regulate, real property acquisition, disposition, leasing, rehabilitation, alteration, demolition, or new construction, or establish, revise or provide for standards for construction or construction materials, manufactured housing, or occupancy. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(I), this notice is categorically excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321).

Nelson R. Bregon,
General Deputy Assistant Secretary/or Community Planning and Development.
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Information about Homelessness, Outcomes and Service Engagement
...the Alameda Countywide Homeless Management Information System

InHOUSE USER AGREEMENT

POLICY, RESPONSIBILITIES, & CODE OF ETHICS

USER POLICY

The Alameda Countywide Homeless Management Information System named InHOUSE (Information about Homelessness, Outcomes and Service Engagement), is a collaborative project that will enable homeless service providers to collect uniform client information over time. Participating Agencies in the InHOUSE system shall share information for provision of services to homeless persons through a networked infrastructure that establishes electronic communication among the Participating Agencies. This system is essential to efforts that streamline client services, continually improve the quality of homeless and housing services, and inform public policy. Through InHOUSE, homeless clients benefit from reduced intake processes, improved coordination in and between agencies, informed advocacy efforts, and policies that result in targeted services. Analysis of information gathered through InHOUSE is critical to accurately estimate the size, characteristics, and needs of the homeless population to inform service and systems planning, funding and advocacy.

The Client and his/her needs are a primary consideration in the design and management of the Alameda Countywide InHOUSE system. This includes the need to vigilantly maintain client confidentiality and treat personal data with significant respect and care. As the guardians entrusted with this personal data, InHOUSE users have a moral and legal obligation to ensure that the data they collect is being collected, accessed and used appropriately. It is also the responsibility of each user to ensure that client data uses and benefits are made explicitly clear to service users, and only used to those ends for which it was collected. Proper user training, adherence to the InHOUSE Policies and Procedures, and strict protection of client confidentiality are vital to the overall InHOUSE system. The InHOUSE system is a tool to assist agencies in focusing services and locating alternative resources to help homeless persons. Therefore, agency staff should use the Client information in InHOUSE to target services to the Client's needs.

The Client Release of Information Authorization form must be signed by Client before any information that identifies the Client (name, social security number, etc.) is searched for or entered into InHOUSE in a shared portion of the database. For each new Client, User shall insure that prior to obtaining Client's signature, the What is InHOUSE? and Client Release of Information Authorization forms were fully reviewed with Client such that the Client fully understood the information.

Partner Agencies shall have rights to data in InHOUSE pertaining to their clients that was created or entered by them. Partner Agencies shall be bound by all restrictions imposed by clients, privacy and security policies, and applicable laws pertaining to the use of personal data.

Minimum data entry for each Client will include:
- Completing the section(s) containing the HUD data elements

Data necessary for the development of aggregate reports of homeless services, including Annual Progress Reports, service needs, services provided, referrals and Client goals and outcomes will require data entry for all of the InHOUSE data sets and relevant forms including but not limited to the Standardized Intake, Program Entry/Exit, and Custom Assessment forms.
USER RESPONSIBILITY

User must be prepared to answer Client questions regarding the InHOUSE system.

User must faithfully respect Client preferences with regard to the entry of Client information within InHOUSE.

User must accurately record Client's preferences by making the proper designations for sharing of Client information and/or any restrictions on the sharing of Client information.

User must allow Client to change his or her information sharing preferences at the Client's request.

User must not decline services to a Client or potential Client if that person refuses to share the Intake information with other agencies via InHOUSE.

The User has primary responsibility for information entered by the User. Information entered by User must be truthful, accurate and complete to the best of User's knowledge.

User will not solicit from or enter information about Clients into InHOUSE unless the information is required for a legitimate business purpose such as to provide services to the Client.

Users will not alter or delete information entered by another Agency.

User will not use the InHOUSE database for any violation of any law, to defraud any entity or conduct any illegal activity.

Upon Client written request, User must allow a Client to inspect and obtain a copy of the Client's own information maintained within InHOUSE. Information requested by the Client to be compiled in reasonable anticipation of or for use in a civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding need not be provided to Client.

User must permit Clients to file a written complaint regarding the use or treatment of their information within InHOUSE. Client may file a written complaint within the Agency/Jurisdiction Grievance Procedure. Client may not be retaliated against for filing a complaint.

The protection of confidentiality is critically important in the InHOUSE system. Your User ID and Password give you access to the InHOUSE system and must not be disclosed or shared.

Initial each item below to indicate your understanding and acceptance of the confidentiality protection measures and the proper use of your User ID and password. Failure to uphold the confidentiality standards set forth below is grounds for downgrading your access, immediate termination from the InHOUSE system, and/or potential termination from employment.

[ ] I understand that an InHOUSE Privacy and Security Certification training must be successfully completed before I administer Intake and Release of Authorization Forms.

[ ] I must successfully complete a ServicePoint User Training before I receive my username and password to the InHOUSE system.

[ ] I have read and will abide by all the InHOUSE Policies and Procedures.

[ ] I understand that my User ID and Password are for my use only and must not be shared with anyone, including other staff members.

Approved for Use 12/14/04
I must take all reasonable measures to keep my Password physically secure.

I understand that my User ID and Password will terminate should I move employment and will not be passed on to the new staff member or transferred to my new employer.

I understand that the Client Release of Information Authorization form must be signed by the Client before any identifiable Client information is searched for, entered into InHOUSE, or designated in InHOUSE for sharing with any Partner Agencies.

I will not knowingly enter malicious or erroneous information into the InHOUSE system.

I understand that I may only view, obtain, disclose, or use the database information that is necessary to perform my job.

I understand that the only individuals who can view information in the InHOUSE system are authorized users and the Clients to whom the information pertains.

A computer that has the InHOUSE “open and running” shall never be left unattended.

If I am logged into InHOUSE and must leave the work area where the computer is located, I must log-off of the software application before leaving the work area.

A computer that has the InHOUSE system “open and running” must have a password protected screen saver installed.

A computer that has the InHOUSE system “open and running” shall never be physically arranged so that unauthorized individuals may see the information on the screen.

Failure to log off the InHOUSE system appropriately and leaving the system exposed may result in a breach in client confidentiality and system security, and may terminate my participation in the InHOUSE system.

I understand that if I notice or suspect a security breach within the InHOUSE system, I must immediately notify my Agency Policy and Procedure Administrator (as defined in the Policies and Procedures Manual).

I understand that all InHOUSE information (hard copies and soft copies) must be kept secure and confidential at all times. When no longer needed, they must be destroyed according to written Policies and Procedures to maintain confidentiality.

I understand that these rules apply to all users of the InHOUSE system, whatever their work role or position.

USER CODE OF ETHICS

A. InHOUSE Users must treat Partner Agencies/Jurisdictions with respect, fairness and good faith.

B. Each User should maintain high standards of professional conduct in the capacity as an InHOUSE User.

C. The InHOUSE User has primary responsibility for his/her Client(s).
I understand and agree to comply with all the confidentiality and user ethics statements listed above. I agree to maintain strict confidentiality of information obtained for and through the InHOUSE system. This information will be used only for the legitimate client service and administration of the above named agency. Any breach of confidentiality will result in downgrading of my access, immediate termination of my participation in the InHOUSE system, and may furthermore jeopardize my employment.

InHOUSE User Signature

Date

Agency or System Administrator

Date

Approved for Use 12/14/04
Appendix I

Glossary

Aggregate Data
Data collected across the system which does NOT contain PPI.

APRs
Annual Progress Reports

CHO
Covered Homeless Organization. Any organization (including its employees, volunteers, affiliates, contractors, and associates) that records, uses or processes PPI on homeless clients for an HMIS.

CoC
Continuum of Care.

HIPAA Covered Entity
An agency/jurisdiction that is required to comply with all HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996) standards as defined by federal regulations.

HMIS
Homeless Management Information Systems. A computerized data collection application that facilitates the collection of information on homeless individuals and families using residential or other homeless assistance services and stores that data in an electronic format.

InHOUSE
The name InHOUSE is an acronym for Information about Homelessness, Outcomes, and Service Engagement.
MOU
Memorandum of Understanding. A signed agreement between agencies/jurisdictions and the Alameda County-wide Continuum of Care Council specifying the terms of participating in the InHOUSE system.

PPI
Protected Personal Identifiers. Any information maintained by or for a Covered Homeless Organization about a living homeless client or homeless individual that: (1) identifies, either directly or indirectly, a specific individual; (2) can be manipulated by a reasonably foreseeable method to identify a specific individual; or (3) can be linked with other available information to identify a specific individual. Data fields determined by HUD to be PPI include: first name, middle name, last name, suffix of name, other first name (alias), other middle name, other last name, other name suffix, social security number, date of birth, zip code of last permanent address, program entry date, program exit date, the client PIN number in the software application, the city code of the service provider, the facility code of the service provider, the CoC code, and the program type code.

Privacy Agreement
An agreement signed by anyone collecting data for entry into INHOUSE or working with data generated by the InHOUSE system that contains PPI, pledging to uphold all confidentiality and privacy standards set forth in the Agreement.

Privacy Notice
A document published by each agency/jurisdiction that describes its policies and practices for the processing of Protected Personal Identifiers (PPI).

ROI
Release of Information.

User Agreement
An agreement signed by all licensed users of the InHOUSE system specifying the terms of being a licensed user.
# AGENDA

## Day One

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A Little Bit About You</td>
<td>10:45 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>11:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Toolbox</td>
<td>11:40 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>12:40 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tools in Action</td>
<td>1:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>2:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Revamping Rules and Policies</td>
<td>2:20 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
<td>4:40 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Day Two

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome Back</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Real Scoop</td>
<td>9:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Renewing the Healthy Helping Relationship</td>
<td>10:15 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>12:20 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Redefining a Housing-Oriented Culture</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>3:10 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Redesigning a Welcoming Physical Environment</td>
<td>3:20 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Taking It Home</td>
<td>3:50 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Presents for Your Presence</td>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Achieving Outcomes

Introduction and Background

The EveryOne Home Plan to prevent and end homelessness in Alameda County by the year 2020 was published in 2006 and an organization by the same name launched in 2007 to lead implementation. Since then EveryOne Home and community stakeholders have worked hard to honor the Plan’s charge to “measure success and report outcomes,” the fourth of the Plan’s five major strategies.

The data presented in this report reflects the performance of the system of care from January through December 2012 on outcome measures related to housing, income, and system efficiencies. It includes some comparisons to 2010 and 2011 data and identifies noteworthy trends. The measures discussed in this report represent the community’s best thinking on how to evaluate our progress toward ending homelessness through achieving the outcomes expressed in both the federal HEARTH Act and the EveryOne Home Plan. The EveryOne Home systemwide outcomes first adopted in 2008 are:

1. 15,000 homeless households obtain permanent housing by January 2020;
2. The amount of time between disclosure of a housing crisis/homelessness and stabilization or residence in permanent housing is reduced from months, even years, to weeks;
3. 85% of those who obtain permanent housing will maintain it for at least one year and 65% will maintain their housing for at least 3 years.

The goals included in the HEARTH Act passed in 2009 are similar:

1. Reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless (the federal goal is 30 days);
2. Reduce the rate at which individuals and families who obtain housing return to homelessness;
3. Ensure all homeless individuals and families in a given region are served;
4. Grow jobs and income for homeless individuals and families;
5. Reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless; and
6. Reduce the overall number of homeless individuals and families.

At the federal level, communities will be evaluated on their progress toward these goals as a system rather than as individual agencies, and our performance will affect the amount of federal homeless assistance dollars available to Alameda County in the years to come.

To meet HEARTH Act and EveryOne Home Plan expectations individual programs must perform well on outcome measures that are appropriate to their role in the system of care. The standardized outcomes and performance benchmarks adopted in 2010 for our system sorts programs into the following sectors:

- Emergency Shelter (ES)
- Transitional Housing (TH)
- Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)
- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH)
- Prevention (Prev)
- Drop-In Center (DIC)
- Outreach (Outreach)
- Employment Programs (Emp. Prog.)
- Services Only programs tied to Permanent Housing (SO-Perm)
- Services Only programs with Case Management not tied to permanent housing (SO-CM)

This report uses these sector names and their abbreviations as labels on the charts and in the narrative throughout this report. Some outcomes, such as exiting with income or exiting to known destinations, apply to all sectors. Others are specific to one or several sectors. For example, the outcome of avoiding
exits to streets or shelter applies to Emergency Shelters, Employment Programs, and Services Only-Case Management sectors. Performance benchmarks, the rate at which outcome measures are to be achieved (i.e. 65%, 40%, etc.), were established based on the sector’s actual performance in 2009. In most cases 25% of agencies were already performing at that benchmark rate. In addition, the community determined that programs demonstrating an increase of at least 10 percentage points above their prior year’s performance would be viewed as meeting the improvement benchmark even if they had not yet reached the performance benchmark. See Attachment B for a chart of outcome measures and benchmarks by sector.

The ultimate goal of the EveryOne Home outcomes initiative is for all providers to be performing at or above the benchmarks. The community anticipated it would take several years to meet that goal because the established benchmarks were a stretch for many programs, data collection and reporting capacity were still under development, technical assistance would be required, and programs needed time to realize the impact of any changes to their service delivery approach.

2012 PRIORITIES and PROGRESS

In the conclusion of last year’s report the following points were identified by the community as priorities for 2012:

1. **Achieving greater rates of obtaining permanent housing**— The systemwide rate of persons exiting with permanent housing decreased from 43% to 38%, though the Outreach, Employment Programs, and Services Only-Case Management sectors saw increased performance.

2. **Increasing income and jobs**— All sectors saw exits with earned income drop in 2012. Six of nine sectors increased the rate of persons exiting with some income who entered with none.

3. **Continuing rapid re-housing resources in light of their demonstrated effectiveness**— With the sunset of the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program (HPRP) in the third quarter of 2012 resources for rapid re-housing shrank substantially. Stakeholders sustained rapid re-housing with funding from sources targeting specific sub-populations including veterans, families reunifying through child welfare, and persons re-entering the community from state prison. These targeted dollars combined with Emergency Solutions Grant funding for the general population of homeless persons total over 2 million annually, approximately 70% of what was available annually at the height of HPRP. Rapid re-housing funding for the general homeless population is now approximately one quarter of what it was with HPRP.

4. **Exploring raising performance benchmarks in future years**— The Performance Management Committee will facilitate the evaluation of current outcomes measures and benchmarks over the next 12 to 18 months in order to make recommendations about what to keep, discard, modify, or add. This report also features two multi-sector collaborative programs whose contributions to the system’s performance are hard to capture with our current approach of having each program categorized in a single sector. Adequately reflecting these programs’ outcomes will also be a focus of this year’s evaluation.

5. **Generating data about both stayers and exiters**— This has been done for retention of Permanent Supportive Housing and earned income in Employment Programs in this report. We continue to work towards more comprehensive reporting on stayers for future reports.

6. **Reporting of numbers of persons as well as percentages**— Numbers of persons as well as percentages are reported for all exits to permanent housing, exits from Permanent Supportive Housing, and exits with earned income for Employment Programs.
7. **Reporting more detail about exits from permanent supportive housing**— Further detail is provided in Figure 15 of this report, including numbers of persons in addition to percentages.

8. **Reporting more detail about rates of returns to homelessness**— EveryOne Home worked to generate data about the rates of returns to homelessness from various types of permanent housing in order to be able to examine questions such as whether persons who exited to live with friends or family on a permanent basis are more likely to return to homelessness than those who exited to unsubsidized or subsidized rental housing. The current report does not aggregate and deduplicate persons returning to homelessness by exit destination, meaning each record of return would need to be analyzed individually. EveryOne Home did not have the staff capacity for that level of data cleaning this year, but will continue to work towards generating that analysis.

9. **Increasing understanding of the interconnectedness of the outcomes, programs, and sectors in our system**— Changes in performance in a specific sector or on a particular outcome can impact the performance of the system as a whole or performance on another outcome. For example, exits with earned income dropped in all sectors between 2011 and 2012, which may have contributed to the drop in exits to permanent housing systemwide. Exits to the streets or shelters have increased since 2010, which may be due in part to the increase in exits to known destinations during that same time period. Additionally, as noted above, the system has experienced a contraction of rapid re-housing housing resources. Rapid re-housing assisted persons utilizing multiple sectors of the system, such as shelters and drop-in centers, exit homelessness to permanent housing at higher rates than otherwise expected. Therefore, the downsizing of that resource will impact housing outcomes across multiple sectors. The decrease in the systemwide rate of exits to permanent housing between 2011 and 2012 may already reflect the significant reduction of that resource.

The 2012 data contains multiple improvements to celebrate, including:

- The increased number of TH programs meeting the performance benchmark for rate of exits to permanent housing and the improvement across the services only sectors on this same benchmark
- Continued high rates of retention in Permanent Supportive Housing, the portion of permanent housing exits to unsubsidized housing, and low rates of returns to homelessness including a 13 percentage point drop in that rate for those who exited Emergency Shelters.
- All sectors improved the rate at which people who entered with no income exited with some.

The report also captures declines in the systemwide rate of exits to permanent housing as well as exits with earned income across all sectors. While important, it is not within the scope of this report to directly evaluate how the broader political and economic environment has been an influential factor in performance outcomes. The termination of HPRP funds, a prolonged recession that has been especially hard on low-income households, an increasingly difficult rental market, and the elimination of state Redevelopment funds as a resource for affordable housing development in 2012 all made the work to end homelessness even more challenging, yet our mandate and our commitment to do so remains resolute. The 2012 outcomes data invites us to ask how our system must evolve to achieve the result of ending homelessness, including investing in best practices and retooling programs to maximize our effectiveness as a system. During the balance of 2013 and 2014 Alameda County will engage in a strategic system redesign to further align ourselves to meet both local and federal expectations. In that effort, our community must be diligent not to let the political and economic environment justify inadequate action on those things most directly within our control. We must also continue to raise our voices to influence the broader environment and advocate for policies and resources that will contribute to ending homelessness.
Housing

- Obtaining Permanent Housing (Figure 1)

Overall the system dropped slightly from 43% in 2011 to 38% in 2012. 38% represents 1961 persons exited to permanent housing of 5180 total persons exited. Despite this decline, the system is still 10 percentage points higher than in 2009. As in previous years’ reports, the systemwide rate of 38% does not include the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing (HPRP) program; however, this year’s report additionally has a systemwide rate with HPRP rapid re-housing included, which was 41%. The increase in the systemwide rate when HPRP rapid re-housing is included demonstrates the positive impact of rapid re-housing services on the effectiveness of the system as a whole. The Emergency Shelter, Rapid Re-Housing, and Outreach sectors met their performance benchmarks in 2012. The Employment Programs sector increased to 37% after three consecutive years at 23% and was just three percentage points shy of its benchmark. Additionally, Services Only–Case Management increased by 19 percentage points over 2011. Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, and Rapid Re-Housing each saw modest declines, while Drop-In Centers saw a more significant drop from 47% in 2011 to 19% in 2012. The decrease for Drop-In Centers appears to be influenced by a high number of administrative exits from one program; that is, exits entered into HMIS en masse as part of an administrative process to update data, rather than as a reflection of when persons actually exited the program. This anomaly also impacts the systemwide rate, which, excluding the one Drop-In Center program, would have been 40% rather than 38%, however, had they been exited previously, may have lowered the systemwide rate in prior years.

![Rates People Obtain Permanent Housing by Sector](image)

Emergency Shelter (ES) Sector (Figures 2 - 3): Fifteen emergency shelters in Alameda County exited 2,439 people from their programs in 2012, 729 of whom exited to permanent housing. Emergency Shelters have experienced significant cuts to funding for their operations, and they have continued to prioritize exiting people to permanent housing. The graph below displays the rates of exits to permanent housing for each shelter in the sector labeled by an abbreviated program name.

![Permanent Housing Exit Rates for Shelters](image)

**Highlights**

Five shelters met the performance benchmark and one met the improvement benchmark in 2012. For BHDW, an increase from 19% to 31% meant they met the benchmark for the first time. EOES improved from 25% in 2010 and 41% in 2011, to 48% in 2012. While some programs increased in 2012, others decreased. Three of those that decreased, ABSV, BOSC, and SMWS were just under the performance benchmark in 2012, but have been consistently above it in previous years.

7 of 14 shelters (excluding BHEC) had more than 50% of their exits to permanent housing occur within 60 days. BFMW and BFSL achieved this for the third year in a row, YEES and SMWS for the second year, and BHDW, BHMO, and CHES for the first time.

*See Attachment C for an index of program abbreviations used throughout report.*

† BHEC is newly included as a unique program in this report and operates overflow cots within BHMO to meet immediate needs for shelter, but does not provide housing services, thus permanent housing exits are not expected as a result of the BHEC shelter contact.

Figure 2  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 3/29/2013 (run for Shelter sector and combined programs), 2012 Alameda County.
Following the 2011 report the community requested numerical data be reported in addition to percentages. The table below includes number of exits to permanent housing and total number of exits for each shelter program. In addition, for the first time this report includes the efficiency measure of occupancy. The occupancy benchmark for shelters serving singles and mixed populations is 90%, while the occupancy benchmark for shelters exclusively serving families is 85%. Occupancies below are for a point-in-time: the night of January 29th, 2013. On that night, ten of fourteen shelters (excluding BHEC) met the benchmark. Countywide, the point-in-time occupancy of all shelters (those in this report and non-HMIS-using shelters) was 89%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHEC</th>
<th>ANES</th>
<th>ANWS</th>
<th>YEES</th>
<th>CHES</th>
<th>BOHH</th>
<th>ABSV</th>
<th>BOSC</th>
<th>SMWS</th>
<th>BHMO</th>
<th>BHDW</th>
<th>FELM</th>
<th>BFMW</th>
<th>BFSL</th>
<th>EOES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exits to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Exits</strong></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Exited to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perm. Housing</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point-in-Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%*</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East Oakland Community Project (EOCP)
Crossroads Emergency Shelter

EOCP’s Crossroads Emergency Shelter (abbreviated as EOES) has demonstrated significant improvement in exits to permanent housing. EOES improved from 25% in 2010 and 41% in 2011, to 48% in 2012.

EOCP Executive Director, Wendy Jackson, and the team of staff at Crossroads attribute their increase in exits to permanent housing to developing relationships with landlords willing to rent to their clients, helping clients explore all possible housing options (including SRO’s and living with family), and working as a team to find appropriate housing for clients. A key tool EOCP is using to develop and maintain relationships with landlords is its quarterly landlords’ brunch.

Some lessons EOCP’s team continues to learn are that clients must be engaged in their housing plans, progress must be encouraged in a positive way, and a team that is focused and supported in its efforts to increase housing outcomes will increase housing outcomes.

EOCP’s team shares the following pieces of wisdom from its work: “housing is a right for everyone” and “we have to keep our collective eye on the permanency aspect of housing...if we do not check-in with clients...and ensure that community supports are in place, we only contribute to the revolving door.”
Transitional Housing (TH) Sector (Figures 4 - 5): Twenty-nine transitional housing programs had 945 people exit in 2012, 556 of whom exited to permanent housing. Nine percent of the people who exited had more than one exit from TH in the year.

**Permanent Housing Exit Rates for Transitional Housing**

- **17 programs met performance or improvement benchmark** (in green)
- **Sector Rate: 59%**
- **Benchmark: 80%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exit Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOCM</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHF</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHD</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODDC</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSF</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOVA</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPA</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFTP</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBY</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHVA</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRP</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCH</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODAS</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOOH</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOOH</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDBH</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPPP</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBC</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOMC</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOFT</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHH</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPC</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBC</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLK</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABHS</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHS</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4** Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 4/19/13 (run for TH sector), 2012 Alameda County.

**Highlights**

- Thirteen programs met or surpassed the 80% performance benchmark, while four additional programs met the improvement benchmark by increasing 10 percentage points or more (in green).

- The rate of seven programs that did not meet the performance nor improvement benchmark in 2012 decreased by five percentage points or more compared to 2011.

- The current HUD national goal for transitional housing programs is exiting 65% of participants to permanent housing. Nineteen programs (66%) met the national standard, up from 47% in 2011 and 61% in 2010. When the subset of HUD-funded transitional housing programs were viewed in isolation for purposes of the 2012 NOFA, their average based on each program’s most recently completed APR was 70.5%.
The table below includes numbers of exits to permanent housing and total exits for each program. Additionally, the efficiency measure of occupancy has been included for the first time. The occupancy benchmark for transitional housing programs is 90%. Occupancies below are for a point-in-time, the night of January 29th, 2013. On that night, twelve of twenty-nine programs met the benchmark, while ten programs were greater than 10 percentage points below the benchmark. Countywide, the point-in-time occupancy of all transitional housing programs (those in this report and non-HMIS-using shelters) was 87%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Exits to Permanent Housing</th>
<th>Total Exits</th>
<th>% Exited to Perm. Housing</th>
<th>Point-in-Time Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOCM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODHD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODDC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOVA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFTP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>84%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBY</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHVA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRP</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOOH</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDH</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDBH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPFP</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOMC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOFT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHIH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHTH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLK</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABHS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5  Source for exit data: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 4/19/13 (run for TH sector), 2012 Alameda County. Source for point-in-time occupancy: Alameda County 2013 Housing Inventory Chart.

* Notes: ANTH occupancy was impacted by an out-of-service elevator at facility. ABHS and ABPI occupancies were impacted by persons who are on caseload but not yet in housing, therefore are not counted in occupancy. APDH occupancy was impacted by change in site control.
**Services Only Sectors** (Figures 6 - 10): Figures 6 – 9 below present 2012 rates of exit to permanent housing of programs in four sectors: Outreach Programs, Drop-In Centers, Employment Programs, and Services Only—Case Management. Each sector has its own permanent housing benchmark. The diversity of these programs presents challenges in determining sector categorization and outcomes for evaluating each sector. Programs in these sectors will be prioritized during the forthcoming evaluation of the current measures and benchmarks by the Performance Management Committee.

### Permanent Housing Exit Rates for Outreach Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Sector Rate</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODMO</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODMV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSS</td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights**

ABHP, ODMV, and ODSS met the performance benchmark in 2012.

ODSS is a streets-to-housing outreach program that is able to provide move-in funds to participants.

The sector rate was significantly above the benchmark at 34%.

---

### Permanent Housing Exit Rates for Drop-In Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Sector Rate</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDI</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights**

WDDI and NMBD both met the performance benchmark in 2012.

BOMA and the sector rate were both affected by a significant number of administrative exits from that program in 2012, as described on page 5.

---

*NMBD recently began entering data in HMIS; 100% represents 1 of 1 person who exited in 2012.*
Permanent Housing Exit Rates for Employment Programs

![Bar chart showing exit rates for Employment Programs]

**Highlights**

RUBE met the performance benchmark, while GWOS met the improvement benchmark by increasing ten percentage points or more over 2011.

The sector rate was just three percentage points below the benchmark at 37%.

Permanent Housing Exit Rates for Services Only - Case Management Programs

![Bar chart showing exit rates for Services Only - Case Management Programs]

**Highlights**

EBOP and BHWR both met the improvement benchmark by increasing ten percentage points or more over 2011.

None of the four programs met the performance benchmark.

The sector rate was 42%, significantly below the benchmark of 65%.

---

**Figure 8** Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 4/1/13 (run for Employment Programs sector), 2012 Alameda County.

**Figure 9** Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 4/25/13 (run for Service Only—Case Management sector), 2012 Alameda County.
Figure 10 below includes numbers of exits to permanent housing and total exits for the services only programs in the four sectors in figures 6 – 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach Programs</th>
<th>Drop-In Centers</th>
<th>Employment Programs</th>
<th>Services Only – Case Management Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODMO</td>
<td>ODMV</td>
<td>ANDI</td>
<td>GWOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABHP</td>
<td>BOMA</td>
<td>BOMS</td>
<td>RUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSS</td>
<td>BHMS</td>
<td>WIDD</td>
<td>OHCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDI</td>
<td>NMID</td>
<td>OHCM</td>
<td>EBOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BHWR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exits to Permanent Housing</th>
<th>Total Exits</th>
<th>% Exited to Perm. Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODMO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABHP</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODMV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHMS</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMID</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWOS</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCM</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCM</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHWR</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 3/29/13 – 4/25/13 (run for each sector and combined programs), 2012 Alameda County.

**Successes of Agencies that Participated in EveryOne Housed Academy**

- **Anka Behavioral Health Inc.**, the operator of the Henry Robinson Multi-Service Center’s transitional housing (abbreviated as ANTH) showed a 17 percentage point improvement (nearly a third) in exits to permanent housing: 61% in 2011 to 78% in 2012.

- **Berkeley Food and Housing Project** Men’s Overnight Shelter (abbreviated as BHMO) and Dwight Way Shelter (abbreviated as BHDW) nearly doubled their rates of exits to permanent housing: BHMO moved from 16% to 29% while BHDW advanced from 17% to 31%.

- **Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center** Bridget House transitional housing program (abbreviated as WDBH) improved by nearly a third, moving from 62% to 80%.

These agencies and two others gathered on June 21-22, 2012 to immerse themselves in the inaugural EveryOne Housed Academy to focus on the drivers of system change, such as the HEARTH Act, along with the approaches and tools to create a permanent housing focus deep within the agency. Teams from each agency worked together utilizing the approaches of Housing First, harm reduction, trauma-informed services, and strengths-based services to revamp rules and policies, redefine housing culture, refine helping relationships, and redesign the physical space. A board game, consumer panel, peer learning, and team workshops provided an interactive variety of forums in which to apply these approaches and test their impact.

The Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center team shared: “the EveryOne Housed Academy helped to inject some energy and focus to the way we help people find permanent housing.” At Bridget House, the focus of weekly house meetings has shifted to clients’ weekly housing goals and the staff has become more thorough in gathering housing resources.
Types of Permanent Housing Obtained (Figure 11): In 2012, 65% of persons who exited the system to permanent housing did so to unsubsidized permanent housing, essentially the same as 2010 and 2011 when the rate was 66%. Unsubsidized permanent housing includes rental housing with no subsidy (38%), family or friends on a permanent basis (26%), and ownership (1%). From 2011 to 2012 people who exited to rental housing with no subsidy fell five percentage points from 43% to 38%, while people who exited to live with family or friends on a permanent basis increased five percentage points from 21% to 26%. Additionally, the percentage of people who exited to permanent supportive housing stayed level at 9%, the same as in 2011. This data is reported systemwide without HPRP as it was in previous years; including HPRP increases the percentage of persons who exited to unsubsidized permanent housing to 71%, rather than 65%.

![Types of Exits to Permanent Housing Systemwide](image)

*Figure 11*  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 4/8/13 (run Systemwide without HPRP and EBCLC Eviction Defense (prevention)), 2012 Alameda County. Note: percentages total 101% due to rounding.
In 2012 the systemwide rate of returns to homelessness was 7% for the third consecutive year. This rate is the percentage of people exiting to permanent housing that subsequently reenter HMIS as homeless within the following twelve months, for the average of the months April 2011, July 2011, October 2011, and January 2012. Thus, the rate of returns to homelessness reflects persons who exited the system in 2011. 7% equates to approximately 324 people returning to homelessness. Homeless is defined as entering a shelter or transitional housing program or entering any other program with a housing status of “literally homeless”. The federal and local goal is that less than 10% of those who exit to permanent housing subsequently return to homelessness. Particularly outstanding is the Emergency Shelter sector’s decrease from 27% in 2011 to 14% in 2012.

EveryOne Home continues to await guidelines from HUD on the methodology for measuring returns to homelessness. As described on page 3, EveryOne Home continues to work towards reporting on returns to homelessness by type of permanent housing exit destination.

![Returns to Homelessness](chart)

*Figure 12* Percentage labels indicate 2012 actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Returns to Homelessness” 4/8/13 – 4/25/13 (run Systemwide with HPRP and by sector for each quarterly increment), 2012 Alameda County. *In 2012, Rapid Re-housing was reported on its own without Prevention included; 2012 data combines Rapid Re-housing and Prevention. Note: 2010 Actuals are averages of Jan, Feb, and Mar.*
Retaining Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) (Figure 13)

Housing retention is measured at six months, twelve months, and three years to comply with local and federal outcome measures. The federal department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) expects 72% of persons moving into permanent supportive housing to maintain it for at least six months. Alameda County utilizes a slightly different methodology for measuring PSH retention than is used by HUD. Locally this outcome is measured by excluding tenants who had moved in more recently than the time period being measured; for example, not counting tenants who had moved in less than six months ago for the first benchmark of six months. These rates have remained relatively stable and well above benchmarks over the past three years.

Figure 13  Percentage labels indicate 2012 actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “CoC APR” 4/1/13 (run for PSH sector), 2012 Alameda County.
- Occupancy of Permanent Supportive Housing (Figure 14)

Figure 14 below includes the point-in-time occupancy detail for the PSH projects that enter data in HMIS and are included in the retention data above. Point-in-time occupancy is for the night of January 29th, 2013. Figure 14 also includes aggregate data for all other non-HMIS PSH projects. In addition to the projects individually listed below, key developers with non-HMIS projects include Allied Housing, Mercy Housing, Resources for Community Development, and Satellite Affordable Housing Associates. Additionally, the Oakland Housing Authority and the Housing Authority of the County of Alameda administer PSH subsidies including Veterans’ Affairs Supportive Housing, Mental Health Services Act, and Shelter Plus Care subsidies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Point-in-Time Occupancy (Persons)</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Persons)</th>
<th>Point-in-Time Occupancy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services/Allied Housing Carmen Ave</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services Bridgeway Housing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services Bridgeway SHP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services Hope Housing S+C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services Lorenzo Creek</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services OPRI BHCS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services OPRI Encampment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services OPRI Re-Entry</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services OPRI SHP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abode Services STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Housing &amp; Community Dev. S+C HOST</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Housing &amp; Community Dev. S+C PRA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Housing &amp; Community Dev. S+C SRA</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Housing &amp; Community Dev. S+C SRO</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Housing &amp; Community Dev. S+C TRA</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Miramar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative NS Perm Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative SHP Perm APP</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Spirit of Hope I</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Food &amp; Housing Project Russell Street Residence</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonita House Channing Way</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency Regent Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berkeley S+C Bonita House SRA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berkeley S+C HOAP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berkeley S+C TRA</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berkeley Square One</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Berkeley RCD-SRA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Community Recovery Project FACT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCO 3rd Street Apartments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for Community Development Concord House</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Affordable Housing Associates Peter Babcock</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Center Closer to Home Seniors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette A. Flunder Foundation Walker House</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Non-HMIS PSH in Alameda County</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of ALL PSH in Alameda County</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14 Source: Alameda County 2013 Housing Inventory Chart.
Turnover In Permanent Supportive Housing (Figure 15)

Permanent supportive housing is a very cost-effective solution for chronically homeless, disabled persons when compared to the high expense of hospital stays and criminal justice involvement incurred by the community for people living in places not meant for human habitation. It is critical to target this deeply subsidized, service-rich resource to those who need it most. EveryOne Home and community stakeholders recognize that people with disabilities stabilize while in permanent supportive housing and may not always need the level of service and subsidy provided in such programs. When it is in the best interest of a participant, programs are encouraged to help people move to other less costly, less service-rich permanent housing. This strategy increases availability of PSH to currently homeless, disabled individuals. Approximately 12% of PSH tenants exited their units in 2012, up one percentage point from 2011 and 2010. Of the 306 people who exited PSH in 2012, 55% exited to some other form of permanent housing. Nearly half (47%) exited to permanent housing other than PSH which is less expensive to the system of care, including rental housing with subsidy, rental housing without subsidy, and staying with a friend or family on a permanent basis. These positive exits from PSH to less expensive housing and services help ensure the system’s ability to target the right resources to the right people, at the right time. The categories reported in Figure 15 have been further divided from the 2011 report to provide additional detail. Numbers in parentheses indicate number of persons per destination.

![Exit Destinations from PSH](image)

* "Other places" includes, hospitals, jail or prison, substance abuse treatment or detox, hotel or motel without an ES voucher, Safe Haven, and Other (non Board & Care). Note: Percentages total 99% due to rounding.
Income

➤ Change From No Income To Some Income (Figure 16)

Systemwide, 22% of persons who entered with no income exited with some income in 2012, compared to 12% when systemwide data was last reported in 2010. Six of nine reported sectors met their benchmark in 2012.

![Rate of Persons Who Exited With Income And Entered With None](chart)

**Figure 16** Percentage labels indicate 2012 Actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 3/29/13 – 4/25/13 (run by sector), 2012 Alameda County.

➤ Earned Income (Figure 17)

Rate of exiting with earned income is a federal outcome and therefore has been adopted locally. From 2011 to 2012 all sectors declined in the percentage of persons exiting with earned income. Systemwide, 14% of persons exited with earned income, a drop from 23% in 2010, the last time systemwide data was reported for this measure. All sectors except Services Only-Case Management did not meet their benchmarks.

![Exit with Earned Income by Sector](chart)

**Figure 17** Percentage labels indicate 2012 Actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 3/29/13 – 4/25/13 (run by sector), 2012 Alameda County.
Employment Programs Sector (Figure 18): In addition to exiting people to permanent housing, exits with employment are also essential to the stabilization of homeless households. The performance benchmark for exits with earned income for Employment Programs is 40%. Figure 18 below reports persons who exited programs in 2012. Of persons who were in these programs in 2012 and had not yet exited by the end of the year, 22% had some amount of earned income. For GWOS 38 of 249 adults exited with earned income and RUBE saw 80 of 223 adults exit with earned income.

![Exits with Earned Income for Employment Programs](image)

**Figure 18** Percentage labels indicate 2012 actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 4/1/2013 (run for Employment Programs sector), 2012 Alameda County.

System Efficiencies

- Rate of Exiting to Known Destinations (Figure 19)

Known destinations include all exit destinations other than “don’t know”, “refused”, or null (unanswered). Improving this rate was an intentional focus at most agencies and within the system during 2010 to ensure that all analysis was based on robust data sets. Systemwide, the rate of known destinations was 82% in 2012, nearly identical to 81% in 2010, the last year systemwide data was reported for this measure. The Employment Programs and Services Only-Case Management sectors saw the most significant improvement between 2011 and 2012. Two sectors – Drop-In Centers and Outreach Programs -- saw significant declines between 2011 and 2012, following notable improvement between 2010 and 2011. The decrease for Drop-In Centers appears to be influenced by a high number of administrative exits from one program, as described on page 5.

![Exits to Known Destinations](image)

**Figure 19** Percentage labels indicate 2012 actuals. Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 3/29/13 – 4/8/13 (run by sector), 2012 Alameda County.
Reducing exits to streets or shelter (Figure 20)

EveryOne Home and community stakeholders aim for reductions in the rate of exits from Shelters, Employment, and Services Only-Case Management Programs back to the streets or other shelters. For this measure the further below the benchmark the better. Employment Programs and Services Only-Case Management were both well below the benchmark for the sector in 2012, while Emergency Shelters were one percentage point above the sector’s benchmark. Services Only—Case Management saw improvement from 14% down to 9%. Emergency Shelters and Employment Programs saw increases of 2 and 12 percentage points, respectively. Any exits to unknown destinations are not counted in exits to streets or shelter; thus, as the rates of exits to known destinations has improved, some of the increase in exits to streets or shelter may be attributed to those exits correctly being captured rather than being exits to unknown destinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exits to Streets or Shelter</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Emp. Prog.</th>
<th>SO-CM only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Actual</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Actual</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Actual</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Actual</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>less than 30%</td>
<td>less than 40%</td>
<td>less than 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20  Source: InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” 3/29/13 – 4/8/13 (run by sector), 2012 Alameda County.

Length of Stay (Figure 21)

Measuring the length of stay in a given program is the best proxy EveryOne Home and community stakeholders currently have for measuring length of time homeless. Emergency shelters and transitional housing are encouraged to reduce the amount of time between program entry and exit to permanent housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay (LOS) in days for Exited Persons</th>
<th>Average LOS per Exit to Permanent Housing</th>
<th>% of those exiting to PH who do so within 60 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21  Source: InHOUSE Report “Length of Stay - Averages” (run for ES and TH sectors) and InHOUSE Report “Outcomes” Report 3/29/2013 (run for ES sector), 2012 Alameda County.

Shelters and transitional housing programs noted slight increases in the average length of stay for all persons exiting: a 4 day increase (7%) for shelters and 20 day increase (7%) for transitional housing programs. Similarly, both sectors saw slight increases in the length of time to exit to permanent housing: a 1 day increase (1%) for shelters and 5 day increase (1%) for transitional housing programs. Reductions in lengths of stay contribute to a lower cost per person served within each sector, and more turnover within the programs to serve more homeless people over time.

Other sectors also have benchmarks for length of time between entry and a specific outcome and we will continue working towards capturing and reporting on those data points.
Multi-Sector Collaborations

Alameda County is fortunate to have innovative housing programs that include outreach, rapid rehousing, permanent supportive housing, and/or prevention. These multi-sector collaborations are demonstrating significant effectiveness at helping people move from the streets into permanent housing and successfully maintaining that housing. Outcomes reporting and benchmarks are currently determined by sector, thus the work of such programs that fall into multiple sectors is not adequately reflected by the current structure of measuring and reporting on program performance. Two such programs are featured below.

Oakland Permanent Access to Housing (PATH) Rehousing Initiative

The Oakland PATH Rehousing Initiative (OPRI) is a sponsor-based rental assistance program developed by the City of Oakland in partnership with the Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) and Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services that is designed to provide housing placement and ongoing subsidies and support services to people living on the street or in emergency shelters, and people exiting foster care or the criminal justice system. According to Vivian Wan, Associate Director of Abode Services, OPRI's success depends on the skilled collaboration that brings together partners with collective expertise in supportive housing services, housing administration, and services for people who are homeless, living with serious mental illness, re-entering from the criminal justice system, and former foster youth (see list of partners below).

Since March 2010, OPRI has assisted more than 200 people with obtaining permanent housing, helping them move directly from the streets, encampments, emergency shelters, the criminal justice system, and foster care into apartments where they hold their own leases. Program participants have achieved significant successes: of all OPRI participants served through December 2012, 96% had been stably housed for 6 months and 89% had been stably housed for up to a year. In fact, 9 of the 10 first participants remain in housing, having just reached the 3-year mark.

Contributing to the success of OPRI, the City of Oakland and OHA have effectively streamlined the eligibility process, including the utilization of a one-page application that OHA is able to process within 48 hours. The time between when an application is submitted and a person moves into their own apartment is typically less than 3 weeks.

OPRI Partners

- City of Oakland
- Oakland Housing Authority
- Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services
- Abode Services
- Building Futures with Women and Children
- East Oakland Community Project
- First Place for Youth
- LifeLong Medical Care
- Operation Dignity
- St. Mary’s Center
- Volunteers of America

Kenneth in his own apartment obtained with the assistance of OPRI, especially Abode Services and Operation Dignity. Photo courtesy of Abode Services and the City of Oakland.
Support Services for Veteran Families

Support Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) is a rapid re-housing and prevention program in Alameda County for veterans and their families, funded by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. While Abode Services is the lead Agency, SSVF is a collaboration: Operation Dignity conducts outreach to veteran households and oversees program enrollment; Building Futures, Lifelong Medical Care, and Abode Services provide case management and housing stabilization services; and Abode Services administers financial assistance. The team works closely together to ensure that at-risk and homeless veterans receive the assistance necessary to obtain and maintain permanent housing.

In 2012, SSVF served 378 people, and 85% (192 of 225) of the people who exited the SSVF program went to permanent housing. This includes people who were provided rapid re-housing services as well as prevention services. Among households who received prevention services, 94% exited to permanent housing. Among households who received rapid re-housing services, 81% exited to permanent housing. Both of these outcomes exceed their respective benchmarks of 90% and 80%.

Of those who exited to permanent housing, 52% exited to a rental with a Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) permanent subsidy, 10% exited to a rental with a permanent subsidy other than VASH, 38% exited to a rental without any permanent subsidy, and just a few people went to live with friends or family on a permanent basis.

The SSVF program is a new initiative, both for Alameda County and for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. In April 2013, the VA recommended that the Alameda County SSVF program serve as a Mentor Program for other SSVF programs throughout the country. In addition to strong program infrastructure and excellent outcomes, the VA specifically cited the strength of collaboration as one of the features that sets Alameda County’s program apart, whereby all of the staff share a unified and consistent vision. Since launching the program, the SSVF team has worked hard on building that vision, and is proud of this recognition.
Community Conclusions

For the second year in a row this report was presented at an EveryOne Home Community Meeting attended by over 75 individuals including consumers, service providers, administrators, and local funders. The community collectively identified the following:

Key Successes Demonstrated by the Data

Notably, the systemwide rate of returns to homelessness has remained consistently low at 7%, with a significant reduction in the rate of returns to homelessness for the Emergency Shelter sector. Additionally, approximately two-thirds of people who exited to permanent housing did so to unsubsidized housing, a portion which has also remained steady over the past three years. Permanent Supportive Housing retention rates remained above benchmarks as they have been in prior years. The system’s quality of data has improved significantly over the past several years according to community perception, and agencies continue to prioritize data accuracy. Attention to data collection and performance measures has increased across the system, including heightened attention to data quality in preparation for the 2013 Homeless Count and Housing Inventory Chart. As a result, the breadth of this report in representing outcomes has advanced. Another success of the report itself is the ability to track a particular program’s progress over time, being that this is the second year programs have been identified by name. Finally, the scope of the report has evolved to identify elements of the current data and outcomes structure that require updating, including the constraints of reporting on multi-sector collaborative programs.

What This Report Says About How We Are Doing As A System

In addition to the key successes identified above, this report also tells a story about how we are doing as a system. From 2011 to 2012 the systemwide rate of exits to permanent housing declined from 43% to 38%. Although there are some nuances to that decline as discussed on page 4, the result is nonetheless noteworthy and continued attention and analysis is necessary to understand how much it is cause for concern. Additionally, the community has expressed the value in increasingly thinking of ourselves as a system, especially in light of the fact that with HEARTH, HUD is now viewing us in that way rather than as individual programs.

The Call To Action For Our Community

The community expressed a strong desire to advocate on the political and economic environmental factors impacting our ability to permanently house people, including urging more state and federal resources to expand affordable housing opportunities. Additionally, expanding our system’s sphere to further involve partner systems, such as employment and education, could bolster our ability to improve outcomes, including increasing the rates of persons exiting the system with earned income.

Our own Continuum of Care must be intentional about matching people with the appropriate level of service to resolve their housing crises. This includes targeting Permanent Supportive Housing to those people with the highest needs and appropriately transitioning people out of PSH into other permanent housing when they no longer require supportive services. We want to increase opportunities for sharing of best practices between agencies, especially for higher-performing programs to share what has been working for them.

May the results contained herein serve as a resource in our continued planning and implementation for ending homelessness in Alameda County.
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**Attachment B**

**Systemwide Outcomes and Efficiency Measures**

**Progress Measure:** For all outcome and efficiency goals, programs can meet or exceed the numerical benchmark or show an improvement of 10 percentage points over past year’s outcome rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Shelter (winter and year round shelters)</th>
<th>Transitional Housing (site based, scattered site, and subsidy-based programs, e.g., Linkages &amp; Project Independence)</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing (site-based and subsidy-based programs [e.g. Shelter + Care and HOST])</th>
<th>Rapid Rehousing (programs w/financial assistance and/or supp. services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain permanent housing</td>
<td>30% or greater²</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Increase exits to other perm hsg by 10% over prev year</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain/retain permanent housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% &gt; 6 mos</td>
<td>85% &gt; 12 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>&lt;30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to permanent OR interim housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit with earned income</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to homelessness in 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency/Process Measures**

| Occupancy | 90% single/mix 85% families | 90% | 95% |
| Exit to Known Destination | 85% | 95% | 95% | 95% |
| Time from entry to permanent housing for those obtaining permanent housing | 50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 60 days | Reduce by 10% length of time from entry to permanent housing for programs with ave. stays over 12 mos | Average of 45 days |
| Other | | | | |

**Systemwide goal:** Returns to Homelessness (as measured by a new entry in HMIS) within 12 months of exit to permanent housing are less than 10%.
For prevention, persons with Housing Status other than “Literally Homeless” are included.

All italicized, underlined numbers are benchmarked on actual performance and subject to annual updating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention (programs with financial assistance and/or supportive services)</th>
<th>Drop-In Centers (material support and services for homeless or unstably housed, e.g. WDDC, MASC, MSC)</th>
<th>Street Outreach (intended to address housing, e.g. HOPE &amp; MOP)</th>
<th>Service Only-Employment Programs (programs targeted to homeless or housing stability)</th>
<th>Service Only-Services tied to perm. Housing (e.g. Lifelong HHISN or APC Service Center for PH residents)</th>
<th>Services Only-Case mgmt tied to other housing (e.g. RISE, OHFP, APC Service Center for Trans Housing clients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Increase exits to other perm hsg by 10% over prev year</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90% of those who have housing at entry</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td>95% &gt; 6 mos</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85% &gt; 12 mos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65% &gt; 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 45 days for those who move; 14 days to first payment for those who stay</td>
<td>50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months</td>
<td>50% of those who gain perm. housing do so within 6 months</td>
<td>50% of those who gain permanent housing do so within 6 months</td>
<td>Reduce by 10% length of time from entry to permanent housing for programs with average stays over 6 months</td>
<td>50% of those who gain employment do so within 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment C
Program Abbreviations and Data Contributors

In this report, tables and charts within six sectors use abbreviations to identify the achievements of specific programs within that sector (Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Drop-In Centers, Outreach, Employment Programs, and Service Only-Case Management not tied to permanent housing). Program names are identified in the report using the four letter abbreviations noted in the tables below. The first two letters represent the agency, the second two represent the program.

Other sectors do not have abbreviated program names within the report or do not have program-level data reported. Those sectors are Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Re-housing, Prevention, and Services Only–tied to permanent housing. Following the tables showing the program abbreviations is a list showing which program data is included in these four sectors.

### Emergency Shelters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSV</td>
<td>Abode Services Sunrise Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANES</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANWS</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Winter Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHDW</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Dwight Way Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHEC</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Men’s Overnight Shelter Emergency Cots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHMO</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Men's Overnight Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHH</td>
<td>BOSS Harrison House Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSC</td>
<td>BOSS South County Homeless Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFMW</td>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children Midway Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFSL</td>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children San Leandro Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHES</td>
<td>Covenant House Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOES</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Crossroads Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELM</td>
<td>FESCO Les Marquis Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMWS</td>
<td>St. Mary's Center Winter Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEES</td>
<td>YEAH! Emergency Shelter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GWOS</td>
<td>Goodwill Industries One Stop Employment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBE</td>
<td>Rubicon Berkeley Employment Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABHS</td>
<td>Abode Services Housing Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI</td>
<td>Abode Services Project Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLK</td>
<td>Alameda County Linkages Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBC</td>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Bessie Coleman Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDH</td>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Dignity Housing West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APUV</td>
<td>Alameda Point Collaborative Unity Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHIH</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Independent House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHTH</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Transitional House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHVA</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project VA Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOCM</td>
<td>BOSS Casa Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHF</td>
<td>BOSS Harrison House Family Transitional Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOHS</td>
<td>BOSS Housing Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMC</td>
<td>BOSS McKinley House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOPA</td>
<td>BOSS Pacheco Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORP</td>
<td>BOSS Rosa Parks House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSF</td>
<td>BOSS Sankofa House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSH</td>
<td>BOSS South County Sober Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRP</td>
<td>Covenant House Rites of Passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOMC</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Matilda Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOOH</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project Our House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOVA</td>
<td>East Oakland Community Project SSP VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBY</td>
<td>FESCO Banyan House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFPF</td>
<td>First Place For Youth My First Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFTP</td>
<td>Fred Finch Turning Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODAS</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Ashby House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODHD</td>
<td>Operation Dignity House of Dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODDC</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Dignity Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDBH</td>
<td>Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center Bridget House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In order to include all providers, including those DV providers who do not enter information into HMIS, the rate of exits to permanent housing for this program is based on data from the APR over the timeframe of 3/1/11 – 2/29/12 rather than the 2012 calendar year.*

### Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABHP</td>
<td>Abode Services HOPE Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODMO</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Mobile Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODMV</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Support Services for Veteran Families Mobile Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSS</td>
<td>Operation Dignity Mobile Outreach Season of Sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drop-In Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDI</td>
<td>Anka Behavioral Health Drop-In Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHMS</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Multi-Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMA</td>
<td>BOSS MASC Multi-Agency Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMBD</td>
<td>Alameda County Network of Mental Health Clients Berkeley Drop-In Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDDI</td>
<td>Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center Drop-In Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Services Only–Case Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHWR</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project Women’s Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBOP</td>
<td>East Bay Community Recovery Project Oakland PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCM</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Families Program Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCM</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Center Case Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sectors below do not have abbreviated program names within the report. The programs listed below the sector heading denote the programs whose data contributes to the sectors’ performance.

Permanent Supportive Housing

- Abode Services: Bridgeway Permanent Supportive Housing, Carmen Avenue, Concord House, HOPE Housing, Lorenzo Creek S+C and SHP, Main Street Village, OPRI BHCS, OPRI Encampment, OPRI Re-Entry, OPRI SHP, STAY Well Housing
- Alameda County Housing and Community Development: S+C PRA, SRA, SRO, and TRA
- Alameda Point Collaborative: Non-Subsidized, Dignity Housing West, Mariposa, Miramar, Unity Village, Perm APP, Spirit of Hope 1
- Berkeley Food and Housing: Project Russell Street Residence
- Bonita House: HOST, Channing Way
- BOSS: Peter Babcock House, Regent Street
- City of Berkeley Shelter + Care Alameda City Collaborative, Bonita House SRA, COACH, RCD-SRA, TRA, Square One
- East Bay Community Recovery Project: FACT
- FESCO: 3rd Street Apartments
- St. Mary’s Center: Closer to Home Seniors
- Yvette A. Flunder Foundation Walker House

Prevention Sector

- Bay Area Youth Center Hayward Housing Stabilization
- Bay Area Youth Center Private Housing Stabilization
- East Bay Community Law Center Eviction Defense
• East County HRC Dublin/Unincorporated County Housing Stabilization
• East County HRC State Livermore/Pleasanton Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Alameda Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Hayward Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC State San Leandro Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Berkeley Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Downtown HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Pathway Home Housing Stabilization
• Oakland TAY Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Fremont Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC State Union City Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization

Rapid Re-Housing Sector
• Abode Services: HOPE Winter Relief
• Abode Services: Support Services for Veteran Families
• Bay Area Youth Center Hayward Housing Stabilization
• Bay Area Youth Center Private Housing Stabilization
• East County HRC Dublin/Unincorporated County Housing Stabilization
• East County HRC State Livermore/Pleasanton Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Alameda Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC Hayward Housing Stabilization
• Mid County HRC State San Leandro Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Berkeley Housing Stabilization
• North County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Downtown HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Housing Stabilization
• Oakland Eastmont HRC Pathway Home Housing Stabilization
• Oakland TAY Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Fremont Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC State Union City Housing Stabilization
• South County HRC Urban County Housing Stabilization

Services Only – Tied to Permanent Housing
• Abode Services: RISE Project
• Alameda Point Collaborative: Service Center
• BOSS: BHCS, RISE Project
• LifeLong Medical Care: Erna P Harris Court, OPRI BHCS, OPRI Case Management, Coach, City of Berkeley S+C, PR AB, PR HGH, Project Respect, PR Summit, SHP Dellums Apts, SHP GA, SHP Hamilton Apts, SHP Harrison Hotel, SHP Oaks Hotel, Square One, UA Homes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:00-10:45 | Welcome, thrilled you are here. Introduce EH Team | Elaine
- Welcome, thrilled you are here. Introduce EH Team
- Take time to walk you thru agenda, housekeeping, and expectations for the next two days before we jump in
- Photo Releases and photography/videotaping for EH website and marketing purposes
- Guests: Building Changes, an intermediary funder in Seattle area serving tri-county area with funding and systems change. Here to observe and see what TA they can take back to their community.
- Binder for all materials. Some items in it and others you will receive as you go along. **Review tabs** Tabs support and correspond to agenda.
- **broad stroke only** Let’s review Agenda – in front of binder. Today we will... Tomorrow we will... Hope you can relax and go on journey without being tied to agenda. Kathie, Allison and I will keep us on task and on time. We want you to focus energy into task and not watching time.
- Breaks are built in several places throughout the day. **Do not say anything else about breaks, since it is covered in participation agreements**
- To address the rest of the ground rules for our time together, I am directing your attention to the participation agreements in the center of your table. Take those, turn them over, and pass around. I will give you about five minutes to read and complete that agreement. Begin!
- **Note time – five minutes or when everyone looks done**

**ORID**

1. Let’s have several people quickly state a word or phrase that you noticed on this agreement. Just looking for a word or phrase, no discussion/analysis just yet.
2. Who got the version with nine rules? (show of hands). How did you feel as you were reading this? Think about your body, your posture, your muscles, your gut. What was going on with them as you read?

3. Who got the version with six guidelines? (Show of hands). Did you find yourself reacting that same way? How did the guidelines make you feel?

4. What did your version of the agreement say to you about how the trainers thought/felt about you?

5. What did the version you got indicate to you about what the next two days of your life would be like?

6. Did either of these versions remind you of the rules/welcome packets in your programs, if so how?

7. Which version do you think we are going to use for our time here today? YES!! Want you to be comfortable, productive, and take care of yourself. Restrooms are located... and we will always have water out. Pass out rest of agreements to those who didn’t get the right one at first.

8. Are there any other agreements we want to add?

Kathie

- Let’s move on to the context of this Academy and the national trends. As you heard in the agenda, throughout your time we will be working together to revamp, renew, redefine, and to redesign. Before we move into those, I want to ask us all to rethink three key pieces of homeless services and some ways that the landscape is changing around.

- 1. Rethink the service system and how we do work: All of you read about the HEARTH Act in the prework materials. This is strong national external force that is driving much system change. The HEARTH Act along with Opening Doors, the Federal Strategic Plan to prevent and end homelessness really places emphasis on three things:

  o preventing and ending homelessness as quickly and cost effectively as possible, rather than managing peoples needs while they remain in a state of homelessness.

  o ensuring the right person gets the right resource
at the right time

- Evaluating our performance as system as a whole. Part of the examination of the outcomes includes the cost effectiveness of each component of system to ensure the system as a whole is as effective as possible, in moving as many people as possible to PH, in the shortest amount of time possible, while monitoring the rates at which people have subsequent homeless episodes.

- These three prongs were strongly evidenced in the CoC NOFA this year and will continue to be highly prioritized, emphasized, and the lens by which our community is evaluated.

- What does this mean for you and Alameda County? Let’s start with what it doesn’t mean. No plans to eliminate all shelters or all TH programs, may need to refine and focus these programs, but not eliminate, and to effectively steer people to the most strategic intervention. Nothing you read or learn about is going to by itself be the answer to ending homelessness. We believe these philosophies and approaches being discussed today are vital to being the best system of care with the most effective programs, but none are a magic bullet while ALL are part of the solution.

- We are also being asked to rethink the way we deliver services. Rethinking these services means transitioning from tried and true service models to new and negotiated service models that are predicated on the lightest and most brief service touch. It requires us to understand and answer what is the minimal amount of services to get this person to housing. It required us to rethink every program participant getting the same or a similar package of services. It requires us to rethink our models where consumers get a big or maximum array of the agency’s services as we collectively learn how to successfully achieve the lightest and briefest service contact.

- I’m also challenging all of us in this room to rethink how we view those utilizing our services. Sometimes it’s easiest to first see the deficits and barriers to housing. While it is true that many consumers struggle with health, mental health, and other challenges, it is also true the resiliency and tenacity hold just as much presence as the challenges. Those challenges should not set them apart or define who they are. These challenges are shared by thousands, tens of thousands
of people, even some of our family and loved ones. In addition to rethinking the challenges in the population, I hope we can also rethink what it means to be homeless.

- You might be thinking “I am all for housing people, but the folks we serve have such high needs and barriers how can I house them when there is so little affordable housing for them.” This is a real dilemma. And tens of thousands of poor, unemployed, and/or disabled people solve this dilemma daily.

- **POVERTY:** According to 2010 Census data, 11.4% of Alameda County residents live in poverty. The population of the County is 1,510,271. If you do the math, 172,171 people in Alameda County live in poverty. *Write that number on board or flip chart. Poverty = 172,171*  Who knows according to 2011 Homeless Count data, how many people are homeless in Alameda County? 4,178 *Write Homeless = 4,178* 4 thousand homeless versus 172 thousand living in poverty. Only 2% of those who live in poverty are homeless in a point in time in Alameda County – 2%. What is your reaction to this comparison of 4000 vs 172000? *Take 4 – 5 responses.* Key point is that living in poverty does not mean homelessness. Most people who are poor can exit homelessness and not necessarily become homeless again. Our data shows only 7% on average become homeless again after being housed in permanent housing. Still looking at own data to understand what makes a difference for those who return to homelessness, but most don’t return, and most don’t exit out of poverty when exiting out of homelessness.

- **UNEMPLOYMENT:** 8.2% unemployment rate in December 2012 for Alameda County. 62,928 people unemployed. 4000 vs 63000. More to it than just unemployment and conversely, having a job is not likely to be the fix for ending homelessness- again, back to the no magic bullet.

- Some of you shared fabulous, amazing stories in your personal reflection about consumers that worked diligently to make it to housing and have retained that housing in a way that surprised you or that you are proud of. I am hopeful we can reset that as a high standard for all your consumers. The goal of the Academy is to give you tools, resources, and ideas that your team translates into action plans that assist you in moving more people to permanent housing more quickly. Some may need longer services once in housing or longer stays in programs but the goal is to work to house everyone as quickly as possible starting the moment
they walk in the door.
• If you haven’t guessed, one of the roles of Elaine and I will be
to expand the context of our thinking during the dialogue.
We will bring latest research, thinking, and data. The
purpose is to compliment the truths of your reality and
experience with other trends that may be relevant, or
explore counterpoints that may contribute to a holistic
understanding of the options and approaches we have at our
disposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10:45-11:30</th>
<th>Time for you to do some talking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 min.</td>
<td>Going to do introductions to the group. Please say your name, role and tenure at your agency, one word that describes how you are feeling about being part of the Academy, and answer the question on your table on the back of the table stand. Each person at table will introduce themselves and answer the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>FESCO: What is one motivation to you personally for change and improvement at your agency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit about you</td>
<td>BOSS: What is one lesson you learned from a change process in your personal or professional life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>EOCP: What was one insight you had from your organizational assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>APC: What will be one challenge for you in implementing the new ideas that come from the Academy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABODE: What is one reality from your service experience that you want remembered in our work at the Academy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubicon: What is one support or partnership that will likely be needed to sustain change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Changes: What is one thing that gives you hope about housing more people more quickly and effectively?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11:30-11:40</th>
<th>10 minute break – <strong>give instructions to group.</strong> During your break, please wander around the room and read all the posters on the walls. We will be using these after break. We’ll be eating lunch in about an hour.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Distribute tape for icons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40-12:40</td>
<td><strong>Worksheet is in binder.</strong> Welcome back from the break!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathie</td>
<td>Open up your binder, grab the second tab and pull up on it. We are going to work on the worksheet with a few key points about three of the main approaches. You can leave it in your binder or take it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The toolbox</td>
<td>On this little cheat sheet, there are 17 questions on the two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diving into the resources for change

| Pages that are broken into Housing First, Harm Reduction, and Trauma Informed Services. The majority are directly from the reading (word for word), while there is at least one in each section applies that approach and asks you to come up with the answer. Icon showing those. As a group at your table, please use each other’s knowledge and the printed materials to complete the worksheet. Try to answer as many questions as you can from memory, even if you are guessing, and then you can use the printed materials to look them up. You all should end up with all the correct answers.

- When everyone is finished, we will review the answers. Going to move pretty quickly and give you 10-12 minutes. Load PowerPoint.
- **Review all answers using PowerPoint. (30 min – end at 12:10)**

Great! Let’s dive a little bit deeper into these tools you will be using here and hopefully at your agency. You noticed some from several disciplines. As use the tools, you will need to make the substitutions of shelter to My Programs, or extract DV language and apply to your population, but these approaches are transferrable to your programs and consumers. Around the room you see posters with excerpts from the preparatory materials we sent in advance. There is a quote or paraphrase at the top and then the source noted in the bottom corner. Hopefully you got a chance to re-read all of them during the break. In your binder pocket are some colorful icons. Take those out now.

- **Explain all icons from the poster. Extra icons if you can come tell me a good reason why you need one! 😊** Take your icons and place them on quote that best matches to each icon. (5 minutes)

- What do you notice as you look at the placement of the icons and what it says to you? (2 min)

- Let’s hear from a couple of you why you placed an icon where you did (maybe point to some and ask if someone wants to explain. Try to get at least one answer for each icon) (5 min)

- What patterns stand out? (5min)

- **OPTIONAL IF TIME ALLOWS:** Were there any quotes in the pre-work that struck you and aren’t up here? (3 min)

- What is something you want to remember as you begin planning for improving the housing outcomes and doing so

Worksheets for each person in binder

PPT that gets populated during review.

Extra icons

Worksheets for each person in binder

PPT that gets populated during review.

Extra icons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:40-1:15</td>
<td><em>Eat elsewhere while set up the game</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-2:15</td>
<td>• <strong>Assign for seating according to marking on name tag</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1hr</strong></td>
<td>• Instructions of game (1:15-1:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>If clinician, feel free to share other answer choices as moving on to next persons turn.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Play game (1:20 – 1:55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debrief game using ORID (1:55-2:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Who got all their clients into permanent housing? Did anybody get no one in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Did anybody make a choice they were confident was the right one and have it result in negative consequences for the client or the agency? How did you feel when that happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Was it sometimes difficult to pick how you were going to handle a specific situation? Did you find yourself agreeing or disagreeing with the approaches that moved clients forward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How would you describe the choices that were helpful to clients, what characteristics did they share? How were the ones that were not helpful different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. How do the decisions you make on a daily basis impact a client’s likelihood of exiting your programs with permanent housing as quickly as possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Think about all we have done today. After discussing the housing first, harm reduction, and trauma-informed approaches; and playing the game, what changes are you inspired to make in your daily program operations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great! That is just what we are going to do next.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:20</td>
<td><em>Give instructions for where to put game supplies for clean up and returning to other room.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 min break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 – 4:40</td>
<td>Pull out Critical Questions to ask about shelter rules. I want you to cross off shelter and put my program’s rules. I’m going to give you about five minutes to read through this document. Grab a colored pencil, highlighter or marker from the jar on your table for noting things as you go along.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1hr 20min</td>
<td>Five minutes 2:20 -2:25 ORID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What phrase or # stood out to you or you noticed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Where did you say Wow! Or Whoa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How alike or different is this approach from the rules and policies currently at your agency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How could using these approaches change the dynamics within your program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2:40 – 2:50 Continual Change cycle entitled Try, Learn, Adjust. Think back to high school science days. Anyone remember the sign for change? Delta, triangle. Use this approach, with a rapid change cycle as the framework for your agency team to take one item you want to change, identify or create the change, actually begin working on it, and then to document what you are going to try, how you are going to learn if it’s working, and what adjustments you will make and when.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rapid evaluation to promote continual change cycle so typically two weeks to month, no more before you check in to see how it’s going. Maybe even daily. With every new habit, you want to give something new a bare minimum of 30 days, and usually a 90 day timeframe for people to get used to the change and think of the new practice as business as usual before you make any major modifications to the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Take out form review form. Highlight where short time and where long time needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We prepared some resources to help you. Review resources. NOTE BHP CLIP ART AND SHORT POLICY DOCUMENTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2:50-3:50 In team, quickly agree to one item to work on. It may be an easy win, a stretch, or something that you think may be foundational to other changes or principles at your agency. You will have 1 hour to work on a revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50-4:40</td>
<td>Each group will report back TLA #1, two key features of their revised product, and the answers to TLA # 3 and 4, #6, and #9 in five minutes. The group will then provide feedback from peers and facilitators. (5 min report back, 3 min feedback per group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40-4:50</td>
<td>Wow, done with day 1. Thank you for your attention, and dedication to the tasks as we moved through the agenda today. Tomorrow will be action-packed as well as you will work on three Redesign areas. We will be starting promptly at 9 a.m. tomorrow so trust everyone to be on time and ready to go. We’ll have coffee and pastries. Is there anything else that you need from us to better use our time tomorrow? Anything not working? Thank you – see you tomorrow!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prep: hand 2nd sticky wall with white paper in middle, put quizzes on table, put half sheets out

---

**Day Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:05-9:25</td>
<td>Welcome back Hope you had a good night’s rest. Up and at it getting back to work. We are going to do a little exercising to remind us about what we did yesterday. Stand up and all move over to this side of room Think back to yesterday morning. Move to the other side of the room if you had the positive participant agreement. What is something that you liked from the positive agreement? Take two answers What is something that you disliked about the other agreement? Take two answers What happened after the participation agreement? (Worksheet on the approaches and icons exercise.) Move over to this side of the room if you placed a rock icon or wanted a rock icon. Can somebody share where they would have put a rock if they could have.</td>
<td>Sticky Wall for quotes and AHA post-its</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brought to you by EveryOne Home & Aspire Consulting LLC
- Now move over to this side of the room if you had a heart or light bulb icon to place. Somebody share where they did put a light bulb.
- Remember the game changer icon? What happened yesterday that could be the most game changing for you and your agency? *Take two-three answers*
- Move over to this side of the room if you feel more comfortable with housing first concepts than you did before you came.
- What housing first practices can you envision implementing in your work? *Take two or three answers.*
- We’ve got a couple more for you. Move over to this side of the room if there was at least one rule or policy you felt ready to change in light of our work together yesterday.
- Let’s finish this by creating a continuum. Over here to my left I invite you to stand if you agree with the statement; “I feel more informed and comfortable with housing first, harm reduction, and trauma informed services and believe it can be helpful to my work than I did when I got here yesterday.” On my right stand if you agree with the statement; “I still don’t get it and/or agree with these approaches and their relevance.” *Take a few explanations of why people stood where.*
- Thanks for participating. You can return to your agency table.
- You may have also noticed something new in the room. This is the Aha wall. Anytime you have an insight or an aha, light bulb moment, take one of the pieces of paper or post-its from your table and write it down and add it to the wall. We hope to have the wall filled by the end of the day. We’ve already added a few of your insights to get the wall going.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9:15-10:15</th>
<th>SEE CONSUMER PANEL NOTES DOCUMENT!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>The Design Team that helped create the content of the Academy felt very strongly that we include the voice of those who have used services to hear first hand what worked, what didn’t work, and what could have helped improve their experience and access to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Recruited five former or current consumers who could share their experiences with us. We’ve asked them to not include names of the agencies from which they received services. We simply gave them a list of questions we wanted answered and asked them to prepare responses for you. This panel will give you the real scoop, unfiltered answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Real Scoop</td>
<td>Name tents for each panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Panel</td>
<td>Microphones (two table top mics) for panelist and questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K and E to take mics to questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have 40 minutes during which I will be asking questions that they will answer, and then we will have 10 minutes for you to ask questions. Please listen for their take on what worked, what didn’t, compare that to what is true at your agency.

Thank you everyone! Time now for your questions. Please remember that we aren’t using any agency, program, or staff names in our discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:15-12:20</td>
<td>Kathie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2hr 5 min</td>
<td>Redesigning the Healthy Helping Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:40</td>
<td>(25 min) The next session we are working on is for developing healthy helping relationship. We are going to continue with the models we used yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What model is it that we used? <em>Try, Learn, Adjust or the Change Model</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is included in this model that makes it useful for planning and implementing change? <em>Quick, also lists indicators of how we will know something is working well, includes dates to begin evaluation of whether working, cyclical, easy to read/use.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arguably the service and helping relationship is one of the most impactful elements of an agency’s infrastructure or programming. We heard about it this morning a bit when you got the real scoop from the consumer panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do I mean by the helping relationship? <em>Traditionally case management but also refers to the relationships with other service staff who are not “case managers” but have a key role in supporting the consumer or interact with the consumer with a great deal of time or frequency.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The organizational assessment asked you some questions about the helping relationships within your agency and programs, but we are going to dig a little deeper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pull out half sheets of paper on your table and pass one piece around to each person. Also take out your organizational assessment. Time for a silent examination of some of the most common practices related to the helping relationship. You do not need to put your name on it. Each person is to answer their own questions honestly as true or false. I will read a statement. You UNDERLINE the answer that you think is correct, either true or false. Remember to underline your answer. Set aside Org Assess for just a few minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. My agency’s assessment and case plan tools are housing-focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When new consumers arrive at the program, they always know that we are happy they are here and they are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accepted for who they are because we have conveyed that in the greeting and welcome.

3. The focus of the first and subsequent case management visits is targeted to what we can do together that gets the consumer back into permanent housing as quickly as possible.

4. The helping process at the agency as a consumer moves through the program capitalizes on the consumer’s strengths.

5. In all my agency’s programs, there are specific service components and protocols for delivering services to the consumer while s/he is housed, acclimating them to the neighborhood-based services, and for future contact should a housing crisis arise.

- Put all your pieces of paper next to each other across the middle of your table so everyone can see. Rearrange seats or stand if you need to for the next couple of minutes to see. Align the papers next to each other and overlapping so that all that you see behind the first sheet is the true column.

1. My agency’s assessment and case plan tools are housing-focused. Look at your teammate’s answer. Is there consistency among your answers? Are you at the first visit with consumers identifying what barriers they have to getting through the screening process by landlords? Do you acquire information about how many past evictions they have, when those occurred, why they occurred? Are you helping consumers fill out a sample housing application so they can take one filled out copy with them that has all the information in one place? Do your staff start discussing what type of permanent housing and where the consumer would like to live on the first visit? What if your case manager or other lead helping person was called a Housing Coach or Housing Advocate? What would the job title of Housing Coach convey to the consumer? What would the job title of Housing Coach convey to the staff person about his/her job responsibilities? The case manager isn’t the only person at the agency interacting with consumers. What about resident advocates or shelter monitors? These staff along with clinicians, managers, supervisors, and employment staff should all have a clear connection to helping the consumer access housing as quickly as is possible for that consumer and holding each other accountable to that task. In your organizational assessment, #19. What are some examples of housing staff other than
housing specialist or case manager who are supporting the client housing process? Take some examples of how staff other than the housing specialists/case manager support the clients housing search. How do staff know they are part of the team that is helping people obtain housing? Take examples.

2. When new consumers arrive at the program, they always know that we are happy they are here and they are accepted for who they are because we have conveyed that in the greeting and welcome. Look at your team’s answers. By coming to see you at your agency, consumers are taking the first step to stabilizing their housing. Do you recognize that or frame it in that perspective? Do all staff at the agency recognize that perspective of being the first step to stabilizing housing? Perhaps the consumer doesn’t recognize that they are taking the first step, but we should. Does that first contact or conversation express a sincere welcome? Are consumers greeted more warmly if they went in for a hair cut or an oil change than they are from us? Is the staff person working the front desk the best face of the agency to greet consumers and the public? What are your policies and practices around welcoming clients and communicating your belief in their ability to get housed? Did your team mark mostly trues or mostly falses?

3. The focus of the first and subsequent case management visits is targeted to what we can do together that gets the consumer back into permanent housing as quickly as possible. True or False? What else are you talking about with consumers? Parenting, lifeskills, mandatory services and mandatory meetings for 12 step or other meetings? Remember that it is Housing FIRST --- not housing only, but housing first. The first services you offer to a consumer should be to mitigate those barriers that a landlord cares about and would use as a basis for rejecting the consumer as opposed to service needs that can be addressed once someone is housed. Remember that we can add a lot of upheaval to a consumer, especially families, children, and those who have never had stable housing, when we get them settled into our residential programs, help them adapt to the routine so they can successfully live in our programs, and then we make them leave the most stable housing they have ever had or had in a long time. No wonder consumers resist or regress. No wonder they get comfortable in our programs and some don’t want to leave. How many times have we advocated in a grant application, to a funder, to anyone else that housing is the one key thing needed to
help this person get healthier, self-reliant, self-sufficient? I’m not a fan of the terms self-reliant or self-sufficient but I’ve seen many agencies use it so I’m going to in this context. Absolutely housing is the one thing consumers need. So get it for them, now, sooner rather than later. Look at your organizational assessment #16 and 21. How soon are you discussing permanent housing with the consumer? Is it really the first visit or first conversation longer than five minutes by any staff person? Does the first service contact take place within 24 hours or does the consumer wait 3 days, one week, within first month, before she or he meets with case manager? What is the balance between necessary paperwork such as intake forms and privacy notices and describing that the role of the agency is to help them move to permanent housing as quickly as possible?

4. The helping process at the agency as a consumer moves through the program capitalizes on the consumer’s strengths? Do staff work with clients as partners in their housing and services plan? Did you all mark true? Or are services more parental and coercive? Give me some examples of what partnering with clients looks like. What do parental or coercive services look like? Look at your organizational assessment question #17 and 23. Is a motivational interviewing and/or a strength-based approach used in every service conversation with the consumer? Consumers are asked what they want, what we can help them with, and those answers are integrated into the service plan. Case workers are skilled and helpful at helping consumers see the strength and resiliency of their past experiences as a helpful tool in persevering toward permanent housing and their ability to retain housing. Do staff hold themselves accountable to the same standards that we have for consumers in terms of showing up for meetings on time, completing the correct tasks before the meeting, speaking respectfully to each other, not bossing me around or telling me what to do?

5. In all my agency’s programs, there are specific service components and protocols for delivering services to the consumer while s/he is housed, acclimating them to the neighborhood-based services, and for future contact should a housing crisis arise. True or False? After consumers are in permanent housing, are staff helping consumers to quickly get their children enrolled or reenrolled in schools, preschools, other educational enrichment activities? Are staff helping consumers locate the closest 12 step meetings
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for them to try out? What about the neighborhood food pantries? These are a must for food stability, your consumers need to know where they are and get enrolled. What about medical or mental health care – are there any community clinics close by? Are there specific service needs your consumer needs to access for continued stabilization in housing. **When we are done providing services to a consumer,** do we leave them information about where to go or what to do if they experience another housing crisis?

- Take a look at your true answers. Where did staff agree and all mark the same answer? Where did staff not think similarly and some marked true and some false? If you have areas where the majority of you did not mark the same answer, this might indicate an area where some think you are doing better than other staff do, or where a particular messaging or philosophy is not permeated through all layers of agency from leadership to management to line staff.

- Here are the five areas you can work on to redesign healthy helping relationships:
  1. Welcoming and orienting clients to your program
  2. Developing a permanent housing strategy
  3. Transforming case management to a strengths-based accountable partnership
  4. Follow-up housing stabilization services
  5. Incorporating consumer voice.

You may want to work on a program manual, a welcome orientation, the program rules, creating a housing case plan, incorporating strengths-based approaches for case managers or housing coaches, creating home visit policies, or creating a consumer input process. Pick one item to redesign. Use all the things you have heard, consumer panel input, peer input, quotes, prework content.

10:40 – 11:30 (50 min): In team, agree quickly on one item to work on from this list. The item you pick can be an easy win (something easy to implement), a stretch (harder to impact but potentially greater returns), or a foundational change (something that seems like it has to happen first before other changes can happen). Answer question 1 and 2 on your TLA worksheet, develop a revised product, and then complete the rest of the Try, Learn, Adjust worksheet. You have 50 min; we will end at 11:30.

11:30 – 12:20 (50 minutes): Each group will report back TLA #1, three key features of their revised product, and the answers to TLA # 3 and 4, #6, and #9 in five minutes. The group will then provide feedback from peers and facilitators. (5 min report back, 3 min feedback per group)
1:00 – 1:30 (30 minutes): Next work area is redesigning a housing-oriented culture at your agency, specifically I mean a permanent housing-oriented culture. Let’s define that for a minute before we move on.

- What do we mean by a housing-oriented culture? Where all the thinking, mindset, and activities focus on or align with permanent housing. **WRITE GROUP’S DEFINITION ON FLIP CHART. Expand on the word culture if needed – should give a sense of permeating throughout agency.**
- This housing oriented culture exists inside of the HEARTH and local expectations to move everyone to permanent housing as quickly as possible. The new standard is to rehouse people as quickly as possible with a perspective to also examine rates of return to homelessness.
- What are two things at or about the agency that should be housing-oriented in order for the culture to be housing-oriented? At your table are two half sheets of yellow paper. Have your group identify two that should be housing-oriented in order for the culture to be housing oriented? Write one item per half sheet. I’ll be around to collect them shortly. **Give a couple minutes. Collect the half sheets from each table.**

  - **Read one card and place it on sticky wall around the flip chart definition of housing-oriented culture. Elaborate and provide a couple sentences of explanation about what pieces of the idea on the card contribute to a housing-oriented culture.**
  - **Continue with each of 12 cards you have collected.**
- Great work. In order to have a housing oriented culture, every job description should explicitly state the position’s role in helping consumers acquire permanent housing. The job description for case managers should explicitly state their role is to help homeless persons acquire permanent housing – not acquire self-sufficiency or self-reliance. PERMANENT HOUSING!
- Pull out your organizational assessment. #29 – how much do those job descriptions focus on permanent housing?
- Supervision should always address the barriers to specific consumers accessing permanent housing and build on the practices of staff that have been successful. Share, learn from each other. Cultivate this time to focus in on accessing permanent housing. If staff don’t have a mindset of what can I do to end this person’s homelessness during this stay or contact at my agency, then staff still have some reorienting...
to do to ingrain a permanent housing culture.

- #34. Can all staff describe housing first? Can and do staff reiterate that their job and the agency’s job is to help people get back into permanent housing as quickly as possible and to help them sustain that housing? If not, this may need to be an area for which your team creates a Change Implementation Plan.

- Do staff trainings occur regularly and teach real skills about housing challenging consumers, teaching new approaches, best practices, or discuss new research or evaluation?

- # 35 and 36. Do you have an intentional plan for doing these things?

- How is the information about your program’s performance and outcomes conveyed to staff? #31 and #33. Is HMIS well taken care of in terms of monitoring and correcting null and inconsistent data in a timely manner, that is at least on a monthly basis or the best practice weekly basis? Is data updated or entered in a timely manner, no longer than weekly? Are the Outcomes reports printed, examined, and the content shared with staff? Do you develop strategies or ideas to address areas you notice in need of improvement?

- So, in light of where you are as a housing-oriented culture at your agency, what is the first change you would like to implement to become a more housing-oriented culture? Changes can focus in these five areas:
  1. Job descriptions and supervisions to outcomes (we request that you to do both, not just one)
  2. Training and staff development
  3. Incorporating evaluation, best practices and data to achieve top performance
  4. Creating or funding a Housing Specialist
  5. Piloting Progressive Engagement

Review instructions and change cycle model. We are still going to be using the Try, Learn, Adjust model. Worksheets are on your table. **1:30 – 2:20 (50 min)**: In team, agree quickly on one item to work on from this list. The item you pick can be an easy win (something easy to implement), a stretch (harder to impact but potentially greater returns), or a foundational change (something that seems like it has to happen first before other changes can happen). Answer question 1 and 2 on your TLA worksheet, develop a revised product, and then complete the rest of the Try, Learn, Adjust worksheet. You have 50 min; we will end at 2:20.

**2:20 – 3:10 (50 minutes)**: Each group will report back TLA #1, three key features of their revised product, and the answers to Clean up from lunch during team work time.
### Redesigning A Welcoming Physical Environment

**3:20 – 3:30: Guided meditation**
- Close your eyes. Walk up to the front door of your agency. Put your hand on the door handle, stop. Look to left, look to right. What do you see? Flowers, signage, mailboxes? Is everything neat and clean, and look well cared for? Anything broken or uninviting. Notice anything related to security. Are there things that are intended to keep people out, or to keep people in? Doorbells where are you have to be buzzed in? Key cards for access? Bars on windows or door? Are curtains or blinds opened or closed. Is the vibe, welcome or keep out? Does any signage catch your attention? Would you know you are in the right place? Would you know where you are going next?
- Walk through the door. As you enter the main lobby or common area, look around. Look down at your feet. What is used for flooring? Is it clean and appealing? Look at the walls, what color are they? What does the color contribute to the mood of the place. What are on the walls? Any artwork or resources or bulletin boards? Look carefully at the bulletin boards. Walk closer to them, closer. Scan over everything that is on the bulletin board. As you look it over, how is it making you feel? Is there anything you find helpful, comforting, informational, or welcoming. Look over to where you are supposed to check in at. What is noteworthy in that area? Are there things intended to keep people out, or from being to close? Walk to the middle of the room and begin scanning to your right. Keep turning to your right and you visually scan the entire room. Stand still and stop, and notice your senses. How is the temperature, the light, the smells? How does the color, and the furniture and its

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:10 - 3:20</td>
<td>10 minute break and snack - STRETCH, rotate shoulders, forward back, touch toes,</td>
<td>Place out cookies or snack for afternoon during report back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:20 - 3:50</td>
<td>Kathie</td>
<td>Place 11x17 sheets and markers in center of table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Redesigning A Welcoming Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td>TLA worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Kathie</td>
<td>11x17 sheets for drawing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TLA # 3 and 4, #6, and #9 in five minutes. The group will then provide feedback from peers and facilitators. (5 min report back, 3 min feedback per group)
arrangement feel? Is it welcoming, claustrophobic, cluttered, clean or unclean? Does it feel clinical or homelike? Would you feel comfortable sitting on the furniture or out of place? What are your emotions saying to you? Happy, content, peaceful, welcome, safe haven, refuge, I’ve come to the right place?

- Open your eyes. While it is still fresh in your mind, what did you want changed and how did you want it changed? Hold those thoughts for about two minutes.
- **INSTRUCTIONS** Take out the worksheet from the binder and complete the worksheet. This is possibly the easiest area of change. The ideas you generate here may be able to be implemented even more quickly or at least set in motion more quickly. On your table is also a large sheet of white paper; if someone feels so inclined to draw up some of the changes, propose rearranging the room, etc. you have this as a tool if you would like. But please 10 minutes and discuss the changes that you would like to see and capture them on the worksheet from your binder. For programs with multiple sites, you may want to further divide your team to tackle each facility.

- **3:40 – 3:50 Report back:** Anyone have something fun, innovative, or creative? What? Anyone decide to do anything with furniture condition or arrangement - What? Anyone signs – what? Anyone with bulletin boards – what?

- Continue until each agency shared at least one. (10 min total report back)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:50 - 4:30</td>
<td><strong>40 min Elaine</strong>&lt;br&gt;Taking it Home Priority &amp; Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50 – 4:15</td>
<td>Teams work to identify top priority and timeframe for other priorities (25 minutes) Take out your worksheet in the Taking it Home Tab. <strong>Review worksheet instructions.</strong> You have 20 minutes to complete this worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 – 4:30</td>
<td><em>All people rotate through room to each team to hear report out about the commitment they can make to the group of what will be different at their agency in 3 months.</em> Picture of each group with their poster! (15 minutes – 2.5 minutes each agency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:30–5:00</td>
<td><strong>30 min Elaine</strong>&lt;br&gt;Evaluation and Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4:30-5:00 | • Lets give ourselves a round of applause for such great work.  
|  | • Take a few minutes to hear your feedback. We are asking you to share with us what worked, what didn’t and what we can change for next time. (Allison and Kathie to chart answers)  
|  | • Also ask you to help us out. We would like to ask you to give |
us about 10 minutes extra in a survey monkey asking a few more detailed questions about what worked and what didn’t. Please be very candid. We will email that to your shortly

- I’d like to ask everyone to please stand and join us in a circle. *Elaine to make toast.*
- *Probably go around in a circle with other toasts/comments.* Is there anything else anyone would like to say to group?
- Thank you – have a great weekend!

| Games packaged to be given out |
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Dear Friends,

EveryOne Home is pleased to present the 2013 Homeless Count and Survey Report.

The Alameda County Point-in-Time Homeless Count and Survey was conducted on January 30, 2013. As the numbers indicate, our community has achieved progress over the last decade and ending homelessness for some populations (veterans, families, chronic homeless) is within reach. However, an accelerated approach is necessary to counteract the substantial challenges our efforts face in reducing and ending homelessness for all residents. It is our intention that this Report be a resource for our planning, helping us to capitalize on our successes and address areas of greatest need going forward.

Upon release of this report, EveryOne Home would like to thank a number of individuals and organizations:

- the more than 1,400 people that shared their experiences with us by completing the survey instrument;
- the thirty-one service sites that graciously welcomed us and allowed our interview teams to be on-site during their busy days;
- shelter and transitional housing programs who utilize the HMIS data system or provided administrative data;
- the nearly 200 volunteer interviewers and site coordinators who worked at service locations throughout the county, indoors and out, from the early morning through well past dark to collect and document the experiences of homeless and at risk people;
- the funders who included, Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department and the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency as well as the cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City;
- the InHOUSE HMIS team for their extensive efforts toward HMIS data quality and accuracy, especially Jeannette Rodriguez who served as the HMIS representative;
- EveryOne Home staff; Sabrina Balderama, co-project manager and fieldwork lead; Allison Millar-project scheduling and communications;
- Aspire Consulting LLC for project expertise, co-project management, and authoring the Key Findings & Policy Implications;
- and MKS Consulting for leading the research team and authoring the technical report.

Let us take heart in the progress demonstrated in these numbers and resolve to redouble our efforts for those who still do not have a place to call home.

Best regards,

Elaine deColigny, Executive Director
Key Findings

This summary highlights the key findings from the 2013 Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, compares results to those of the 2011 Count, and reflects on the trends over the last decade since the first Homeless Count and Survey in 2003. Two other resources accompany these Key Findings: the Policy Implications found at the end of this document which discusses implications for future efforts to reduce and end homelessness and the Alameda Countywide Homeless Count & Survey Report found online and available for download at www.everyonehome.org.

The overall number of people who are homeless in Alameda County is essentially the same as in 2011. This count of 4,264 homeless people follows a period of decline, most notable between 2007 and 2009. On one hand, these static results are encouraging in the context of the severe effects of recession, its impact on the housing and job market, the increase in the population of Alameda County, and its rate of poverty. Some groups, like families who are homeless with children, have shown a significant reduction in number over the last several years.

On the other hand, the results are troubling. Programs are helping move nearly 2,000 homeless people to permanent housing annually, but just as many people are becoming homeless each year. The number of people living on the streets or in places not meant for habitation has increased for the second count in a row. New or time-limited housing resources over the last two years have not produced a marked reduction in the number of homeless, including for homeless veterans. Progress has slowed in reducing the number of individuals who are homeless living with serious mental illness or chronic substance abuse.

While intentional and strategic investments of resources have achieved promising results, Alameda County must accelerate the rate at which people access permanent housing, reduce the flow of people into homelessness, replicate successful programs on a larger scale, ensure the most efficient use of existing resources, and garner new resources and partnerships to create a significant reduction in the number of people who are homeless at a point in time.

Overall Count in 2013

The 2013 Homeless Count and Survey estimates that 4,264 people were homeless in Alameda County on January 29, 2013. This slight 2.1% increase (86 people) from the 4,178 estimated in the 2011 count is not a statistically significant change. The net result is a reflection that people experiencing homelessness are leaving the streets, shelters, and transitional housing programs at essentially the same rate as people with housing crises are becoming homeless.
To be counted as homeless, a person must either be sheltered (living in an emergency shelter or in a transitional housing program for the homeless) or be unsheltered (living outdoors or in a place not meant for habitation). The table below notes the household type and newly-required age categories of people who are homeless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People in households with at least one adult and one child under age 18*</td>
<td>People age 17 and under</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People age 18-24</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People 25 and older</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in households without children under age 18</td>
<td>People age 18-24</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People 25 and older</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>2,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>4,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey, 2013. *Includes 10 people age 17 and under who are in households without an adult.

**Transition Age Youth:** When considering all transition age youth (persons age 18 through 24) who are sheltered and unsheltered, in households with or without children under age 18, this age group comprises 10% of the total homeless population (435 people). The way that transition age youth are accounted for and reported was changed in the 2013 count, yielding data that may be
considered a new baseline for future analysis. This age group is frequently considered to require specialized services to reach them. For example, the majority of unsheltered 18-24 year olds are age 18 – 21, which may warrant a unique outreach approach.

Transition age youth are a notable portion within two broad types of households who are homeless, those without children under age 18 and those with children under age 18.

**Of persons in households without children:**
- Age 18 – 24: 9% (269 people)
- Age 25 and older: 91% (2,643 people)

**Of persons in households with children:**
- Age 17 and under: 55%, (743 people)
- Age 18 -24: 13% (166 people)
- Age 25 and older: 32% (433 people)

**Race and Ethnicity of Unsheltered Homeless:** Among people who are unsheltered homeless, disproportionately more people identify as African American and American Indian/Alaskan Natives than in the total population of Alameda County. Hispanics and Asians are represented as unsheltered at a much lower rate than in the county populous.

**Looking Through Two Years And A Decade of Data: 2003 – 2013**

Since Alameda County has used the same methodology for all five counts over the last ten years, this is also an opportunity to reflect on the key findings of past two years and the past decade, giving a larger picture of the trends relevant to the efforts to reduce and end homelessness in Alameda County. The arrow to the left denotes the impact since 2011; the arrow on the right reflects the impact over the decade of 2003 through 2013.

**Count Similar to 2011, But Homelessness Is Less Prevalent In The County**

The number of people who are homeless in 2013 is similar to 2011; however, when examining ten years of data from 2003 to 2013, there is both a 16% reduction in the number of homeless people and a reduction in the rate of homelessness in Alameda County.

- **Homelessness increased by 2% (86 people) over the last two years, an amount that is not statistically significant.**
- **Sixteen percent fewer people are homeless than in 2003.**

Over 800 fewer people are homeless than in 2003, from 5,081 to 4,264. In the past ten years, the population of Alameda County has grown by 6% while the homeless population has declined by 16%. **For every 1,000 residents in this county, 2.8 are homeless in 2013, down from 3.5 in 2003.**

While the change of 800 seems large, even this change is not significant enough to be statistically meaningful given the confidence intervals of this methodology. In other words, homelessness has
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decreased steadily over ten years by 16%, but that change is insufficient to determine that the homeless population is smaller now than it was in 2003.

Alameda County’s rate of homelessness is lower than expected given its rate of poverty. In Bay Area communities, there appears to be a relationship where higher rates of poverty are associated with higher rates of homelessness. Alameda County has homelessness rates similar to the more affluent counties of San Mateo and Marin. Despite having a poverty rate that is almost twice that of San Mateo and Marin, Alameda County’s rate of homelessness is practically equal to these two communities. The research did not examine what contributes to or is the cause of this dynamic.

People Who Are Sheltered and Unsheltered

The number of unsheltered persons increased by 6%, from 2,212 in 2011 to 2,337 in 2013. This is the second count in a row showing an increase in the number of unsheltered people. The vast majority of the unsheltered (91%) are persons in households without minor children. The 2,337 unsheltered people exceed those living in emergency shelters and transitional housing combined, but the proportion is comparable to 2011.

While the proportion of the homeless who are unsheltered is now at 55%, the number of people has declined over the last ten years by almost 12%, from 2,642 people in 2003 to 2,337 people in 2013. Unsheltered persons hovered at or slightly above 50% of the homeless population for the decade, with only one year less than 50%.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey 2013.
**Unsheltered Women**: The proportion of unsheltered people who are women has declined quite significantly over the past decade. In 2003, women comprised 41% of the unsheltered population. In 2013, women comprise 13% of the unsheltered population. Conversely, men have increased from 59% to 84% of the unsheltered population.

**Homeless Families With Children**

In 2013, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development added a new requirement to report on the age categories of each homeless person by their household type. This addition required extensive modification of the survey tool and the questions used to determine household type as well as adding new questions about age categories of the other family members. As a result, the 2013 data regarding household type is considered a new baseline and cannot be compared to prior years. The majority of households are those without children under age 18 (68%) although 1,342 are people in families with children who are homeless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</th>
<th>Persons in households without children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey 2013. *10 persons (0.2%) are in households with only children, and excluded from this chart.

Homeless families with children are 32% of the overall homeless population, down from 56% in 2003. While a new baseline of household data restricts comparisons of counts of people in families, this significant decrease over the decade results in 462 homeless families with children in 2013.
**Chronically Homeless Persons**

The total number of chronically homeless single adults decreased by 185 persons (17%), from 1,116 in 2011 to 931 in 2013. They constitute 22% of Alameda County’s homeless population, down nearly 5 percentage points from 27% in 2011. 82% of the chronically homeless are unsheltered. The prevalence (22% of the total homeless population) is the lowest since reporting began in 2003.

*Chronically homeless people* – people who on the night of the Count are residing in a emergency shelter or are unsheltered and are disabled and homeless for 12 consecutive months or longer or at least four times in the past three years.

The number of chronically homeless people has declined by 350 people since 2003 from 1,280 to 931. As shown below, the proportion has consistently hovered at roughly one-quarter of the homeless population.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, Focus Strategies, 2013, Figure 9, p. 40.
Homeless Veterans

The total number of homeless veterans is 492, about 12% (11.5%) of all homeless people. This closely mirrors the 2011 results of 488 homeless veterans constituting 11.7% of all homeless people. Additionally, the proportion of veterans who are sheltered and unsheltered is essentially unchanged from 2011, with 72% unsheltered. Female veterans (a new data field for 2013) are four percent of the veteran population, and less than half of one percent of the overall homeless population. Just over half of female veterans are unsheltered (55%) compared to nearly three-fourths of the entire veteran population.

Over the past decade, the number of homeless veterans declined by over 200 people (694 to 492). They have consistently comprised between 10% and 14% of the homeless population.

Homeless People With Chronic Substance Abuse

The proportion of the homeless with chronic substance abuse remains at approximately one-third of the homeless population (30%), equating to 1,289 people. Looking further back, the proportion has risen and fallen over the decade with a low of 28% and high of 40%. The 2013 proportion is on the lower end of the range over the past decade. In 2013, about three-quarters of homeless people with chronic substance abuse are unsheltered.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, Focus Strategies, 2013, Figure 12, p. 48.
Homeless People With HIV/AIDS

Although the total sub-population of homeless people living with HIV/AIDS is small and did have an increase to 97 people, the proportion remained fairly consistent with 2011 at just above 2% of the homeless population. The 2011 data noted a shift from mostly sheltered to mostly unsheltered. This trend continues in 2013 with 74% of people homeless with HIV/AIDS being unsheltered. As noted in 2011, this may warrant continued monitoring to examine potential correlations to chronic substance abuse or reduced funding for targeted residential beds. For the decade, the rate of HIV/AIDS among homeless people has remained between one and three percent of the overall homeless population.

Homeless People with Severe Mental Illness

A substantial increase in the number of people with severe mental illness, entirely in the unsheltered population, reverses the progress shown in 2011. 1,106 homeless persons are living with severe mental illness, up significantly from 818 persons in 2011 and also exceeding the 1,007 persons in 2009. The proportion of people with serious mental illness is practically identical within the sheltered population (25%) and unsheltered (26%). Nearly 60% of the severely mentally ill homeless are unsheltered (57%). This is the opposite of 2011 when nearly 60% of the severely mentally ill homeless were sheltered and only 40% unsheltered.

Over the past decade, the prevalence of severe mental illness has nearly doubled from 14% to 26% of the overall homeless population. In some years, the proportion of sheltered persons with severe mental illness has closely matched the proportion of unsheltered persons with severe mental illness. It is unclear why there are fluctuating increases and decreases between the prevalence among those sheltered and unsheltered.

Source: Alameda Countywide Homeless Count and Survey Report, Focus Strategies, 2013, Figure 11, p. 46.
Policy and System Design Implications

Alameda County views count data as vital to the efforts to end homelessness. It is one source to understand the needs of homeless people and the context in which services are delivered and thereby measure progress, adjust services and program design, and create a bigger impact. While high standards exist locally for reducing and ending homelessness, additional scrutiny from the state and federal government is being given to homeless count results. Alameda County and communities across the country are rated annually on the progress made toward the federal United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) initiatives of ending veteran and chronic homelessness by December 2015. With this deadline fast approaching, increased attention is being given to how successful communities are reducing the number of people who are chronically homeless and veterans who are homeless, eventually reducing them to a very small number of people that get rehoused within thirty days of becoming homeless. The USICH initiative also calls for ending family and youth homelessness by 2020, while the EveryOne Home Plan calls for ending all homelessness by 2020.

To successfully meet the goals of ending homelessness, Alameda County must:
1) accelerate and finish the job for families with children, chronically homeless, and veterans;
2) develop new resources and new partners to accelerate and reach the end of homelessness;
3) effectively use existing resources; and
4) coordinate more effectively to better streamline access to critical housing and services.

The Context

Change in the number of people who are homeless at a point in time count is a combination of the number of people who become homeless through the year and the number of homeless who move to permanent housing. The number of people who are homeless decreases when the number of people becoming housed exceeds the number who became homeless. This is referred to as the net change, the end result at the point in time, taking into account all those people who became homeless and all those who ended their homelessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Change Over 10 Years</th>
<th>Average Net Change Per Year</th>
<th>Number Of Years To End Homelessness At Current Pace</th>
<th>Average Change Per Year Needed to End Homelessness by December 2020 (8 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-817</td>
<td>-81.7</td>
<td>52.2 Years</td>
<td>533 additional people annually plus those currently exiting to permanent housing (1,961 in 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The net decrease of 817 people homeless over the span of ten years is equivalent to an average net reduction of 82 people per year. At this pace, it would take 52 years to end homelessness assuming the current rates of people becoming homeless and leaving to permanent housing. To
end homelessness by 2020 as adopted in the EveryOne Home Plan, an additional 533 people would need to acquire permanent housing each year, a 28% increase from the 2012 rate (if the current rates of people becoming homeless and moving out to housing remain the same).

While the point in time count and the net change are appropriate tools to evaluate the reduction of people who are homeless, they neglect to articulate the external factors that can excel or hinder the efforts to rehouse people such as vacancy in the rental market or fair market rents relative to disability income or minimum wage. It also neglects to articulate the changes within the programs that serve the homeless that may contribute to the success or challenges of the efforts to end homelessness. Other key contextual information is presented below.

- The fair market rent for a two bedroom in the Alameda County and the Oakland metropolitan area is the 17th most expensive in the nation. At $1,361 per month, the fair market rent is Oakland is well above the $977 national average and has risen steeply over the last year, making it unaffordable to someone working full-time at a minimum-wage job.
- Even the fair market rent of an efficiency/studio apartment is $892, outstripping the Supplemental Security Income benefits of $866 for someone who is disabled.
- Job growth has primarily been in higher wage sectors, creating competition for increasingly expensive rental units.
- Housing development continues to be at an insufficient pace – and lack the affordability – to meet the housing needs of all Alameda County residents.
- 5,289 people received homeless or prevention services for the first time in 2011, 4,323 in 2012, tapering down due to the full expenditure of Priority Home Partnership funds.
- 1,961 people moved from homelessness to permanent housing in 2012.
- An average of 38% of all people served by homeless programs exited those programs to permanent housing in 2012.
- Rapid Rehousing programs exited an average of 89% of participants to permanent housing.
- Alameda County has several streets-to-housing programs that successfully work with people living in encampments or on the streets and support their move to permanent housing with housing subsidies and services that help them retain that housing.
- Over the last decade, a variety of programs were added to serve homeless people. Some no longer exist; others are at maximum capacity.
  - The Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63) program in the mid 2000’s added significant housing and service capacity for people with mental illness, but are now full and have no increase in resources.
  - The Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program through federal stimulus dollars infused nearly $10 million dollars from late 2009 through mid 2012 to create Alameda County’s program known as the Priority Home Partnership. This funding helped stave off the effects of the recession, and was targeted to assist homeless people to move into permanent housing and to prevent those with temporary or rental housing from becoming homeless. Most of these funds were spent on prevention.
- Foster care was extended in 2012 via Assembly Bill 12 to continue providing critical housing and support services to foster youth through age 21.
- Over the last three years, veteran-specific programs have added housing subsidies and services for homeless and at-risk veterans, including 200 Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) certificates and $2 million from the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program.
- The Affordable Care Act and Veteran Affairs are possible sources for additional or expanded resources in the future, beginning with $5 million dollars awarded in 2013 for four SSVF programs in Alameda County.

In a sample of fifteen California counties for which Homeless Count data from 2011 and 2013 was available, Alameda is one of four that experienced static or very small increases. The other eleven of the fifteen California counties experienced decreases in the proportion of the population who are homeless. These promising results throughout the state help propel Alameda County’s quest to learn, innovate, strategize, and ensure the most effective programs to rapidly end homelessness scale.

The data and these realities call the community to make the following commitments.

1. Accelerate and finish the job.

There has been an impact where the community has invested and targeted resources, utilized best practices, and launched innovative approaches. Ending homelessness is within reach for homeless veterans, families with children, and chronically homeless. Yet if we continue at the pace of the last decade, Alameda County will take at least eight times longer than the federal timeline to end veteran and chronic homelessness. To end homelessness for these three populations, the system of care will need to aggressively invest in the strategies that have worked to rapidly house these populations and to accelerate the rate at which people move to permanent housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeless Sub-Population</th>
<th># People (Families) Currently Homeless</th>
<th>Net Change Over 10 Years</th>
<th>Average Net Change Per Year</th>
<th>Number Of Years To End Homelessness At Current Pace</th>
<th>Average Change Per Year Needed to End Homelessness by December 2015 (3 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families with Children</td>
<td>462 Families</td>
<td>-307</td>
<td>-30.7</td>
<td>15.0 years</td>
<td>154 additional families annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Veterans</td>
<td>492 People</td>
<td>-202</td>
<td>-20.2</td>
<td>24.4 Years</td>
<td>165 additional people annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>931 People</td>
<td>-349</td>
<td>-34.9</td>
<td>26.7 Years</td>
<td>310 additional people annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The USICH deadline for ending family homelessness is 2020, but in Alameda County this goal is achievable in three years due to the relatively low number of homeless families with children.
Alameda County’s efforts to prioritize those with multiple barriers to housing and long periods of time living outdoors or in shelters is the type of targeted and innovative use of existing resources that could reduce and end homelessness for veterans and chronically homeless people. New or reassigned VASH vouchers should continue to be targeted to unsheltered veterans or chronically homeless veterans for greatest impact. New and expanded rapid rehousing funding should be explored for families with children on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families as other states have done with great success.

2. New resources and new partners are essential to accelerate and reach the end of homelessness.

Quite simply, new money, partnerships, and resources are needed to help homeless people access and maintain permanent housing while also overhauling the prevention system to help people avoid becoming homeless. New and expanded opportunities include:

A. Affordable Care Act (ACA). Over one-third of those connected to services are uninsured, which can be reduced or eliminated while providing health care for acute and chronic illnesses. In addition, the care coordination available through ACA may make it possible to repurpose some existing service funding into housing if the services can be paid for by ACA. Staff training, sophisticated billing abilities, and partnerships with federally qualified health centers will be necessary to utilize this funding.

B. the California Homes and Job Act (SB 391). California needs to make a permanent investment in creating and sustaining affordable housing to meet the need. This has been exacerbated by the loss of local redevelopment funds. The Homes and Jobs Act will create a permanent, dedicated source through which to fund the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of affordable housing and create tens of thousands of jobs.

C. former redevelopment set-aside. Redevelopment Agency funds have been a vital source of financing for affordable housing. In 2012 Redevelopment Agencies were dissolved as part of the effort to balance the state budget. RDA law required that this money was to be used for economic development (80%) and affordable housing (20%). The portion of property tax revenue that previously went to Redevelopment Agencies will now be distributed to all of tax-receiving entities in the County, including the County and all cities in the County – like a ‘boomerang’, the funds are returning. Housing advocates are asking that funds previously dedicated to affordable housing by law now be dedicated to affordable housing by choice.

D. criminal justice realignment dollars. As responsibility for criminal justice shifts from the state to local county officials and superior courts, some of those sentenced to probation instead of prison will be homeless and require permanent housing. Other legal barriers of this population may further inhibit their abilities to independently secure permanent housing. County funding to care for probationers can be allocated to providing rapid
rehousing services. This approach was piloted in 2012, refunded in 2013 and could be expanded to more people in the future.

It will be essential to deepen and expanded partnerships (such as using TANF funding through Social Services Agency on an on-going basis to rapidly rehouse families with children) and develop new, well-coordinated partnerships (such as with departments of education, transitional age youth planning efforts, and more landlords and housing operators).

3. The effective use of existing resources is equally essential.
Current and future planning must address and ensure utilization of existing resources as effectively as possible to rapidly rehouse those who are homeless. To create a dramatic reduction of the overall number of homeless people, more concentrated efforts and strategies will be needed to:

A. increase the rates at which people exit homeless services to permanent housing for most types of homeless programs;
B. reduce lengths of stay in programs while maintaining or increasing the exits to permanent housing;
C. target key populations – particularly the unsheltered homeless and the three subpopulations that are within reach;
D. invest new resources in the programs with low costs per permanent housing exit;
E. explore reallocation from programs with high cost per housing outcome to those programs with lower costs per permanent housing exit;
F. implement promising and best practices; and
G. revamp programs where there is interest and/or possibility to convert to more effective interventions.

Individual programs and the system of care must implement these strategies. A thoughtful roadmap is needed to assist the system of care in identifying and transitioning to the most effective use of existing resources for homeless people.

4. Coordinate more – and more effectively.
The objectives of the system of care are to quickly identify the current needs of homeless persons, match the person with the best solutions to their homelessness, assist with quick access to the most appropriate type of permanent housing for each individual, and prevent future homelessness. A coordinated assessment and intake system is central to effectively accomplishing each of these objectives and to quickly transition out of homelessness. As a collective system, each program will need to effectively promote short stays in homeless services and the quickest access to permanent housing. The system design needs to be created and shared over the next year, and must include:

A. creation and implementation of a coordinated assessment and intake system that efficiently matches and connects people with the most appropriate rehousing resource; and
B. diversion and prevention of people with a housing crisis from needing a shelter or becoming unsheltered; and
C. programmatic conversion to serve unsheltered, singles, and other targeted populations as success is made reducing homelessness in specific sub-populations, such as families with children.

Conclusion

Alameda County is committed to using data to plan, implement, evaluate, and refine our service delivery system for homeless and at risk people. The information contained in the 2013 Homeless Count and Survey Report informs not only our understanding, but our actions as we seek to improve outcomes for people who have lost their homes. We will use this information to target resources and refine programs, believing that we can continue to reduce homelessness for families, veterans, and persons living with serious mental illness while simultaneously achieving reductions in the numbers of homeless adults, particularly those who are unsheltered. We will continue to work together to innovate, replicate effective strategies, and maximize the use of our resources. Together we can and will end homelessness.

For questions regarding the data or trends in Alameda County, contact Elaine deColigny, Executive Director, at Elaine.decoligny@acgov.org or 510.670.5944.

---

1 USICH Opening Doors (Federal Plan For Ending Homelessness) can be found at www.usich.gov.
2 Center for Housing Policy, Paycheck to Paycheck 2013 Rankings: Most to Least Expensive Metro Areas for Renting.
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Executive Summary

The Point-In-Time Count (“Count”) is an enumeration of the homeless population in Alameda County on the night of January 29, 2013. On that night, 4,264 people were homeless in Alameda County.

This report sets 2013 results in the context of the last 10 years, including:

- The rise in the overall County population,
- The income level and poverty rates in the County compared with the region,
- The development of permanent housing programs that impact population dynamics, and
- Ten years of Count and survey results.

The 2013 Count results indicate that Alameda County’s homeless population is smaller than might be expected given larger demographic and economic conditions and considering rates of homelessness in neighboring communities.

- From 2003 to 2013, homelessness decreased from .35% to .28% of the Alameda County population, a period in which the overall County population increased by 8% (pg. 22).
- Alameda County has the second highest poverty rate (12%) and lowest median income (just over $70,000) compared with surrounding Bay Area counties. Despite this, Alameda’s 2013 homeless population is equal to or less than neighboring, more affluent Counties. (pg. 25-26)

From 2003 to 2013, the big picture trends are somewhat promising:

- Homelessness decreased by over 800 people, a 16% reduction. Homelessness increased very slightly from 2011; however, these results are statistically indistinguishable (pg. 29).
- The proportion of unsheltered persons to persons in shelter and transitional housing remains comparable to previous years (pg. 36).
- While the percent of unsheltered persons as a portion of the homeless population has remained constant (around 50%) since 2003, there has been a relative decrease in shelter capacity and increase in permanent supportive housing stock, simultaneous to a reduction in the
sheltered homeless count (from 2,459 to 1,927). This evolving set of programs is by definition related to a change in population dynamics (pg. 38).

Trends for some homeless subpopulations are encouraging:

- **22% of homeless individuals are chronically homeless** – this population has fluctuated slightly as a percent of the homeless population over the last ten years; 2013’s rate is the lowest recorded level (pg. 40).

- **The number of homeless veterans has remained fairly consistent since 2007.** However, the number of homeless people who are veterans has declined since the first two counts in 2003 and 2005 by more than 200 people (pg. 44).

- **Homelessness for unsheltered women is declining.** In 2009, females made up 24% of the unsheltered homeless population; in 2013, women were just over 13% of the unsheltered population (pg. 55).

For the most part, results for homeless subpopulations are static or concerning:

- The **prevalence of severe mental illness among homeless people has risen** from 14% of the total homeless population to 26% in the past 10 years (pg. 46).

- The **proportion of homeless people living with chronic substance abuse issues** has remained roughly the same over the last 10 years (in 2003, 28% and in 2013, 30%), (pg. 48).

- **Domestic violence has increased from a low of 9% in 2005 to a high of 25% of homeless people in 2013.** Rates of surviving domestic violence have varied widely across the six Counts; 2013 reflects the highest rate to date (pg. 51).

- **10% of unsheltered homeless people are 61 years or older** (pg. 53).

The data and analysis in the following sections provide information about homelessness in Alameda County as it relates to the nation, California, and the Bay Area region. The 2013 Count report provides population figures, data on changes in the homeless population over time, homeless subpopulation characteristics, and demographic information on the unsheltered homeless population. In general, the news about homelessness in Alameda County is rather promising in the big picture, and trends among homeless subpopulations are varied.
1. Organization of the Report & Presentation of the Data

This report details the methodologies utilized to generate the results, provides the 2013 population and subpopulation data tables as required for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and offers some economic context and regional and national comparisons. The context is followed by an examination of changes in sub-populations since the 2011 Count and over the last decade since the first Count was conducted. Finally, Chapter 7 presents age, race and gender demographics of unsheltered homeless people.

2013 Data and Context

As in the 2011 report, many analyses are presented in tables with the number of people or households for each population or subpopulation, the percent of the population that is sheltered versus unsheltered, and the change from 2011 to 2013. Some of the analyses in this report match those presentations. However, this year’s report also includes:

1. Population trend information, placing changes in the homeless population in the context of regional, state, and national data;
2. 2011 to 2013 comparisons of the subpopulations show the numeric change and difference in proportion of the total homeless population;
3. Information about trends in homelessness over the last 10 years.

Percent Change & Difference in the Proportion of Population

Tables in this report use both percent change and the difference in proportion of the total homeless population to describe change in populations over time. The difference between these two analyses, including when they are used, is described below.

Percent Change

Percent change is the ratio of two values (new minus old, divided by old). This calculation simply looks at whether the number of people with a particular characteristic has changed since a prior count. For example, the total number of homeless persons with HIV/AIDS (Table 25, page 50) in 2011 was 60 and in 2013 was 97. The percent change, then is:

\[ \frac{97 - 60}{60} = 62\% \]
Percent change is a relative change – in this case, the number of persons who are homeless with HIV/AIDS increased relative to the number of homeless people with HIV/AIDS in 2011.

**Difference in the Proportion of the Population**

This calculation shows differences in a given subpopulation from one Count to another in proportion to the total homeless population or total adult unsheltered homeless population. The change in proportion is calculated by the current Count proportion minus prior Count proportion. In many cases, it is more useful to examine change in this way. Looking again at the change in homeless people with HIV/AIDs (Table 25, page 50), the change in proportion is:

\[ 2.3\% - 1.4\% = 0.9 \text{ percentage points} \]

Percentage of the total, or percentage point change, is absolute change in the population – in this case, the rate of people with HIV/AIDS who are homeless increased in the homeless population overall by about one percentage point.

**Use and Implications**

Both percent change and difference in proportion of the population are useful calculations, and both have merit, depending on the relationship being analyzed. For the Alameda Countywide Count, the number of homeless persons in 2013 is not statistically different than the number of homeless persons in 2011. However, this result may not hold true across all portions of the homeless population, including subpopulations, demographic groups and distribution across family type and living situations. The confidence intervals for the population figures are quite wide, because homeless counts are an imprecise science. Smaller figures, such as subpopulations and demographic characteristics, can appear to vary significantly but the differences may not actually be statistically meaningful. Therefore, whenever appropriate, percentage points are shown (difference in proportion of the population from Count to Count) because subpopulation estimates are tempered by the more stable population estimates. Also, subpopulation and demographic trend information are best understood in the context of the homeless population overall – changes should be seen as
absolute changes in the population of homeless people.

This report presents Count results over a ten year period, during which there were methodological implementation differences as well as shifts in definitions and HUD requirements. This context, coupled with the inherent challenge of pinpointing a population estimate for homeless people, leads to wide confidence intervals meaning that the true value (homeless population size) is within a fairly wide range. If we wish to look at changes over time, it is important to use the most stable estimate with the narrowest confidence intervals – the total population or total adult population estimates. Using difference in proportion of population allows for the population estimate to anchor and put in context subpopulation results which can vary widely, but frequently are not outside of confidence intervals from previous years. By contrast, using percent change to determine whether subpopulations in general have varied over the 10 years (e.g. there are now more or less people with serious mental illness who are homeless than there were in 2003) is not as defensible as looking at the proportion of the homeless population that has that status or characteristic.

As an example, Table 25 (page 50) presents data from 2011 and 2013 on homeless people with HIV/AIDS. The number of homeless people with HIV/AIDS has increased from 60 in 2011 to 97 in 2013. Understanding this relationship as a percent change would show a 62% increase in this subpopulation:

The bar graph above shows a steep increase in the numbers of people, but what this presentation
does not reveal is the size of the homeless population with HIV/AIDS relative to the homeless population, shown below:

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Alternatively, looking at this same data as a difference in proportion of the homeless population allows for an understanding of the relative size of the subpopulation within the overall population over time. While the population has increased, homeless people with HIV/AIDS remain a very small portion of the homeless population.

![Pie Chart](chart.png)

Whereas the percent change in the count of homeless persons with HIV/AIDS is 62%, the
difference in proportion of population is about one percentage point (or one hundredth of the whole homeless population). In 2011, 1.4% of the homeless population had HIV/AIDS; in 2013, 2.3% of the homeless population had HIV/AIDS. This difference in the proportion of the population presentation of the results shows that the number of homeless people with HIV/AIDS has changed in the homeless population very slightly since 2011. Slight changes, especially given small subpopulation estimates, should be interpreted with caution.

**Rounding**

In most cases, whole numbers or decimals to the tenth place are presented for ease of reading. Occasionally, calculations presented in tables will appear to be off by 1, .1, or .01 due to rounding of the values in the underlying calculation and/or the result.
2. Methodology

Background Information

Once every two years EveryOne Home estimates the number of people within the county who are homeless on a given evening. This effort, known as the Homeless Point-in-Time Count (Count), is congressionally mandated for all communities that receive U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding for homeless programs. HUD’s requirement includes a count or scientifically-derived estimate of both sheltered and unsheltered homeless people, as well as the frequency of certain subpopulation characteristics among the homeless population. HUD requires that the Count be conducted during the last ten days in January. This year, the fieldwork for the Alameda County Count was conducted on January 30, reflecting the count of people who were homeless on January 29. This is the sixth such Count conducted in Alameda County since 2003.

The sheltered portion of the Count (persons residing in shelters and transitional housing within the county) is primarily extracted from data in the County’s Homeless Management Information System, called InHOUSE and operated by the Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development. InHOUSE includes data on persons who occupied a shelter or transitional housing bed on the night of the count. Any shelter or transitional housing program that does not participate in InHOUSE is independently surveyed for the count of people and the characteristics of those people on the night of the Count. The unsheltered portion of the Count is based on a one-evening count and survey, described below.

Methodology

The Alameda County unsheltered homeless Count uses a site-based survey methodology. Whereas the sheltered Count consists of the actual numbers of persons and households staying at shelters and transitional housing programs and their characteristics, the numbers of persons and households who are unsheltered on the survey night are estimated. The estimated Count of unsheltered homeless persons and households is completed using a survey conducted at four kinds of non-residential program sites serving low-income people, many of whom are homeless. Data presented in Tables 1 through 5 details the methodological process. These five tables describe the process of arriving at
the unweighted dataset; the number of surveys and respondents are not representative of the weighted numbers found in the result tables.

Persons to be surveyed for the unsheltered estimate are selected through what is known as a two-stage sample design. A list of hundreds of program sites within Alameda County serves as the sample “frame”, or the total possible program sites at which persons could be interviewed. This comprehensive list includes all known programs that commonly serve homeless persons: served meal programs (hot meal programs/soup kitchens), food pantries, drop-in centers and mobile outreach programs. The sample frame is also divided by the region of the County where the program is located or where the majority of the services are provided. At the first stage of the design, service program sites are selected from this list as the locations at which the surveys will be administered, with special care to select at least one program from each of the six county regions. Using this methodology, 39 sites were selected and 33 of those sites could participate. On the day of the survey, one of the sites opened and closed before the time they had reported they would open, meaning that despite agreeing to participate, no surveys were administered at this site. With this unexpected change, on the day of the survey, service users at 32 selected sites were sampled.

Based on the expected service counts on the day of the Count, each service program site is assigned a sampling interval to determine the proportion of service users at the particular site who will be approached for an interview; this is the second “stage” of the sample design. The two-stage sample design provides reliable estimates of the number of unsheltered homeless persons in the county and of selected subpopulations within the unsheltered homeless population. When the data are population-weighted and analyzed with a statistical program that accounts for the sample design, it is possible to calculate a reliable estimate with 95% confidence intervals.1

Applying the second stage of the sample – the respondent selection intervals - a total of 2,387 persons were approached for interview at the 32 sites; however, not all interviews were completed. There were a variety of reasons that interviews were not completed, including simple refusal to

---
1 A 95% confidence interval around an estimate means that there is a 95% probability that the true value for the population lies within the confidence interval. Confidence intervals show the range where a sample-derived value will fall 95% of the time, if you draw samples by the same method from the same population.
participate, ineligibility for interview due to age, and language and disability limitations. In a few cases, the survey was completed but the researchers were unable to determine from the responses whether respondents were housed or homeless and these surveys were also deemed “incomplete”. Table 1 below presents the reasons and frequencies for surveys being incomplete or unusable.

Table 1: Survey response by persons selected for interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Selected for Interview</th>
<th>Number of persons</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed enough to determine housed or homeless</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person approached for survey refused to participate</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person was a minor accompanied by an adult (ineligible for interview)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to score housing status</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent too disabled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, 1,500 people agreed to complete the survey and provided enough information for the researchers to determine housing status. Participation rates varied by site type; the number and percent of selected persons who were approached to participate in the survey at each type of interview site are presented in Table 2 below. Overall, two-thirds of the people approached completed the interview; only one-third refused or was found to be ineligible. Persons at drop-in centers and at mobile outreach locations were most likely to agree to participate in the survey.
Table 2: Non-respondents and participants, by type of interview site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th>Non-Respondents</th>
<th>Completed Responses</th>
<th>ALL PEOPLE APPROACHED FOR INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served Meal Programs</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent at site</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent at site</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop In Center</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent at site</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach locations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent at site</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL FOUR SITE TYPES</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Completed Responses</th>
<th>ALL PEOPLE APPROACHED FOR INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish using a standardized survey questionnaire and trained interviewers. All respondents are asked about their living situation the prior night and about their typical use of services. These two series of questions establish two key thresholds for the remaining data analysis: housing status and the population weights.

While the sample frame includes service locations and programs known to serve homeless persons and households, many service users are not literally homeless. For the unsheltered point-in-time count, paragraph 1.i of the federally-applicable definition of homelessness applies, which includes individuals and families: “with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings, including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground.”, also referred to as a “place not meant for human habitation”. Because our objective was to collect data only on persons meeting this definition, when a respondent reported spending the previous night in a house

---

2 The survey questionnaire can be found as Appendix F to this report.
or apartment, a permanent housing program, medical institution, or jail s/he was defined as housed, and the interview was concluded. If the person spent the last night in a shelter, temporary supportive housing (also known as transitional housing), on the streets or in a place not meant for human habitation, s/he was defined as homeless, and the interview continued.

Later analysis divided these respondents into sheltered homeless – those sleeping in a shelter or transitional housing – from the unsheltered homeless – those sleeping outdoors or in another place not meant for human habitation. Tables 3 and 4 below shows the numbers of interviewed persons who were determined to be housed or homeless and, if homeless, the numbers determined to be sheltered and unsheltered, by the type of interview site. A total of 1,500 persons were interviewed, almost 16% more than the 1,296 who were interviewed in 2011. More than 95% of persons served at a mobile outreach program were found to be homeless. In contrast, only 12% of persons served at food pantries were found to be homeless.

### Table 3 Homeless vs. Housed Respondents selected for interview by type of interview site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>Homeless</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Served Meal Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Site Type</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Pantry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Site Type</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drop In Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Site Type</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Site Type</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All interview sites</strong></td>
<td>961</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percent</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once housing status was determined, the researchers used the first series of interview questions to determine the population weight to apply to each unsheltered homeless respondent. The interview collected information on how many days during the last week the respondent used or had contact with each type of program where interviews were conducted (i.e. meal programs, food pantries, drop-in centers or mobile outreach). This information was used to assign a weight to each unsheltered homeless respondent, based on the type of service program at which they were interviewed, the frequency of their reported use of all service types and the availability of known services in the region of the county in which they were interviewed. This weight allows the respondent to represent a specific number of the total population of unsheltered homeless people using eligible services in Alameda County. The number of people represented by the respondent is known as the “population weight”.

Table 5 below shows the numbers of selected persons at each site type who were determined to be unsheltered, before population weights were applied. Next, the table shows the average population weight applied to each respondent at each type of interview site, as well as the smallest and largest weights for unsheltered homeless persons. The next column shows the weighted estimated number of persons, and the last column shows the weighted percent of respondents at each type of interview site who were determined to be unsheltered on the night before their interview.
New Data Fields and Changes to the Survey Instrument from Prior Counts

With HUD’s introduction of more detailed age reporting requirements, new survey questions were introduced. The result is new information that suggests how homeless persons think about and account for their families is complex and worthy of additional consideration before the 2015 count. The new age and households questions may have impacted the estimates noted in this report, so caution is recommended in reviewing comparison to prior years. For more details, see Appendix A.

---

4 The unweighted numbers of respondents in the Table 5 are shown in gray cells and in smaller type because, in a complex survey sample design, unweighted numbers do not represent valid estimates of population size or proportions. However, the unweighted number of respondents can be important because very small numbers may not support reliable estimates for the population. The remainder of this report presents weighted population estimates.

5 Only adult service users were interviewed and only adults appear in Table 5. Numbers of minor children residing with those adults were estimated separately and added to the total population estimates later. Tables reporting the estimated total homeless population (in the introduction and next section of the report) include the estimated numbers of minor children.
### 3. Population Results

#### Table 6: Part 1 of HUDs Final Table 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type: Persons in Households with at least one Adult and one Child (under 18)</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons (Adults and Children)</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons 17 and under</strong></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons 18-24</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons 25 and older</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type: Persons in Households with only Children</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons (Age 17 or under)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Households with Children</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Persons in Households with Children</strong></td>
<td>374</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type: Persons in Households without Children (under 18)</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>2,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons (Adults)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons 18-24</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons 25 and older</strong></td>
<td>477</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>2,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type: All Households/All persons</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS</strong></td>
<td>667</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>2,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONS</strong></td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>4,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Part 2 of HUDs Final Table 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 2: 2013 Homeless Subpopulations</th>
<th>Sheltered *</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Individuals **</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Families ***</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Chronically Homeless Families</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Veterans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Mentally Ill</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Substance Abuse</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Domestic Violence</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes persons in emergency shelters and transitional housing, except that chronically homeless individuals and families include only persons in emergency shelters.

** HUD defines a chronically homeless individual as an unaccompanied homeless adult living on the street or in a shelter who has a disabling condition and has either been continuously homeless for a year or more, or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years.

*** A chronically homeless family is a family (including at least one minor child) with at least one adult member (18 or older) who has a disabling condition who has either been continuously homeless for a year or more, or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years.
4. Context and Comparisons to Regional, State and National Data

The 2013 Alameda County Point-in-Time Count of homeless persons is one piece of a larger effort to understand homelessness and develop the system that houses and serves homeless people in Alameda County. Reviewing the Alameda County Count in the context of the region, state and nation is an interesting lens through which to consider the results of the 2013 Count and the trends since 2003. Because communities select the methodology for their homeless Count that best suits the preferences and resources of their community, these results should be understood as approximations.

Alameda County is among the most populous ten counties in the State of California, with almost 1.6 million residents. In the past ten years, the overall population of Alameda County has grown by 6%, while the homeless population has declined by over 16%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Homeless Population</th>
<th>Homeless as % of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,461,030</td>
<td>5,081</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,448,905</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,476,401</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,503,827</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,525,655</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,546,108</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, during the nationwide January Point-in-Time Count, there were an estimated 636,017 homeless people in the United States, or 0.2% of the total United States population. Throughout the country, the homelessness rate varied widely from state to state from as low as .08% to as high

---


as .45% of the state population. The Alameda County Count has been and remains within this national range; the homeless population has declined from .35% in 2003 to .28% in 2013.\(^8\)

In 2003, Alameda County estimated the homeless population at 5,081 people; in 2013, this estimate has dropped to 4,264 people. At the same time, the population of Alameda County grew by over 85,000 people, an increase of almost six percent. The shift in overall homelessness and corresponding increase in the countywide population is shown in Figure 1, below.

**Figure 1: Shifts in Countywide and Homeless Populations: 2003 – 2013**

With the exception of Los Angeles County and San Francisco County, which are among the ten communities with the largest homeless populations in the nation, the proportion of people in the County who are homeless in Alameda County is similar to many other California jurisdictions.

---

\(^8\) See Table 8: Homelessness in Alameda County, 2003 – 2013 for more detail.
The majority of Counties report declines in their rate of homelessness since 2011; with the exception of Los Angeles, those that have had increases, including Alameda County, have been very small, .01% or less.

Table 9: California County Homeless Counts: 2011 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2011 Population</th>
<th>2011 PIT Count</th>
<th>% of People Homeless in 2011</th>
<th>2013 Population</th>
<th>2013 PIT Count</th>
<th>% of People Homeless in 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>1,525,655</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>1,546,108</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>1,061,132</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>1,079,300</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9,857,567</td>
<td>51,340</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>9,927,173</td>
<td>58,423</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>254,114</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>256,656</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>3,043,964</td>
<td>6,939</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>3,096,336</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>2,226,552</td>
<td>4,321</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>2,307,191</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1,430,537</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>1,460,215</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>2,059,630</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>2,106,217</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>3,131,254</td>
<td>9,020</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>3,186,188</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco *</td>
<td>814,088</td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>826,754</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>693,589</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>714,411</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>725,245</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>732,324</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>425,840</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>430,882</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>518,481</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>529,660</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>830,215</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>841,591</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that San Francisco’s Count includes people in jails, hospitals and rehabilitation facilities.

Figure 2 compares median household incomes (2007-2011) with rates of homelessness in select California counties. The graph below provides a general picture of the relationship between community income and homelessness rates. There is wide variety in the relationship between rates of homelessness, income and poverty across the state.

---

9 The State of Homelessness in America in 2012: A Research Report on Homelessness, published by NAEH, [http://b.3cdn.net/naeh/9892745b6de8a5e5f59_q2m6yc53b.pdf](http://b.3cdn.net/naeh/9892745b6de8a5e5f59_q2m6yc53b.pdf)

10 Data for this table compiled by Focus Strategies from the CA Department of Transportation population counts for 2011 and projections for 2013 and local PIT count materials.
Figure 2: Median Incomes and 2013 Homeless Rates in California Counties

*Note that San Francisco’s Count includes people in jails, hospitals and rehabilitation facilities.

**Santa Clara percent of people homeless is from 2011, as their 2013 Count was not released as of printing.
Figure 3: Poverty and 2013 Homeless Rates in California Counties

*Note that San Francisco’s Count includes people in jails, hospitals and rehabilitation facilities.

**Santa Clara percent of people homeless is from 2011, as their 2013 Count was not released as of printing.

Looking at the Northern California counties surrounding Alameda who have reported 2013 PIT results (shown in Figure 4), as the median income of a County declined, the rate of homelessness increased.  San Mateo and Marin Counties have the highest incomes and the lowest rates of homelessness.  Contra Costa and San Francisco, which have lower incomes, have higher rates of homelessness (San Francisco numbers should be read with caution, given the extremely high population density in the County and given that their Count includes persons in institutions who are excluded from other Counts).  However, Alameda, which has the lowest income of the five Counties, has a homeless rate almost equal to that of its more affluent neighbors San Mateo and Marin.
In addition to the apparent relationship between income and homelessness rates in the surrounding region, there also appears to be a relationship between rates of poverty and homelessness. In these Bay Area communities, higher rates of poverty are associated with higher rates of homelessness. The exception is Alameda County, which again, has homeless rates similar to the more affluent communities of San Mateo and Marin. Despite having a poverty rate that is almost twice that of San Mateo and Marin, Alameda County’s rate of homelessness is practically equal to these two communities. Alameda County’s rate of homelessness is lower than expected given the rates of poverty and median household income.

*Note that San Francisco’s Count includes people in jails, hospitals and rehabilitation facilities.*
Figure 5: Rates of Poverty and 2013 Homeless Rates in California Bay Area Counties

*Note that San Francisco’s Count includes people in jails, hospitals and rehabilitation facilities.

The 2013 Alameda County Homeless Point-in-Time Count (Count) represents the sixth such Count in ten years. While policy and program changes at the federal and local level have influenced the design and analysis of the PIT over the years, the Count methodology has been consistent, allowing for trend analyses.

Tables 10 through 15 more deeply examine data drawn from Tables 6 and 7 in this report, the required HUD population and subpopulation tables. Where applicable, comparisons to similar results from past years are included to demonstrate changes over time. The sources for tables 10–26 and figures 6-13 are the homeless Count results and reports from 2003 – 2013.

**Overall Homeless Population**

The homeless population in Alameda County has declined by 817 people since 2003, which is a sixteen percent decline. Given the wide confidence intervals (as described in Section 1 and Appendix D), even this change is not significant enough to be statistically meaningful. In other words, homelessness estimates have decreased steadily over 10 years by 16%, but that change is insufficient to determine that the homeless population is smaller now than it was in 2003. Similarly, the 2013 Count of 4,264 people is a slight increase of just over two percent since 2011, and this result is statistically indistinguishable.
Table 10: Alameda County Homeless Population, 2003 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Homeless Population</th>
<th>% Change Year to Year</th>
<th>% Change 2003 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,081</td>
<td>↑ .94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>↓ -5.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>↓ -10.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>↓ -3.75%</td>
<td>↓ -16.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>↑ 2.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homeless Population by Household Type**

In 2013, HUD introduced new requirements for reporting homeless people by household type (these requirements are detailed in Appendix A). In order to accommodate these new requirements, the survey questions asking homeless people about the members of their family were changed, making comparison of household type to previous years’ Counts not possible. In 2013, 68% of the homeless population was in a household without children and an estimated 32% were in a household with children. People in households with children include 10 people in child only households.
Table 11: Change in Homeless Population by Household Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with only children</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households without (minor) children</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONS</td>
<td>4,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of unsheltered homeless people by household type in 2013 are not comparable to prior years because of the change in survey questions. Since the questions and the context of the questions asked of respondents shifted significantly, whether changes from prior counts to 2013 reflect population shifts or merely a change in how respondents understood what was asked cannot be known without future field-testing and additional work with the survey questionnaire. Figure 6 and Tables 12-15 below show comparisons necessary for community reporting and planning purposes. Caution is recommended when interpreting the 2013 results in comparison to prior Count results. 2013 results should be understood as a new baseline.11

---

11 In 2013, new requirements for reporting people in homeless families were introduced, prompting a revision to previous years’ survey questions. Appendix A provides details on these changes and the likely impacts on the Count estimates.
Figure 6: Proportion of Homeless Persons in Adult Only vs. Family Households, 2003 – 2013

**Homeless Population by Living Situation**

There has been small a decrease in the number of sheltered persons and a slight increase in the number of unsheltered persons since 2011. The top section of the table below refers to the two types of programs serving sheltered homeless people. The number of people in emergency shelters increased slightly (7%) but was offset by the slight decrease (9%) in the number of people in transitional housing. The unsheltered homeless population has increased by 6% since 2011.
The majority of the increase in the proportion of homeless persons in emergency shelters since 2011 detailed in Table 13 below is composed of people in households with children. In 2011, persons in family households comprised 34% of the emergency shelter population, whereas in 2013, persons in family households composed 41% of the emergency shelter population. Overall, the sheltered population increased by one percentage point, or one one-hundredth, of the overall homeless population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Situation</th>
<th>2011 #</th>
<th>2011 %</th>
<th>2013 #</th>
<th>2013 %</th>
<th>% Change 2011 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Programs</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing Programs</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sheltered Persons</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered Persons</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONS</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a slight increase in persons in households with children living in transitional housing, but a larger decrease of persons in households without children in transitional housing since 2011. Overall, the proportion of homeless persons living in transitional housing decreased by almost three percentage points from 2011 to 2013.

### Table 13: Change in Homeless Population in Emergency Shelters (ES) by Household Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with only children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households without (minor) children</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS IN ES</th>
<th>852</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As % of all Homeless Persons</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference in Proportion of Total Homeless Pop. 1.0
Table 14: Change in Homeless Population in Transitional Housing (TH) by Household Type

From 2011 to 2013, the population of unsheltered persons in households with children increased from six percent of the homeless population to nine percent. While the number of persons in households without children slightly increased, proportionally, they are less of the overall homeless population at 91%. Overall, the proportion of unsheltered people within the total homeless population increased by almost two percentage points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with only children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households without (minor) children</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL PERSONS IN TH</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Total Homeless Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As % of all Homeless Persons</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Change in Unsheltered Homeless Population by Household Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households with only children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in households without (minor) children</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 below shows the proportion of homeless people living in unsheltered situations, in emergency shelters and in transitional housing from 2003 to 2013. While 2013 has the largest proportion of unsheltered homeless people, it also has the lowest proportion of homeless people living in transitional housing.
Since 2003, the proportions of homeless people in the sheltered Count versus unsheltered persons have hovered around 50%. However, these results do not show the whole story about the relationship of homeless people staying in beds or units restricted to homeless people to unsheltered homeless people. A different and broader review includes housing programs that are required to house homeless persons.

Over ten years, the homeless Count in Alameda County has remained methodologically consistent, including the definition of the sheltered population. Unsheltered homeless population estimates are bound by a careful definition of literal homelessness. By contrast, the sheltered component of the Count includes only homeless residential programs. Entry into certain permanent housing program types are specifically restricted to people who are literally homeless or in a program type included in the definition of the sheltered count. Since at least one program type – permanent supportive housing – is operating in Alameda County near qualifying population scale, the Count does not reflect the dynamics of movement in the homeless population fully, which is a primary aim of this report. Residential capacity matters, because the definition of sheltered persons includes those in
programs. Without the analysis below, the Count reflects the results of the 2013 Count compared with prior Counts, but not the meaning of the results in terms of population dynamics.

Alameda County added over 500 permanent supportive housing (PSH) beds over the last six years, as shown in Figure 8. This figure includes new permanent housing for formerly homeless persons over the ten year period. Please note the supportive housing figures are beds, or capacity, not people living in supportive housing. Assuming a modest vacancy rate, Figure 8 demonstrates that the portion of the homeless population in permanent supportive housing versus those sheltered (in emergency housing or transitional housing) flipped from 2007 to 2013. Because people in permanent housing are not part of the count, it is important to look at all the beds and units restricted to homeless people when considering homeless population trends.

Considering this broader group of people (a subset of formerly homeless people in PSH and currently homeless people), in 2007, 29% were living in PSH units and 36% in shelters or transitional housing; in 2013, 38% were living in PSH and 28% in shelters or transitional housing. In other words, while the percentage of unsheltered to sheltered persons has remained roughly the same, for ten years (as shown in Figure 7 above), the total number of people in sheltered situations has decreased.
Figure 8: Unsheltered vs. Sheltered Homeless People, 2003 – 2013

* In 2003, some subpopulation data was calculated using a community definition of homelessness, which was more expansive than the HUD definition, and included people living in precariously housed situation who were “at risk” of becoming homeless.

**PSH bed counts are not available for 2003.

In addition to enumerating homeless people and families by family composition and living situation, Alameda County also reports on certain characteristics among the homeless population. Subpopulation data is generally collected by self-report from respondent. Mental illness and chronic substance abuse are assessed through a series of questions, rather than a simple yes or no type question. In general, certain characteristics may be under-reported due to stigma and/or the very personal nature of the information. Therefore, the data on the prevalence of subpopulations, including domestic violence and disabilities within the homeless population could be considered a lower bound estimate.

**Chronically Homeless People and Families**

931 of the 4,264 homeless people estimated in 2013, or 22%, are chronically homeless individuals (see page 20 for the definition of chronic homelessness). This result is a decrease of almost five percentage points since 2011. Approximately 18% of these persons are sheltered; the remaining 82% are unsheltered.

**Table 16: Change in Chronically Homeless (CH) Individuals by Current Living Situation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Total Homeless Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CH INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As % of all Homeless Persons</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered *</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For chronically homeless individuals and families, “sheltered” includes only people in emergency shelter programs. For all other subpopulations, “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.*
Figure 9 below, shows the number of chronically homeless individuals since 2003 and the percentage of the overall Count that these figures represent. The number of chronically homeless individuals has decreased by nearly 350 people since 2003. The number of chronically homeless people as compared to the total homeless population is proportionally the lowest since reporting began (22%), but remains about a quarter of the homeless population.

**Figure 9: Changes in % of Chronically Homeless Individuals in Homeless Population, 2003 – 2013**

HUD began requiring a count of chronically homeless families in 2011; therefore there are no comparisons available prior to 2011. In 2013, HUD required not only a count of the number of chronically homeless families, but also a count of the people in those families. About one-third of chronically homeless families are sheltered, while about two-thirds are unsheltered, and the split of people in chronically homeless families matches those proportions. In 2011, the split between chronically homeless families in shelters and in unsheltered situations was quite different – 57% were sheltered and 43% were unsheltered. While this may appear to be a dramatic difference, the subpopulation numbers of chronically homeless families in both 2011 and 2013 are small enough that no conclusions can be drawn about the change in population size. In other words, the estimated
number of total chronically homeless families in both years is too small to determine whether there was a change in the size of the population. There were 98 chronically homeless families in 2011 and 37 in 2013. The proportion of chronically homeless family households (HH) in the entire homeless household population declined by just under two percentage points since 2011.

Table 17: Change in Chronically Homeless Families* by Current Living Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Chronically Homeless Families</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Total Homeless HHs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CH FAMILIES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As % of all HHs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered **</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chronically Homeless Families are households that include at least one adult and at least one minor child.
**For chronically homeless individuals and families, “sheltered” includes only people in emergency shelter programs. For all other subpopulations, “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.

Table 18: People in Chronically Homeless Families, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People in Chronically Homeless Families *</th>
<th>People in Families - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Living Situation</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered **</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chronically Homeless Families are households that include at least one adult and at least one minor child.
**For chronically homeless individuals and families, “sheltered” includes only people in emergency shelter programs. For all other subpopulations, “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.
The 931 chronically homeless individuals and 123 people in chronically homeless families together represent 25% of the total homeless population. However, homeless people in adult-only households who meet the disabling condition and chronicity components of the chronic homeless definition are not included in the HUD-defined chronically homeless households (Tables 6 and 7). In part because household and family composition information was collected differently in 2013, additional analyses are included below, detailing all possible household types in which at least one member of the household is literally homeless, an adult, and has a disabling condition. Tables 19 and 20 below detail how many households and people meet these criteria from the sheltered and unsheltered population.

Table 19 shows that of the 169 unsheltered multiple adult (only) households, 109, or 65% of them include at least one chronically homeless individual. These 109 households are 12% of all unsheltered households with a chronically homeless adult. 2013 is the first year that persons meeting the chronically homeless definition were calculated by two household types, so there are no comparisons available to past years. In future Counts, it may be interesting to make this comparison, using 2013 as the baseline.

**Table 19: Chronically Homeless Adult(s) by Household (HH) Type, Unsheltered Homeless 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Adult HH</th>
<th>Multi-Adult HH</th>
<th>Family HH</th>
<th>All HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of HH type</td>
<td>% of HH type</td>
<td>% of HH type</td>
<td>% of HH type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH with CH Adult</td>
<td>760 59%</td>
<td>109 65%</td>
<td>26 62%</td>
<td>895 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH without CH Adult</td>
<td>533 41%</td>
<td>59 35%</td>
<td>16 38%</td>
<td>608 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,293 100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>169 100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42 100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,504 100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the unsheltered multiple adult only households with a chronically homeless adult member, the majority are two-person households with the respondent and a partner, followed by respondents living with a partner and adult child(ren) and respondents living with adult child(ren). Additional information about unsheltered multiple adult only households is presented below.
Table 20: Unsheltered Multiple-Adult (Only) Households including at least one Chronically Homeless Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Type</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Plus Partner Only</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Plus Partner &amp; Adult Child(ren)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Plus Adult Child(ren) Only</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Plus Other Mix of Adults</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homelessness among Veterans**

The number of homeless veterans changed little since 2011; there was less than one percentage point decrease in this subpopulation as a whole. The table below shows that of the 492 homeless veterans, 72% are unsheltered, while 28% are sheltered.

Table 21: Change in Homeless Veterans Population by Current Living Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Total Homeless Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOMELESS VETERANS</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As % of all homeless people</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For all subpopulations (except chronically homeless individuals and families), “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.

In the homeless veteran population since 2003, the proportion of veterans has hovered between ten and fourteen percent of the overall homeless population. However, the total number of homeless veterans has declined by over 200 people. In 2013, there were an estimated 492 homeless veterans.
Among the 492 homeless veterans, 20 (approximately four percent) are female veterans. Female veterans make up less than half a percent of the overall homeless population. Just under half of the female veterans are sheltered and just over half are unsheltered, as shown in Table 22 below.

Table 22: Female Veterans by Living Situation, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL HOMELESS FEMALE VETERANS</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As % of all homeless persons</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Living Situation</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For all subpopulations (except chronically homeless individuals and families), “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.
**Mental Illness and Homelessness**

In 2011, there were 818 homeless people with severe mental illness (SMI); this number increased to 1,106 in 2013. This increase is substantial, reflecting a 6.4 percentage point increase. The increase is entirely in the unsheltered population.

Table 23: Change in Proportion of Homeless People with SMI by Current Living Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered*</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For all subpopulations (except chronically homeless individuals and families), “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.

The increase in the numbers of homeless persons with serious mental illness, most notably in the unsheltered population, is large. The proportion of serious mental illness among sheltered and unsheltered people in 2013 is practically identical: 25% of the total sheltered population (1,927) and 26% of the total unsheltered population (2,337) lives with a serious mental illness.

Looking at this population as a percent of sheltered and unsheltered homeless people over time shows some years (2005 and 2009) where this trend holds: the prevalence of SMI is about equal among sheltered and unsheltered people. However, there are other years (2007 and 2011) where there is a large discrepancy between sheltered and unsheltered populations in regards to the prevalence of serious mental illness.
Figure 11 below shows the living situation of homeless people with serious mental illness from 2003 to 2013. It is not clear why in some years a much higher proportion of this subpopulation is in sheltered situations compared with unsheltered situations.

* In 2003, some subpopulation data was calculated from a community definition of homelessness, which was more expansive than the HUD definition, and included people living in precariously housed situation who were “at risk” of becoming homeless.

**Substance Abuse and Homelessness**

The number of homeless people chronically abusing drugs or alcohol decreased by three and a half percentage points since 2011, but remained approximately one third of the homeless population. Similar to the proportions in 2011, about 73% of homeless people chronically abusing a substance are unsheltered, while 27% are sheltered.
Table 24: Change in Proportion of People with Chronic Substance Abuse (CSA) by Current Living Situation

Over the past ten years, the proportion of the homeless population with a chronic substance abuse issue has risen and fallen, from a low of 28% in 2003 and 2009 to a high of 40% in 2007. The 2013 proportion of 30% is on the lower end of the trend over time.

*For all subpopulations (except chronically homeless individuals and families), “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.
In 2003, some subpopulation data was calculated from a community definition of homelessness, which was more expansive than the HUD definition, and included people living in precariously housed situation who were “at risk” of becoming homeless.

**HIV/AIDS and Homelessness**

The number of homeless persons with HIV/AIDS increased by less than one percentage point from 2011 to 2013; 97 homeless people, or two percent of the entire homeless population, is living with HIV/AIDS. The table below also shows that about 74% of persons with HIV/AIDS are unsheltered, while about 26% are sheltered.
Table 25: Change in Proportion of Persons with HIV/AIDS by Current Living Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Total Homeless Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOMELESS PEOPLE WITH HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As % of all homeless people</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For all subpopulations (except chronically homeless individuals and families), “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.

While the numbers of persons with HIV/AIDS has shifted over time, from a high of 157 in 2003 to a low of 60 in 2011, the proportion of the homeless population with HIV/AIDS has remained between one and three percent of the overall homeless population since the first count.

**Domestic Violence and Homelessness**

The number of homeless survivors of domestic violence increased seven and a half percentage points since 2011. However, in 2011, a more strict definition was applied to this subpopulation, counting only those people who reported they were currently fleeing domestic violence. In 2013, per the HUD definition, anyone who had ever experienced domestic violence was included in this subpopulation, which would include experiences violence that adults may have experienced as a child. Had the 2011 definition been applied to 2013 data, there would have only been 256 unsheltered victims of domestic violence counted, a statistically indistinguishable difference from the 2011 Count of 281 unsheltered persons.
Table 26: Change in Proportion of Survivors of Domestic Violence by Current Living Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Living Situation</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered*</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For all subpopulations (except chronically homeless individuals and families), “sheltered” includes people in both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.

The apparent change in the prevalence of domestic violence survivors in the homeless population from 2011 to 2013 reflects the shift in definition. However, prior to 2011, when the definition of domestic violence was aligned with the 2013 definition, the proportion of the homeless population experiencing domestic violence was lower than in 2013 by between 6 and 16 percentage points (2005 and 2009, respectively).
Figure 13: Percent of Homeless Population that are Domestic Violence Survivors, 2003 – 2013

*In 2003, some subpopulation data was calculated from of a community definition of homelessness, which was more expansive than the HUD definition, and included people living in precariously housed situation who were “at risk” of becoming homeless.*
7. Demographics of the Unsheltered Homeless Population

Tables 27 through 33 provide demographic data on age, gender, race, and ethnicity of the unsheltered population and compare the recent findings with those from the 2011 Count and, when applicable, to data from the 2009 report as well. With the exception of gender, demographic data reported on in 2003 was not consistently measured on people meeting the HUD homeless definition, rather, it was reported on people meeting a community definition of homelessness. Because numbers beyond the HUD-requited tables are not available for 2005 and 2007, comparisons are possible back to 2009 on most demographic information.

Because only adults completed the surveys, those tables refer only to unsheltered adults 18 or older. Statistical tests of significance were not performed on the demographic tables, and confidence intervals were not generated. Confidence intervals would be needed to make statistical claims about differences. Based on past analyses of data from this population and with a similar survey sample size, we have found that statistically significant differences are generally results that vary more than 5%. Changes from Count to Count that are smaller than 5% (between subpopulation data points from Count to Count) are unlikely to be statistically significant and therefore the results should be understood as indistinguishable from the prior Count(s) results.

Age

After an increase from 2009 to 2011 in mean and median age by about 8.6%, the mean (average) age of unsheltered homeless has dropped back down to just over 47 years, comparable with the mean age of 46.6 in 2009. Median age is virtually unchanged from 2011, at 50 years, as compared to 51 years in 2011.

Table 27: Age Mean and Median of Unsheltered Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>All Unsheltered Homeless People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (years)</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (years)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents ages 41 to 60 are the largest known age group among the unsheltered homeless population. While it appears as if there has been a large decline in this age category in 2013, the majority of the 13% of respondents of “unknown” age are most likely in this category (see Appendix A for more information). Despite the uncertainty of the unknown age respondents, the changes detailed in Table 28 show an almost five percentage point rise in the proportion of younger adults (age 25-40) among the unsheltered homeless population since 2009 and a more than doubling of the proportion of unsheltered people in this age group since 2011. The proportion of homeless people over age 60 is unchanged from 2011, however there was a rise in people 61 years and older from 2009 to 2011. This age group has increased almost 7 percentage points since 2009, so 10% of unsheltered homeless people are 61+.

Table 28: Changes in Age of Homeless Persons, 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-24.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, Alameda County first began looking more deeply at the transition age youth homeless population, those people between the ages of 18 and 24. Transition age youth made up less than one percent of the homeless population in 2011, and it remains a very small portion of the homeless population in 2013, only 1.3%. However, whereas in 2011, the majority of the transition age youth were in the younger age category of 22-24, in 2013, this trend has reversed, and the majority of transition age youth are between the ages of 18 and 21. Given the very low number of transition
age youth overall, these percentages should be considered a starting point for future analyses rather than a meaningful result.

Table 29: Changes in Transition Age Youth Populations, 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Unsheltered Homeless Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TRANSITION AGE YOUTH</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As % of all homeless people</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unknowns are respondents who indicated they were 18-24 (and therefore, a transition age youth), but did not give an exact age to allow further categorization.

**Gender**

In 2011, almost 80% of the unsheltered homeless population was male, a five percentage point increase from 2009. In 2013, unsheltered men increased by another four percentage points compared to 2011 so that men are now 84% of the unsheltered population. Conversely, only 13% of the unsheltered population is female, a decline of almost eleven percentage points in four years. Eleven people identified as transgendered and 28 did not report gender.
### Table 30: Changes in Gender of Homeless Persons, 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Percent of Unsheltered Homeless Population, 2003 – 2013

![Bar chart showing the change in the percentage of unsheltered homeless population by gender from 2003 to 2013.](image)
**Race**

The distribution of race categories among unsheltered homeless people remains quite similar to 2011 figures. There was a slight increase in both Black/African Americans and White/American Indians. The largest decline was in “Other Multi-Racial” respondents, which dropped by over six percentage points but can probably be accounted for in the increase in “Unknown” races and other identified racial mixes.

**Table 31: Changes in Race (Multi-racial categories) of Homeless Persons, 2011-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th># 2011</th>
<th>% 2011</th>
<th># 2013</th>
<th>% 2013</th>
<th>Difference in Proportion of Unsheltered Homeless Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black + White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black + American Indian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black + Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black + Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White + American Indian</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White + Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White + Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian + Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian + Pac Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian + Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-Racial</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 32: Change in Race (HUD Categories) of Homeless Persons, 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-Racial</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity**

In 2013, just over seven percent of unsheltered adults identified as Hispanic/Latino, a slight decrease from the 9.5% in 2011. This includes people who identified only as Hispanic/Latino as well as people who identified one or more racial categories in addition to Hispanic/Latino. Those not identifying as Hispanic/Latino remained essentially equal to 2011, at approximately 85%.

### Table 33: Change in Ethnicity (HUD Categories) of Homeless Persons, 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A. Composition of Homeless Households & Age Data

Composition of Homeless Households

For the first time, in the 2013 point-in-time count, HUD required detailed information on the ages of the people making up each household type. Prior to 2013, communities were required only to report the total number of people in each household type, not the ages of those people. With HUD’s introduction of more detailed age reporting requirements, new survey questions were introduced. The result is new information that suggests how homeless persons think about and account for their families is complex and worthy of additional consideration before the 2015 count. The new age and households questions may have impacted the estimates noted in this report, causing a potentially skewed comparison to prior years.

These new survey questions were developed by experienced survey researchers and field tested before the count. The questions were designed with prompts to help the respondent accurately identify all of the people in their family they live with now and with whom they would choose to live with in a permanent housing situation. In general, survey respondents often accounted for larger families than they have in past years. Other communities who used these same questions yielded similar results; those that used a public places “street count” methodology had observed family size data from volunteer counters to compare against the family size data recorded in the survey. In these communities, it appears that the survey questions may have encouraged people to report who they wished to live with and not necessarily who they currently live with. This feedback from other communities can help shape modifications to the survey design for the next Count such that both comparable and accurate information can be collected.

The possible reasons for these discrepancies include insufficient volunteer interviewer training and/or unclear questions either in the 2013 survey and/or the 2011 survey. While it is impossible to know if family types and ages captured in the survey match how people would access services or housing or best reflect their current household composition, it may be appropriate to field-test a mix of strategies for interviewing homeless people before the next count. A different approach to family member questions may yield more useful information about both the actual composition of homeless families and the perceptions of unsheltered people regarding family composition.
There is inherent complexity in family composition, especially among homeless populations and it is difficult to thoroughly collect this information in brief encounters or surveys. However, the data collected in the Alameda County Count regarding family composition is consistent with the national and historical data on the unsheltered population. As HUD refines the data they are interested in on family homelessness and plans are made for future homeless counts, this information can be used to inform revisions to the data collection processes.

**Age Data**

From 2003 – 2011, respondents were asked to give their age and researchers later categorized respondents into age brackets. In 2013, respondents were asked both their precise age and then to confirm the age category they fell into. This change was made to accommodate new HUD requirements on reporting households by age of respondent and family members. Many surveyors and/or respondents choose to mark only one of these age indicators – thus there are 219 surveys with an age category but no precise age. The age categories in 2013 were: “17 and under”, “18 to 24” and “25 plus”. Any respondent indicating “25 plus” but no precise age, therefore, was categorized as “unknown” for purposes of comparing to 2011 data. All 219 people categorized as “unknown” were marked “25 plus”.

Future counts could benefit from field testing strategies for obtaining age data more comparable to prior count’s methodology. The goal should be to increase the incidence of precise age responses so that age data is robust for comparison purposes.
Appendix B. Definitional Shifts from 2003 to 2013

The table below presents changes to the implementation of the Count methodology over time and changes to the definitions of terms used in the Counts over time. These changes impact the meaning of results; a careful review of trend data should include an understanding of these shifts between different point-in-time Counts. Some of these changes were related to HUD guidance or rule changes and some were community driven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>2005: Estimated based on using a 2005 count of service users and applying the ratios of subpopulations from 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007: Sampling frame not updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011: Sampling frame not updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>2003: Included any person who had experienced domestic violence in the past 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011: Included only persons who indicated they had left their last place of residence due to domestic violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013: Included any person who had ever experienced domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age categories have changed over time, such that people of the same age might be placed in different groups in different years. In some years, age was not reported outside of required HUD age categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003: Age categories applied only to community definition of homelessness, ages not reported per HUD definition of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005: No age data reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011: Age categories were 18-24; 25-40; 41-60; 61+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013: Age categories were under 18; 18-24; 25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(if exact age given, able to “fit” into 2009/2011 categories, but many without exact age in the 25+ coded as unknown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sampling Methods and Construction of Weights

for the

2013 Alameda County Homeless Survey

by

Thomas Piazza

and

Yuteh Cheng

May 2013
1. Overview

1.1 Background of the Study

The 2013 Alameda County Homeless Count and Survey was designed to provide an estimate of the number of unsheltered homeless persons in Alameda County and to study the characteristics of such persons. This information was desired for purposes of planning and for reporting to funding agencies and informing local planning of services and housing. The 2013 survey was intended to complement data available on the Alameda County-wide population of residents of shelter and transitional housing services. These data have been recorded in a Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS) in place at shelter and transitional housing services operating under contract with public agencies within Alameda County. Administrative data for other program sites were acquired on a one-time basis for the night of January 29, 2013. Survey estimates were considered adequate to generate information about unsheltered persons. These data can then be added to data from HMIS and other administrative records (representing sheltered homeless persons), to get a full perspective on homeless persons in the county. Another survey is planned for 2015.

The survey was organized and directed by EveryOne Home, including the training of field workers in data collection procedures. The fieldwork was carried out by community volunteers, employees of the county, of various cities within the county, and of homeless housing and service providers. Aspire Consulting LLC provided overall project management and training of EveryOne Home staff in project management and other tasks. EveryOne Home recruited and trained all volunteers, updated the sampling frame, scheduled volunteers, enrolled sites for fieldwork, and provided logistical support and project management. Focus Strategies and its subcontractors, Jean Norris, Yuteh Cheng and Thomas Piazza were contracted to design and select the survey sample, to clean and analyze the data, to create weights, and to report on the number and characteristics of the homeless population of Alameda County.

Thomas Piazza and Yuteh Cheng of the University of California, Berkeley, drew a sample of facilities that provided non-residential services to the homeless and gave to Focus Strategies a target sampling fraction for each selected site. They also created site-level weights, to compensate for
differences in selection probabilities and for differential non-response within sites. The final individual-level weights were created by Jean Norris.

1.2 Definition of the Target Population

The target population for the survey was all English-speaking or Spanish-speaking adults (aged 18 or over) who were served by meal service sites, food pantries, drop-in centers, and outreach programs in Alameda County that provide services to the homeless. The survey was focused on the housing status of people during the night of Tuesday, January 29, 2013. The interviews were conducted the following day, January 30, 2013.

1.3 General Design of the Sample

The sample was a stratified two-stage cluster sample. The first stage of the sample was a selection of facilities serving the homeless (and others). Prior to selection, facilities were stratified by location within the county and by type of service provided. Facilities were then selected from each stratum list with probability proportional to the estimated number of client contacts in a week.

Facilities selected at the first stage were assigned a target sampling fraction for the second stage of selection. Field workers were then sent to the facility to interview that proportion of the clients served that day. However, these sampling fractions could be, and were, changed. The fraction actually used (the number attempted divided by the number served that day) was recorded and was used for the construction of weights.

2. Sampling Procedures

2.1 Constructing the Sampling Frame

EveryOne Home assembled a list of all known facilities in the county that provided services to the homeless. Facilities known to be closed on the target date for the survey were set aside, for purposes of selection. The facilities were categorized by service type (meal service, food pantry, outreach, or drop-in program) and by location in the county (Oakland, South County, East County,
and Mid County; versus Berkeley, Emeryville, and Albany). This information was used to stratify the list of facilities prior to selection, so that a stratified selection could be made.

For each facility, information was also gathered about the number of client contacts per week. This latter number was then used as a measure of size for the first stage of selection, which was carried out with probability proportional to size. A few sites with less than 15 client contacts per week were excluded from the frame. The total number of estimated client contacts per week at all sites in the frame was 29,927 (excluding those set aside because they were known to be closed that day). The total number of estimated client contacts per week at the closed sites was 9,897.

### 2.2 Selection of Facilities

Three facilities were included with certainty in the sample, either because of their large size or their distinctive characteristics. The certainty selections were all in Oakland.

The remaining facilities were selected in the following manner: The list of facilities was first divided into four strata for the four service types. Then the facilities were substratified into the two major geographic areas (centered on Oakland and Berkeley, respectively). We then proceeded to select facilities from the list in each stratum with probability proportionate to size (PPS), where the measure of size was the estimated number of client contacts per week. For meal service sites, the number of client contacts was the number of meals served in an average week. For food pantries, drop-in centers, and outreach programs, the number of client contacts per week was estimated from the number of people served in the past. A total of 44 sites were selected in this manner from all of the strata.

After the 44 facilities had been selected, the order of the selected sites in each stratum was randomized. The first few sites in each stratum were designated as the initial sample, and the remaining selected sites were set as a reserve sample to be used as needed. Since the budget allowed for interviewing at 33 sites (including the three certainty sites), field work began with an initial 33 facilities. Some of the sites were not open or available for interviews or, so they were
replaced by taking the next site on the randomized list for that stratum. In some strata all of the reserve sites were exhausted, and no more sites were available. On the day of the fieldwork, two additional sites were unexpectedly closed and interviews were therefore conducted at 31 sites rather than 33.

2.3 Selection of Individual Clients

For each selected site, an initial selection interval was set. For example, at the St. Vincent de Paul food service the initial interval was set to 3 – meaning that one third of the clients that day were to be selected into the sample. For most other sites, the initial interval was set to 1 – meaning that all clients that day were to be selected. The actual selection intervals could be modified on-site by the project management team to account for the number of clients that day and the number of available interviewers. The actual sampling fraction for each site is calculated by dividing the number of clients selected and approached by the total number of clients served that day.

Field workers were sent to each selected facility, with instructions to interview the target proportion or number of clients. Selection of individuals was carried out by systematic random selection, applying a fixed interval to the queue of persons being served, after a random start. The selection interval actually used was recorded, and that information was used to construct the weights.

**For the sites selected with certainty**, the probability of selecting the site was 1. And therefore the overall probability of selection is the same as the probability of selecting individuals at each site:

\[ P_{\text{cert}} = \frac{1}{I_i} \]  

(Equation 1)

where \( I_i \) is the sampling interval at that site.

**For the sites selected with PPS**, the probability of selecting site \( i \) in stratum \( h \) was \( a_h M_{hi}/T_h \), where \( a_h \) is the number of sites selected in that stratum (including reserve sites that were actually used), and \( M_{hi} \) is the estimated number of client contacts per week at site \( i \) in that stratum, and \( T_h \) is the total number of estimated client contacts in that stratum. The probability of selecting individuals at each site was \( 1 / I_{hi} \), where \( I_{hi} \) is the sampling interval at that site. The overall probability of selection for the PPS sites, therefore, was:
\[ P_{hi} = \frac{a_h M_{hi}}{T_h} \times \frac{1}{I_{hi}} \]  

(Equation 2)

This selection probability was used in the construction of the weights.

3. Calculation of Weights

A weight was calculated for each case in the data file. This weight compensated for differences in the probability of selection and for various levels of non-response. Each of the weighting factors will now be described.

3.1 Selection Probability

There are two factors accounting for differences in selection probability – the probability of selecting the particular facility, and the probability of selecting individuals served by that facility.

For the certainty sites, the probability of selection is given above in Equation 1. For the PPS sites, the probability of selection is given above in Equation 2.

The basic sampling weight is obtained by taking the inverse of the appropriate equation (either #1 or #2) for probability of selection. A few of the weights were trimmed, to exclude extreme differences between facilities. Some of the original estimates of clients served turned out to be erroneous, and the resulting weights needed to be adjusted to compensate for those errors.

3.2 Response Rate Adjustments

There were two levels of non-response that required weighting adjustments – non-response of entire sites, and non-response of individuals within selected sites.

Site-level non-response was due to several factors, most notably because they were not available on the target data collection day. Among the sites selected with PPS, the non-response varied by stratum. Response rates of the sites within strata varied from 80% to 100%. The respondents in strata with less than 100% site-level response rates were weighted up, to compensate for the non-
responding sites. The weighting factor for each stratum was the inverse of the site-level response rate. For example, a response rate of 80% produced a weighting factor equal to $1 / .80 = 1.25$. The site-level weighting factor was applied to the weight of every respondent who was interviewed in that stratum.

The second level of non-response was that of individuals within the selected sites. The field staff at each site selected a pre-defined proportion of the clients being served on that day, at that facility. The response rates within each site varied from 41% to 90%. To compensate for non-responders, the respondents at each site were weighted up. Once again, the weighting factor was the inverse of the proportion responding. This individual-level weighting factor was applied to the weight of every respondent who was interviewed at that site.

After the above factors were applied to the weight of every respondent, we compared the sum of the weights with the original estimates of weekly client contacts. The total of the originally estimated number of weekly service contacts for all the sites in the sampling frame was 39,851. The sum of the weights after adjusting for probability of selection and non-response was 30,194, a decrease of 24.2 percent. After adjusting for this level of weighting, therefore, we found that the number of service contacts per week had decreased substantially compared to the original estimates. However, in comparison with the previous Homeless Survey in 2011, the weighted sum of 30,194 is only about 6% lower than the weighted figure in that year.

The next level of weighting, described in the following section, is designed to convert the number of service contacts into the number of discrete individuals served.

3.3 Service Usage Factor

Some clients of the services provided by these sites use the services more frequently than other clients and consequently had more opportunities to be selected for an interview. For example, a person who eats four meals every week at one or another of the meal service sites included in the sampling frame had a four-time’s greater chance to be selected into the sample on the interviewing
day than a person who eats only one meal a week at such a site. An additional weighting factor, referred to as the “service usage factor,” was designed to compensate for multiple opportunities of selection.

As part of the interview, each respondent provided information on the number of times per week he or she could have been selected for an interview during the week before the target day. This information included the number of days that a respondent ate a meal in the preceding week at a site in the County that serves the homeless population, and it included additional data on the number of times a respondent used food pantries, drop-in centers, and outreach programs during the week before the target day.

The responses to all of those questions were combined, in order to calculate an overall estimate of the relative availability of each respondent to have been selected into the sample. The number of contacts in the previous week were added together to get the overall estimate. The minimum value of this factor was 1.0, since everyone interviewed obviously had at least one chance to be selected into the sample. The maximum value of this factor was set to 7.0, since it was very unlikely that even very frequent users of these services could have been selected more than once per day for an interview.

This service usage factor is an indicator of the relative chance of each respondent to have been included in the sample. A respondent with a value of 4.0, for example, had double the chance of being included, compared to another respondent with a value of 2.0.

3.4 Creation of the Final Weight

The final weight for each case was the product of the weighting factors described above. The process can be summarized as follows.

- Start with a weight of 1.0
- Divide by the probability of selection (trimmed if necessary)
- Divide by the site-level response rate (expressed as a proportion)
• Divide by the response rate within the site (expressed as a proportion)
• Divide by the service usage factor

The result for each case is a number that corresponds to the estimated number of persons in the population represented by that case. For example, a final weight of 10 for a case would mean that there were 10 persons in the population estimated to have the characteristics of this particular case. The sum of the weights is an estimate of the total size of the population from which the sample was drawn.

4. **Defining Strata and Clusters for Standard Errors**

The sample for this study was a stratified cluster sample, not a simple random sample of individuals. Special procedures are therefore required to calculate standard errors and confidence intervals. Those procedures require that each respondent’s stratum and cluster membership be known. We describe here how those fields in the data file were produced. The standard error calculations themselves were carried out by Jean Norris, using appropriate computer programs.

4.1 **Strata for Standard Errors**

Separate samples of sites were drawn within each of the two major parts of the county (centered on Oakland versus Berkeley) for each of the four types of services, resulting in eight major strata. The certainty sites in Oakland are also treated as separate strata (although the Oakland outreach services are represented only by the one certainly selection). There were ten separate strata in all.

Each record on the data file has a code to indicate which of the ten strata it was selected from. This is the variable to be used for the calculation of standard errors.

4.2 **Clusters for Standard Errors**

Each service facility or site was a primary sampling unit (PSU) or cluster, for purposes of sampling, and interviewing was successfully carried out at 31 sites. However, the largest sites were divided
up into random parts for purposes of calculating standard errors, in order to control the cluster sizes within strata. The Taylor series method of calculating standard errors requires that the cluster sizes within each stratum be of roughly the same size (such that the coefficient of variation of the size is less than .20). Those units created at random were used as the PSU’s for purposes of calculating standard errors. The final division of sites into randomized units was carried out by Jean Norris.

The data record for each respondent contains a value (1, 2, 3, etc.) for the final PSU (cluster). The PSU codes are unique when combined with the stratum value of 1 - 10.

The final stratum and PSU variables were merged with the questionnaire data and the weights, to construct the final data file. They are available to analysts wishing to calculate standard errors and confidence intervals that take into account the design of the sample. The 2013 Homeless Count and Survey Report lists some confidence intervals in Appendix D of the final report.
# Appendix D. Final Unsheltered Homeless Count Estimates with Confidence Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in households with at least one adult and one child</th>
<th>Number of Unsheltered Homeless People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 17 and under</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 18 to 24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 25 and older</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in households with only children</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in households without (minor) children</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>2,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 18 to 24</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 25 and older</td>
<td>1,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Persons</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>2,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI lower bound</td>
<td>1,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%CI upper bound</td>
<td>3,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number of Unsheltered Homeless People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronically Homeless Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronically Homeless Families</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Veterans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severely Mentally Ill</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronic Substance Abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons with HIV/AIDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victims of Domestic Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Maximum Available Services Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region name</th>
<th>Oakland (Males)</th>
<th>Oakland (Females)</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Mid-County</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Other North*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region code</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City names</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Mid-County</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Other North*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Males)</td>
<td>(Females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Soup Kitchen - Breakfast (B)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: Soup Kitchen - Lunch (L)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: Soup Kitchen - Dinner (D)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: Food pantries (FP)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Drop-In Center (DIC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3xMo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5Male/6Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6: Mobile Outreach (O)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter nights available (S)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Service Use (did NOT spend night in a shelter)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Service Use</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38M/39F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Service Use (DID spend previous night in a shelter)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Service Use</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24M/25F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other North is a subset of North, and is coded as a "7" in its own column of data, so that the research team can sort these data during the Service Use data cleaning process. Note that in 2013, it turned out that only one site (id#47 ECAP in Emeryville) was in the North region and it was coded as “Other North” for Service Use Data cleaning processes.

**Emergency shelters are required to serve breakfast and dinner. In a 2003 survey, the vast majority of respondents who reported staying in an emergency shelter “last night” also reported that they had spent all 7 nights of the previous week in an emergency shelter. Therefore, in 2013 it is assumed that respondents who spent the previous night in an emergency shelter could not have received any of their breakfast and dinner meals at a Soup Kitchen. During data cleaning, all respondents in a shelter had their Q1: B and Q3: D set to 0 (zero).
Appendix F. Survey Questionnaire

SITE COORDINATOR READ TO RESPONDENT:

We’re conducting a short survey of about 1,000 people using meal, food pantry, drop-in, and outreach services in the County. We do this survey every two years to help keep funding for programs serving low-income and homeless people. May we have ten minutes of your time today?

FILL OUT THIS FORM FOR EVERYONE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Date: 01/30/2013</th>
<th>Site Coordinator Initials ___ ___ ___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site ID #: _____________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name: ________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete by Observation:

Gender: 

( ) Male.....1
( ) Female.....2
( ) Other/Unknown.....3

Race/Ethnicity:

( ) Hispanic.....1
( ) White.........2
( ) Black.........3
( ) Asian.........4
( ) Other/Mixed....5

Interview Not Started:

( ) Minor.........1
( ) Refused......99
( ) Language Barrier

Spanish (1) Asian (2) Other (3) Unknown (4)

( ) Respondent Too Disabled....2

( ) Not Enough Time: [Optional explanation of why] _________________

Site Coordinator Comment (Optional):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
INTERVIEWER INITIALS: ___ ___ ___

INTERVIEWER READ TO RESPONDENT:

Hello, my name is ___________. I’m a volunteer with Alameda County EveryOne Home.

We won’t ask your name or other identifying information, and all of your responses are strictly confidential. Your honest response is very important to help us keep the housing funds we have for Alameda County. You may stop the interview at any time, or refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

I need to read each one all the way through.

I will start by asking about meals you ate at service sites in the last week.

1. Not counting any meals provided by a shelter program, how many days did you have breakfast at a soup kitchen or public dining room in the last 7 days? ___ DAYS

2. Not counting any meals provided by a shelter program, how many of the last 7 days did you have lunch at a soup kitchen or public dining room? ___ DAYS

3. Not counting any meals provided by a shelter program, how many of the last 7 days did you have dinner at a soup kitchen or public dining room? ___ DAYS

4. In the last seven days, how many days did you go to a food pantry? That’s a place where you get a bag or a box of food to take away and prepare later. ___ DAYS

5. Over the last seven days how many days did you go to a drop-in center or a multi-service center? That is a place where you can go to in the day, talk to someone, get a cup of coffee, pick up messages, and use a phone, but not stay overnight. ___ DAYS

6. Over the last seven days how many days did an outreach worker offer to help you? Outreach workers are people from agencies who come to you at outdoor locations to hand out blankets or food, see if you are okay, or offer help. ___ DAYS
7. Where did you stay last night [THE NIGHT OF JANUARY 29th]?
   
   □ a. The streets, a vehicle, an abandoned building, bus/ train/BART station/ airport, anywhere outside, or other place not meant for human habitation
   
   □ b. Hotel, motel, or campground paid for by an agency, church, or other service provider
      b1. What is the name of the hotel, motel or campground? ________________________________
      b2. What city is it in? ________________________________
   
   □ c. A garage, backyard, porch, shed, or driveway
   
   □ d. Shelter for single adults or youth or families
      d1. What is the shelter name? ________________________________
      d2. What city is it in? ________________________________
   
   □ e. Transitional housing for homeless adults, families or youth (where you pay rent and can live up to two years and receive services)
      e1. What is the name of the transitional housing program? ________________________________
      e2. What city is it in? ________________________________
   
   □ f. Permanent housing for formerly homeless persons (such as Shelter + Care, the Harrison Hotel, or UA Homes)
      f1. What is the name of the housing program? ________________________________
      f2. What city is it in? ________________________________
   
   □ g. Hotel or motel paid for by you or a family member
      g1. What is the name of the hotel or motel? ________________________________
      g2. What city is it in? ________________________________
   
   □ h. In a friend or family member’s room, apartment, or house
   
   □ i. Room, apartment or house that you rent (subsidized or not)
   
   □ j. House, apartment or condo that you own
   
   □ k. Foster care home or foster care group home
   
   □ l. Hospital or nursing facility
      l1. Have you been there for less than 30 days? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
      l2. Were you on the streets or in a shelter before that? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
   
   □ m. Psychiatric hospital or other mental health facility
      m1. Have you been there for less than 30 days? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
      m2. Were you on the streets or in a shelter before that? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
   
   □ n. Jail, prison or juvenile detention facility
      n1. Have you been there for less than 30 days? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
      n2. Were you on the streets or in a shelter before that? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
   
   □ o. Substance abuse treatment facility or detox center
      o1. Have you been there for less than 30 days? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
      o2. Were you on the streets or in a shelter before that? □ No ... 0 □ Yes ... 1 □ Don’t Know ... 98
   
   □ p. Other
      p1. Specify KIND OF THE PLACE: ________________________________
      p2. Specify NAME OF THE PLACE: ________________________________
   
   □ q. Don’t Know. . . . . 98 □ r. REFUSED. . . . . 99
8. These next questions are about the people in your immediate family. We need to count every person, and I need to know an age category for everyone. By immediate family, I mean the people who live with you now, some of the time or all of the time, so that if you moved to another residence, they would move with you. If some of your immediate family is temporarily living in a separate shelter, please count them here.

**PROMPT:** Remember that everything you tell me is confidential.

| A | Let’s start with:  
*Yourself, how old are you? __________  
MARK “1” BY AGE GROUP RESPONSE |
|---|------------------|
|   | So, one (1) person  
  _ 25 or older ............1  
  _ 18 to 24 .............2  
  _ 17 or under ...........3  
  _ DON’T KNOW ...........98  
  _ REFUSED ..............99 |
| B | In your family, are you **alone** or **with others**, like a partner, children, or other family members?  
  □ Alone  
  □ With others  
  □ DON’T KNOW  
  □ REFUSED |
| C | So, then the total number in your immediate family is:  
  __________ NUMBER  
  □ DON’T KNOW  
  □ REFUSED  
  **If 1, GO TO Q#9** |

Now we need to know the **age category** for everyone else in your immediate family.

| D | Your children, or your spouse’s children that live with you some of the time or all of the time:  
  how many in each age group?  
  MARK # BY AGE GROUP RESPONSE |
|   | □ NONE .................. 0  
  _ 25 or older ............1  
  _ 18 to 24 .............2  
  _ 17 or under ...........3  
  _ PREGNANT/UNBORN ....4  
  _ DON’T KNOW ...........98  
  _ REFUSED ..............99 |
| E | A spouse or partner:  
  how old is that person?  
  MARK # BY AGE GROUP RESPONSE |
|   | □ Don’t have one ....... 0  
  _ 25 or older ............1  
  _ 18 to 24 .............2  
  _ 17 or under ...........3  
  _ DON’T KNOW ...........98  
  _ REFUSED ..............99 |
| F | Brothers or sisters living with you:  
  how many in each age group?  
  MARK # BY AGE GROUP RESPONSE |
|   | □ NONE .................. 0  
  _ 25 or older ............1  
  _ 18 to 24 .............2  
  _ 17 or under ...........3  
  _ DON’T KNOW ...........98  
  _ REFUSED ..............99 |
| G | Other relatives or friends living with you in your immediate family:  
  how many in each age group?  
  MARK # BY AGE GROUP RESPONSE |
|   | □ NONE .................. 0  
  _ 25 or older ............1  
  _ 18 to 24 .............2  
  _ 17 or under ...........3  
  _ DON’T KNOW ...........98  
  _ REFUSED ..............99 |
9. How much of the last 12 months have you lived in a shelter, on the streets, in a car, or in other places not meant for habitation?

PROMPT: Your best estimate is fine.

MARK ONLY ONE

DAYS _____
WEEKS _____
MONTHS _____
ALL OF IT / ENTIRE TIME .............. 1
NONE OF THE LAST 12 MONTHS ........... 2
DON’T KNOW ..................................... 98
REFUSED .......................................... 99

10. How many separate times in the past 3 years have you lived in a shelter, on the streets, in a car, or in other places not meant for habitation?

PROMPT: How many separate times?

MARK ONLY ONE

This is my first time.............................................................. 1
2 to 3 times ......................................................................... 2
4 times or more ..................................................................... 4
All of it / entire time ............................................................ 5
NONE .................................................................................. 0
DON’T KNOW ................................................................. 98
REFUSED ................................................................. 99

11. Have you ever served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States?

PROMPT: Have you served in a full-time capacity in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard?

YES ................................................................. 1
NO ................................................................. 0
DON’T KNOW ......................................................... 98
REFUSED ................................................................. 99
12. Were you ever called into active duty as a member of the National Guard or as a Reservist?

**PROMPT:** For purposes other than training?

- YES ..................................................... 1
- NO .......................................................... 0
- DON’T KNOW ........................................... 98
- REFUSED ............................................... 99

13. Did you leave your last place because your spouse or partner or someone else in your family was hurting you or threatening to hurt you? That includes hurt or threatened by being kicked, hit, shoved, or beat up, or hurt or threatened with a knife or gun, or forced to have sex.

**PROMPT:** By someone in your family, inside the family.

- YES ..................................................... 1
- NO .......................................................... 0
- DON’T KNOW ........................................... 98
- REFUSED ............................................... 99

14. Were you ever, either as a child or as an adult, physically hurt or threatened by a spouse or partner or someone in your family? That includes hurt or threatened by being kicked, hit, shoved, or beat up, or hurt or threatened with a knife or gun, or forced to have sex.

**PROMPT:** By someone in your family, inside the family.

- YES ..................................................... 1
- NO .......................................................... 0
- DON’T KNOW ........................................... 98
- REFUSED ............................................... 99
15. The next questions are about your health and any disabilities you may have. Which of these statements are true for you?  MARK ALL THAT APPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>D.K.</th>
<th>REF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Does another adult or adult child 18 or older in your immediate family have a disabling condition such as a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability or chronic physical illness or disability?

- YES ..................................................... 1
- NO ..................................................... 0  GO TO Q#19
- NOT APPLICABLE ....................................... 2  GO TO Q#19
- DON’T KNOW ............................................. 98
- REFUSED ................................................ 99

17. How many other adults or adult children 18 or older in your immediate family have a disabling condition?

18. How many of those other adults or adult children 18 or older in your family with a disabling condition are here with you today?

19. Next, I’m going to ask you a few questions about alcohol use.
Remember, your answers are confidential and anonymous.

**PROMPT:** I have to ask everyone the same questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>D.K.</th>
<th>REF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. During the last 12 months, did you ever feel bad or guilty about your drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. During the last 12 months, did you ever have a drink first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or get rid of a hangover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. During the last 12 months, did a friend or family member ever tell you about things you said or did while you were drinking that you could not remember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. During the last 12 months, did you fail to do what was normally expected of you because of drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. The next few questions are about drug use. Remember, your answers are confidential and anonymous.

**PROMPT:** I have to ask everyone the same questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>D.K.</th>
<th>REF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. In the last 12 months, did you ever fail to do what was normally expected of you because of your use of drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. In the last 12 months, were you ever under the influence of drugs in a situation where you could get hurt, like driving, using knives or machinery, or anything else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. In the past 12 months, because of drug use, did you have any emotional or psychological problems, like feeling depressed, suspicious of people, paranoid, or having strange ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. In the past 12 months, was there a month or more when you spent a lot of time using drugs or getting over the effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. In the past 12 months, were there several times when you used a lot more drugs than you intended or used drugs for a longer time than you meant to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In the past 12 months, did you ever have to use more drugs than you used to, to get the same effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. In the past 12 months, did you ever use drugs to keep from feeling sick when you stopped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ NO DRUG USE 12+ MONTHS....1
There are just a few more questions. To let us categorize respondents, would you tell me:

21. How do you describe your race or ethnicity?

   **MARK ALL THAT APPLY**
   - White/Caucasian .............................................. 1
   - Black/African American ................................. 2
   - Hispanic/Latino ........................................... 3
   - Asian ................................................................. 4
   - Pacific Islander .............................................. 5
   - American Indian/Alaskan Native ......................... 6
   - Other ................................................................. 8

   **SPECIFY (OPTIONAL):** _____________________________
   - Declined to state ............................................. 99
   - Don't know ......................................................... 98

22. How do you identify your gender?

   - Male ......................................................................... 1
   - Female ................................................................. 2
   - Transgender ........................................................ 3

   **DECLINED TO STATE** ........................................ 99

**READ TO RESPONDENT:**

Thank you very much. We’re done with our questions. We really appreciate your help.
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE COMPLETE 23 AND 24 A – E.

23. If you could not get an answer about respondent’s age, please make your own best guess:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 25 or older</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 18 to 24 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(  ) 17 or younger</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. WERE ALL QUESTIONS UNDERSTOOD AND ANSWERED?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. RESPONDENT WAS IMPAIRED BY DRUGS OR ALCOHOL</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. RESPONDENT WAS UNABLE TO UNDERSTAND QUESTIONS, MENTALLY DISABLED</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. RESPONDENT BROKE OFF INTERVIEW ANY REASON GIVEN?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. INTERVIEWER STOPPED INTERVIEW WHY?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALAMEDA COUNTY EVERYONE HOME
2013 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR NEW PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Alameda County EveryOne Home is inviting applications for new permanent housing projects to serve homeless individuals and/or families. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Projects must be for chronically homeless individuals or families. Rapid Rehousing (RRH) must be for families. New projects can be proposed in one of two ways:

1. A new permanent housing project using funds reallocated from local projects that fall into Tier 2 and/or do not achieve the minimum score for inclusion in the package. The exact amount of this pool of funds is contingent on what projects are reallocated. The pool could be up to $1,241,000 dollars. Projects funded in this way can be either PSH or RRH.

2. Projects that are currently transitional housing or support services only projects that want to convert to permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing.

   Note: Any organization considering applying for projects of the 2nd type (Conversion) must notify the Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department and EveryOne Home immediately. Projects of this type will only be accepted in the competition if preliminarily approved for conversion.

Applicants responding to this RFP should be very familiar with the HUD NOFA issued November 9, 2012, and with the detailed guidance for completing new applications. See www.hudhre.info. Applicants are expected to know the eligible types of assistance, eligible populations, required match and other requirements from HUD.

Local new project applications are due electronically to everyonehome@acgov.org by 4:00 pm Friday January 3, 2013. Due to the competitive nature of the process and rigid HUD timing requirements, applications received after that time will not be considered.

All new projects received by the deadline will be reviewed and applicants will be notified by January 20th, 2014 whether they have been selected to submit a final application to HUD. Projects selected to submit must complete the New Project Application in e-snaps by January 28th. Selected projects may be required to make project changes to their project application in order to ensure they comply with HUD new project thresholds, fit into the appropriate Tier, and other requirements.

Ranking and Tiering
HUD is requiring the CoC’s submit their application with projects placed in a ranked order.

1. HUD will first fund all the projects in the first “Tier” (Tier 1) which will total as close as possible to $23,579,723 (our local annual renewal demand amount decreased by the mandatory 5% HUD reduction).

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
2. Projects following below this amount will be the list for Tier 2. HUD will fund any Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards nationally to all Tier 1 projects, up to the amount of funding it has available nationally. As the amount of additional funds that HUD will obtain is unknown, projects in Tier 2 are not certain to be funded. HUD will prioritize permanent housing projects in Tier 2. Given the Sequester’s impact on available funds, it is highly unlikely that any renewals of TH and SSO will be funded from Tier 2. We are therefore only including permanent housing projects in Tier 2.

New Project Applications may receive up to 100 points. The scoring sheet attached to the end of this RFP provides the breakdown of points by section.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be considered for inclusion in Tier 1. New Projects scoring below that will not be included in the package at all. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the RFP, and to self-score their project on the performance indicators as soon as possible in order to determine if they will meet the minimum score.

In addition to the total score projects receive, reviewers may use additional factors to break ties and/or to adjust the final order in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, and meet other local and national objectives for a strong and balanced package that maximizes points for the entire Continuum. Factors that may be considered include:

- the percent of chronically homeless persons served;
- the geographic diversity of the projects included in Tier 1;
- the projected impact of the loss of any residential buildings on homeless people.

If more renewal projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then the lowest scoring projects above the 60 point threshold will still be placed in Tier 2, subject to the adjustments described above.

If fewer projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then there will be funds in Tier 1 available for new permanent housing, subject to the adjustments described above.

New projects that are included in Tier 1 will be ranked after all renewals included in Tier 1.

Download a Word version of this application from the EveryOne Home website at www.everyonehome.org. Save your completed application as a PDF and attach to an email to everyonehome@acgov.org to submit as described on page 1.

For questions regarding the completion of this application, please contact EveryOne Home at everyonehome@acgov.org. All questions received on or prior to December 27, 2013 will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.
GENERAL SECTION (Worth up to 32 points for project type, meeting HUD priorities, and using Housing First)

a. Project Name:

b. Applicant Name:

c. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application:


d. Project type:  (Type an “X” inside checkbox to indicate selection.)

1.  □ New Permanent housing project from reallocated funds:
   a.  □ Permanent supportive housing
      i. Is this project exclusively for chronically homeless?  □ Yes  □ No
      (If answer is no, not eligible)
   b.  □ Rapid rehousing for families

2.  □ New Permanent housing project from an existing project conversion
   a.  □ Permanent supportive housing
      i. Is this project exclusively for chronically homeless?  □ Yes  □ No
      (If answer is no, not eligible)
   b.  □ Rapid rehousing for families

Please note: Projects wishing to convert some or all of their projects from TH or SSO to PH must have notified Alameda County HCD and EveryOne Home of their intent to convert and have been preliminarily approved for conversion. Because conversion requires sun setting the current project, which may need to occur before new HUD funds are in place, the project needs to establish that bridge funding is in place or likely so that no persons will have to exit the prior project into homelessness.

Because final pool for reallocation is still not known, we are asking for projects to provide a budget range for their proposals. The maximum amount a single project can request is $1,240,000. This is the amount of Tier 2 funds. The Continuum may have more or less than this amount to allocate to new projects.

e. Amount of application:
   Minimum $  □   Maximum $  □

f. Does this project include acquisition, new construction or rehabilitation?  □ Yes  □ No

g. Number of Units/Subsidies
1. Total units/subsidies in project for homeless persons: [ ]

2. Total beds for homeless persons: [ ]

3. Total units in project for chronically homeless (CoC funding can only apply to PSH units for the homeless this must be 100% of units included in application): [ ]

4. If this application is for a project that includes additional units for other populations other than homeless, total units in Project : [ ]

*If this application is for a project which will include more units than those covered by funds requested in this application, please attach a table of all units, their affordability levels, and the target populations with your application.*

h. List all partners in this project and their role(s), and whether they will be a “subrecipient” per HUD’s definition. Add additional rows as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Role (Developer, Service Provider, Property Manager, Rental Assistance administrator, etc.)</th>
<th>Sub recipient? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Primary location of Project (city): [ ]

j. Areas of the County served by Project (list specific cities or regions): [ ]

l. Utilizing a Housing First Approach: [HUD defines Housing First as; “a model of housing assistance that is offered without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary goals.”] Please describe how the project will employ a Housing First approach.

[ ]

**DEMONSTRATED CAPACITY of Applicant, Subrecipient(s) and Other Partners (Worth up to 30 points)**

(As much as possible, these questions have been chosen to be identical to those that will be required in e-snaps if selected for submission. Question numbers from the New Project Application in e-snaps are noted in parentheses after the question where applicable. Most word limitations are locally established.)*

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
a. (500 words or less) Describe the experience of the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities in the application, given funding and time limitations (2.B.1)*

b. (250 words or less) Describe the experience of the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) in leveraging other Federal, state, local and private funds (2.B.2)*

c. Describe the basic organization and management structure of the applicant and subrecipients (if any.) Include evidence of internal and external coordination and adequate financial accounting system. (2.B.3)*

d. Has this set of partners or agencies worked together previously on a similar project? Please explain.

e. Are there any unresolved monitoring or audit finding for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the application or potential subrecipients?

- Yes
- No

If yes, describe the unresolved monitoring or audit findings.

f. Quality Assurance

Please use the space below to describe policies, procedures and actions the project and its sponsor take to ensure continuous quality improvement. How does the agency stay abreast of and implement best practices in the field? How is quality of service, consumer satisfaction and program performance assessed and maintained? Please address how data is used in planning and program management as well as how often it is updated and data quality reports run and errors corrected. How is staff trained and managed to ensure high quality of care?
**Past Performance on Relevant Outcome Measures:**
Complete the Outcome chart below for all partners in this application with previous experience with relevant projects of similar type. Applicants applying for Permanent Supportive Housing should complete the chart for all or five (whichever is less) Permanent Supportive Housing projects they currently operate which report data in HMIS, and for any SSO tied to permanent housing they or any service partner in the application operate. For example, if the applicant currently operates one or more PSH or S+C programs, complete a column in the chart with data from Outcomes Report run for 10/1/12-9/30/13 for each of these programs. If the applicant or a services partner currently operates an SSO that provides services in Permanent Housing, complete a column in the chart with data from the same time period for each of these programs.

1. **Outcomes Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Agency Name</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>Project 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type (PSH, RRH, SSO tied to PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.1: Obtaining Permanent Housing (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13 for RRH; insert N/A for PSH and SSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.2: Permanent Housing Retention &gt; 6 months (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13 for PSH and SSO’s; insert N/A for RRH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B: Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure C: Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If the applicant or any partners did not reach or exceed the benchmark on any of the indicators above appropriate to the sector, please explain how the benchmark level of performance for the project in this application will be achieved.

3. If the applicant or any partners do(es) not have relevant HMIS data (similar program type) to demonstrate ability to meet or exceed performance benchmarks, please describe how the project will achieve performance benchmarks. Include data from sources other than HMIS if available and relevant.

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
Instructions for completing outcomes charts
The following measures should come from the HMIS Outcomes Report: 1) People Obtaining Permanent Housing for RRH 2) Adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with income for all projects. All projects should run the Outcomes report from HMIS for the following periods—10/1/11-9/30/12 and 10/1/12-9/30/13—and attach a copy of the "Program Summary" Tab page only for each report. Please attach a copy of the Outcomes Report Program Summary pages for each project included in the chart.

To be used by Rapid Rehousing for Outcome A.

To be used by all other program types for Outcome B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Housing Summary</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>HmIss %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>80. %</td>
<td>57/71</td>
<td>76. %</td>
<td>54/71</td>
<td>80. %</td>
<td>45/56</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing - entered w/housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 36 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to permanent or interim housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults exiting with employment income</td>
<td>34. %</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>34. %</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>26. %</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency/Process Measures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People exiting to Known Destination</td>
<td>94. %</td>
<td>67/71</td>
<td>90. %</td>
<td>64/71</td>
<td>93. %</td>
<td>52/56</td>
<td>(95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Obtain permanent housing within 60 days</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adults who gain employment, 50% do so within 13 weeks</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
From APRs (for PSH and SSO tied to Permanent Housing Only): Permanent Supportive Housing Projects and SSO projects connected directly to Permanent Housing must produce the retention information from Question 27. All projects should run the APR for 10/1/12-9/30/13 and attach a copy to the application. for each project included in the chart. Using the formula below and the sample table identifying each cell value, calculate the 6 month retention rate. If the applicant did not meet the benchmark, run an APR for the dates listed above (10/1/11-9/30/12) and calculate the rate for six months of retention both years to identify whether the performance was 10 percentage points greater than the previous year.

Housing Retention > 6 months: \( \frac{(P - H - I - J + G) - A - B - C}{(P - H - I - J + G)} = \% \) of persons retaining permanent housing for 6 months or more.

### 27. Length of Participation by Exit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
From APRs (for all project types) produce the Access to Mainstream Benefits information from 10/1/12-9/30/13. Using questions 26a2 and 26b2 below from the APR, calculate use of mainstream benefits as follows:

\[
\frac{(B+G)}{(E+J)} = \% \text{ of adults non-cash mainstream benefits}
\]

26a2. Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status - Leavers

Client Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status
Number of Non-Cash Benefits by Number of Persons - Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26b2. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources - Stayers

Client Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status
Number of Non-Cash Benefits by Number of Persons - Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DETAIL

Project Summary

a. (750 words or less) Provide a description that addresses the entire scope of the proposed project. (3B.1)*

b. (200 words or less) Describe the specific population to be served and how this project will meet their needs.

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
Housing Assistance summary

c. (300 words or less) If applicable, describe the proposed development activities and the responsibility that the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) will have in developing, operating and maintaining the property.


d. If applicable, indicate the type of rental assistance (ex. TBRA, SRA):  

   1. Indicate the maximum length of rental assistance:  

   2. Describe the method for determining the type, amount and duration of rental assistance that participants can receive:  

   3. What agency will administer the rental assistance? (must be a PHA or a unit of State or local government):  


e. Will participants be required to live in a particular structure, unit, or locality, at some point during their participation?  


f. Will the project use an existing homeless facility or incorporate activities provided by an existing project?  


Services and Outreach

g. (300 words or less) describe how participants will be assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing (4A.4)*  


h. (300 words or less) Describe specifically how participants will be assisted to both increase their employment and/or income and to maximize the ability to live independently (4A.5)*  


i. (200 words or less) Describe the outreach plan to bring homeless persons into the project (4C.3)*  


*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
TIMING

a. (no word limit, please be concise but specific and thorough) Describe the estimated schedule for the proposed activities, the management plan and the method for assuring effective and timely completion of the work (3B.2)*

b. By what date is the first person/household expected to be housed by this project?

c. By what date is the project expected to be at capacity?

d. (no word limit, please be concise but specific and thorough) If this project is a conversion project (an existing SHP TH or SSO grant that is converting to permanent housing), please list the expiration date of the current grant, and describe how activities will be continued or transitioned before a new grant agreement so that no currently served person becomes homeless.

e. What is the proposed term of this grant? (See HUD NOFA p. 16 for options)
**BUDGET**

a. Please complete the budget form below or attach a similar form. This form is the summary budget of the HUD new project application in e-snaps. (7J)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Costs</th>
<th>Annual Assistance Requested</th>
<th>Grant Term</th>
<th>Total Assistance Requested for Grant term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Leased Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Leased Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Housing Relocation and Stabilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Short-term/Medium-term Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Long-term Rental Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supportive Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HMIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Subtotal costs requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Admin (up to 10% allowed by HUD, but 7% is the maximum for full points locally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Assistance Plus Admin Requested (sum lines 9 and 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cash Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In-kind Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Total Match (sum lines 12 and 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Budget (sum lines 11 and 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Budget Narrative: (300 words or less)** Briefly describe how the funds will be used for the project and the source of matching funds.


c. If the project includes short- or medium-term rental assistance, please describe how the budget for short- or medium term financial assistance and the budget for housing stabilization was developed (applicants are encouraged to provided a table or chart if useful) and the average estimated cost per person or household assisted, and average estimated length of assistance.


*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
d. If the project includes long-term rental assistance, please complete the table below or attach a similar one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>FMR</th>
<th># of Months</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. If the project includes any new construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation, please include a complete development budget, and sources and uses. You may use a format that is currently acceptable to State or local government housing sources. (Attach separately.)

f. If the project includes operating funds, please include a complete annual operating budget, and a 15 year operating budget. (Attach separately.)

**LEVERAGING**
Please complete the leveraging chart below or attach a similar chart from e-snaps. Add additional rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contribution (e.g. cash, in-kind)</th>
<th>Name the Source of the Contribution</th>
<th>Type of Source (government, Private)</th>
<th>Date of Written Commitment</th>
<th>Value of Written Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leverage letters do not need to be submitted with the local application, but do need to be on file with HCD, the collaborative applicant, prior to package submission on 2/3/13.

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
## SCORING FOR NEW PROJECTS

Total points available = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description of basis for assigning points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Primary Activity</td>
<td>18 points</td>
<td>Permanent Housing (PH) = 18 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 HUD priorities=chronically homeless or rapid rehousing for families | Up to 8 points | Provides PSH to 100% of chronically homeless households = 8 Points  
Provides Rapid Rehousing to families= 4 Points |
| 3 Using Housing First Approach                 | Up to 6 points | Applicant will offer housing assistance without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary. |
| 4 Demonstrated Capacity of Grantee and Partners | Up to 30 points | Applicant and any subrecipients have recent relevant experience performing similar activities; If application has subrecipients, applicant organizations have experience working together; No applicant or subrecipient has outstanding monitoring or audit issues or issues are explained; applicant and partners meet or exceed local outcome measure benchmarks or have credible explanation how the proposed project will meet them. Applicant has strong quality assurance plan in place. |
| 5 Project Detail                               | Up to 16 points | Project description describes the type and purpose of project and the target population; project meets a local need; project is well-designed to meet the identified need; services proposed are appropriate to meet housing, income and independent living goals; outreach plans are well-defined. |
| 6 Timing                                       | Up to 8 points | Project has a clear schedule for the proposed activities; project is likely to begin serving homeless people quickly and to reach full capacity within one year; if project is a conversion project, a reasonable transition plan is established. |
| 7 Budget                                       | Up to 8 points | Budget is reasonable for type of project and clearly articulated; Required match of at least 25% is included; Other project funds needed for project are committed or likely; Project is cost effective compared to other similar new permanent housing applications; if a conversion project a clear strategy is identified to ensure no persons are made homeless if there is a funding gap. |
| 8 Leverage                                     | Up to 3 points | Project leverages more than 150% of HUD budget = 3 Points  
Project leverages 100%-150% of HUD budget = 1.5 Points  
Project leverages 100% or less of HUD budget = 0 Points |
| 9 Completeness and Clarity of Application      | Up to 3 points | Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered. |

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
As it did last year, HUD is requiring all projects submitting from a local Continuum of Care (CoC) to be rated and ranked by the CoC and included in the collaborative application. In order to complete the rating and ranking, the HUD Continuum of Care NOFA process includes a local application to EveryOne Home and a project application to HUD. All applicants submitting projects for renewal must complete this local application in addition to the Renewal Project Application in e-snaps. A separate application is available for new projects that will be created through any reallocation of funds that will occur.

Renewal projects must complete the following application electronically and submit via email to everyonehome@acgov.org by 4:00:00 pm Friday, January 3, 2014.

The Renewal Application in e-snaps must also be completed by January 3, 2014. Applicants are encouraged to complete the e-snaps application earlier, as some questions below can be answered by cutting and pasting answers from the e-snaps application.

In addition to the completed local application form, applicants must include copies of the required back up documentation as a PDF. The required documents and instructions for their uses are described in greater detail in the sections below, and include:

1. The project’s InHouse Demographics Report for October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013.
2. InHOUSE Outcomes Report, “Program Summary” Pages only, run to cover the last two years, starting October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013 as the current period and October 1, 2011-September 30, 2012 as the prior period.
3. Questions 26, charts a2 & b2, and 27 of the APR for the 12 months ending September 30, 2013. This is used to calculate 6 month retention (only applies to PSH and SSO projects attached to Permanent Housing) and access to mainstream benefits (all project types)
4. The Returns to Homelessness Report for October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013. EveryOne Home or HMIS staff will run and send PDF’s to each project.
5. Project Leveraging chart from e-snaps.
7. Any Performance Improvement Plans submitted last year-except Exits to Known Destinations.

Please ensure the PDF is titled with the name of the project.

Ranking and Tiering

There are differences from last year’s NOFA and thereby Alameda County’s local process:

HUD is still requiring CoC’s to rank their projects in two tiers, with Tier 1 projects assured of funding and Tier 2 projects highly at risk. Last year the Tier 2 amount was 3.5% of the total package. This year it is 5%. Alameda County’s Grant Inventory Worksheet has our Annual Renewal Demand at $24,820,761. Five percent of that is an estimated $1,241,038 to be ranked in Tier 2, leaving a Tier 1 amount of $23,579,723. HUD will first fund all the projects ranked in the Tier 1 up to the Tier 1 amount.
Projects ranked below this amount will fall into Tier 2. HUD will consider any project that has even a portion of its budget in Tier 2 as wholly in Tier 2 for these purposes.

HUD will fund Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards nationally to all Tier 1 projects, up to the amount of funding it has available nationally. Different than last year, HUD will prioritize permanent housing projects, both renewal and new, before other types of renewals are funded in Tier 2 (See page 49 of the 2013 NOFA). Because of Sequestration it is expected that HUD will be able to fund fewer Tier 2 projects than it did last year.

In order to maximize the amount of Tier 2 funds our community might recapture, Transitional Housing and Support Services Only renewals, who’s scores place them into Tier 2 in the initial rating and ranking, will not be included in the package, their funds will be reallocated to new permanent housing project(s).

Renewal Projects may receive up to 100 points. The application form and the scoring tool are tightly linked. As you prepare the application you may want to detach the scoring chart at the end of this RFP and use it along side many of the sections in order to self score.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be considered for inclusion in Tier 1. Projects scoring below that are subject to reallocation. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the RFP, and to self-score their project on the performance indicators as soon as possible in order to determine if they will meet the minimum score.

In addition to the total score projects receive, reviewers may use additional factors to break ties and/or to adjust the final order in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, and meet other local objectives for a strong and balanced package that maximizes points for the entire Continuum. Factors that may be considered include:

- the geographic and population diversity of the projects included in Tier 1;
- the projected impact of the loss of any residential buildings on homeless people;
- the expiration date and amount of the grant.
- Whether projects attempted to convert from TH to PH and were denied by HUD

If more projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then the lowest scoring projects above the 60 point threshold will still be placed in Tier 2, subject to the adjustments described above.

If fewer projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then there will be funds in Tier 1 available for new permanent housing, subject to the adjustments described above.

New projects that are included in Tier 1 will be ranked after all renewals included in Tier 1.

Download a Word version of this application from the EveryOne Home website at www.everyhome.org. Save your completed application as a PDF and attach to an email to everyonehome@acgov.org to submit as described on page 1.

Voluntary reductions or eliminations of grants
Given that a reduction of total HUD funding is assured, with projects ranked in Tier 2 likely to be eliminated, projects may wish to assist the CoC to meet the 5% reduction by opting to voluntarily reduce the amount of renewal funds they are requesting. Grants that have consistently under spent may wish
to consider this. Projects that determine they are unlikely to receive the minimum score on their local application may elect not to submit. Page 1 of the application has a space to indicate if the amount requested is less than the amount indicated on the Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW) and by how much. Projects cannot request more than what is listed on the GIW. Those projects wishing to withdraw from consideration can do so by completing items 1.a-d of the application and submitting a PDF of that application page to everyonehome@acgov.org.

For questions regarding the completion of the local application, please contact EveryOne Home at everyonehome@acgov.org. All questions received on or prior to December 27th will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.

For questions regarding the completion of the Project Application in e-snaps, please contact Riley Wilkerson at riley.wilkerson@acgov.org. Answers to questions regarding the Project Application may be shared with other applicants if they are considered germane to other applicants.
ALAMEDA COUNTY LOCAL RENEWAL APPLICATION

GENERAL SECTION (section worth up to 40 points; 18 for activity type, 22 points for alignment with HUD priorities)

a. Project Name:  

b. Applicant Name:  

c. □ This project is not submitting a request for HUD funding in 2013. If you are not submitting a project application please complete item d. below, make a PDF of this page and submit it via email to everyonehome@acgov.org.

d. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application or withdraw it from consideration:  

e. Primary Activity Type:  □ PH (PSH or RRH) □ TH □ SSO □ HMIS □ CoC Planning  

f. If SSO, please indicate type of SSO project, per local designation:  □ Drop in □ Street Outreach □ Employment □ Services tied to PH

g. Capacity

Number of Units in project:  or □ Not applicable

Point in Time Capacity:  Persons served at a point in time  
Households served at a point in time  

Annual Capacity:  Persons served in a year  
Households served in a year  

h. Service Area:  
Primary location of Project (city):  
Areas of the County served by Project (list specific cities or regions):  

i. Amount of application:  

Does this amount match what is listed in the GIW? □ Yes □ No.

If no what is the amount by which the request is being reduced? $
j. End date of current HUD grant: 

k. Please insert the **General Description** of your project as included in the HUD Project Application Form in e-snaps:

l. If renewing for a lower amount, please describe how the project will continue to be able to meet its program outcomes and performance targets:

m. Mainstream Resources: Please describe how this project systematically assists homeless persons to identify and apply for mainstream benefits with other federal agency program such as TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, SCHIP, WIC, etc.:

n. Education:

   1. Does this project have an active collaboration with one or more local school districts to identify homeless individuals and families and ensure individuals and families understand their eligibility for educational services? Please describe.

   2. Does the project have established policies to require that all children are enrolled in school? Please describe.

o. Does this project or the applicant agency have any of the following issues: 1) Any audit findings from a HUD monitoring that are overdue or have not been satisfactorily resolved; 2) A current outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon; 3) Audit findings from any auditor that have not been resolved?

   □ No    □ Yes

If yes, explain status of issues:

p. **HUD Priorities—Ending Chronic Homelessness**: If project is Permanent Supportive Housing or Services tied to Permanent Supportive Housing how does it serve chronically homeless individuals and families?

   □ Exclusively (100%) All units in project are dedicated to the chronically homeless
Not all units are dedicated, but by policy and practice a portion of turnover units are prioritized to chronically homeless:  

- 100%  
- 85%  
- 50%

Is this policy:

- In place and operational
- In place and will be operationalized within 6 months
- Under consideration

What percent of clients served in the last year were chronically homeless?  
(Must be verifiable in attached HMIS demographics report from 10/1/12-9/30/13)

- N/A, this is not a PSH project and/or this is not a specific target population for this project.

q. HUD Priorities—Rapidly Rehousing Families: Is this project Rapid Rehousing for Families?  

- Yes  
- No

r. HUD Priorities--Target Populations: Does this project serve 50% or more of the following populations?  

- Veterans  
- Youth  
- Domestic Violence survivors  
- Unsheltered Homeless  
(Must be verifiable in attached HMIS demographics report from 10/1/12-9/30/13)

s. HUD Priorities--Utilizing a Housing First Approach: [HUD defines Housing First as; “a model of housing assistance that is offered without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary goals.”] Please describe how the project employs a Housing First approach. These principles can be applied to TH and SSO projects as well as PH and all projects can earn points for this narrative.

u. If this project is an SSO or TH project, is it considering converting to permanent housing?*  

- Yes, in 2014  
- Considering for 2014  
- Yes, in 2015  
- Considering for 2015

What technical assistance would be helpful in making or executing this decision?*  

*We understand that conversion is very challenging and may not always be possible or in the best interest of the project. A positive response to these questions does not constitute a commitment.
PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (Section worth up to 38 Points). The following section is related to project performance on local and HUD required outcomes. Please read the instructions carefully and complete Table 1, 2, or 3 below (according to program type).

INSTRUCTIONS

From InHOUSE Outcomes report: All projects should run the Outcomes report from HMIS for the following periods—10/1/11-9/30/12 and 10/1/12-9/30/13—and attach a copy of the “Program Summary” Tab page only for each report. Fill in the corresponding table based on the report for those measures that apply to your program type only. See the scoring pages for the project type, for the benchmark, and to self-score.

To be used by Transitional Housing and SSOs not tied to PH, for Outcome A.

To be used for SSO Employment only, for Outcome B.

To be used by all other program types for Outcome B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Housing Summary</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>Hmlss %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57/71</td>
<td>76. %</td>
<td>54/71</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45/56</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing - entered w/housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 36 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to permanent or interim housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults exiting with employment income</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency/Process Measures**

| People exiting to Known Destination | 94% | 67/71 | 90% | 64/71 | 93% | 52/56 | (95%) |
| * Obtain permanent housing within 60 days | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | (N/A) |
| Of adults who gain employment, 50% do so within 13 weeks | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | (N/A) |

Attach a copy of the Outcomes report to the application.
From APRs (for PSH, RRH, and PSH and SSO tied to Permanent Housing Only): Permanent Supportive Housing Projects and SSO projects connected directly to Permanent Housing must produce the retention information from 10/1/12-9/30/13 question 27. Using the formula below and the sample table identifying each cell value, calculate the 6 month retention rate. If the applicant did not meet the benchmark, run an APR for the dates listed above (10/1/12-9/30/13) and calculate the rate for six months of retention both years to identify whether the performance was 10 percentage points greater than the previous year.

Housing Retention > 6 months: \((P - H - I - J + G) - A - B - C / (P - H - I - J + G) = \% \text{ of persons retaining permanent housing for 6 months or more.}\)

Attach a copy of Question 27 from the 10/1/12-9/30/13 APR, or from the last two APR’s if the project did not meet benchmarks this year but did make the 10 point improvement.

27. Length of Participation by Exit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Participation by Exit Status</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From APRs (for all project types) produce the Access to Mainstream Benefits information from 10/1/12-9/30/1. Using questions 26a2 and 26b2 below from the APR, calculate use of mainstream benefits as follows:

\[(B+G)/(E+J) = \% \text{ of adults non-cash mainstream benefits}\]

### 26a2. Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status - Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 26b2. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources - Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach charts from Question 26a2 from the 10/1/12-9/30/13 APR or from the last two APR’s if the project did not meet benchmarks this year but did make the 10 point improvement.
### 1. Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing, and SSOs tied to Permanent Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use APR for Outcomes A-C and Returns to Homelessness Report for Outcome D</th>
<th>Benchmark for applicable sector</th>
<th>Difference between project performance and benchmark (+/-)</th>
<th>If project performance was not at or above the benchmark, was it 10 points greater than the previous grant year? Y/N</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. % of person who exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 12 months*</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EveryOne Home staff and/or HMIS staff will generate these reports, which will be provided to you by 12/17/13.

### 2. Transitional Housing, SSO Street Outreach and SSO Drop-In Center

<p>| Outcome Measure | Use Outcomes Report for Outcome A; Benchmark for applicable | Difference between project | If project performance was not at or above the benchmark, was it 10 | Self Score: Please |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</th>
<th>APR for Outcomes B-C and Returns to Homelessness Report for Outcome D</th>
<th>sector</th>
<th>performance and benchmark (+/-)</th>
<th>points greater than the previous grant year? Y/N</th>
<th>see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. % of person who exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 12 months*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EveryOne Home staff and/or HMIS staff will generate these reports, which will be provided to you by 12/17/13.

### 3. SSO Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use Outcomes Report for Outcome A; APR for</th>
<th>Benchmark for applicable sector</th>
<th>Difference between project performance</th>
<th>If project performance was not at or above the benchmark,</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes B-C and Returns to Homelessness Report for Outcome D</th>
<th>and benchmark (+/-)</th>
<th>was it 10 points greater than the previous grant year? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adults who obtain or maintain earned income</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. % of person who exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 12 months*</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EveryOne Home staff and/or HMIS staff will generate these reports, which will be provided to you by 12/17/13.
SPENDING (Section worth up to 4 points)

HUD and Congress have both emphasized the importance of spending all allocated grant funds in a timely fashion. In light of certain cuts in this funding round, it is all the more important that we send back as little money as possible from grants that remain funded.

a. All applicants must complete this chart, even if the project had no funds remaining in the most recent grant year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unspent funds</th>
<th>Dates of grant year</th>
<th>Amount of Total Grant awarded</th>
<th>Amount unspent and returned</th>
<th>% of grant award unspent (Amount unspent / Amount of Total Grant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed grant year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. If this project had remaining grant funds in the most recent year, please explain briefly why and what steps have been taken to increase expenditures in the current and coming years if returned funds were over 5% of the grant value:

____________________________________________________

__________________________


c. Is this project classified as Rental Assistance?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No
ALAMEDA COUNTY EVERYONE HOME
INSTRUCTIONS FOR HMIS RENEWAL PROJECT APPLICATION

As it did last year, HUD is requiring all projects submitting from a local Continuum of Care (CoC) to be rated and ranked by the CoC and included in the collaborative application. In order to complete the rating and ranking, the HUD Continuum of Care NOFA process includes a local application to EveryOne Home and a project application to HUD. All applicants submitting projects for renewal must complete this local application in addition to the Renewal Project Application in e-snaps. A separate application is available for new projects that will be created through any reallocation of funds that will occur. The HMIS project must complete the following application electronically and submit via email to everyonehome@acgov.org by 4:00:00 pm Friday, January 3, 2014.

The Renewal Application in e-snaps must also be completed by January 3, 2014. Applicants are encouraged to complete the e-snaps application earlier, as some questions below can be answered by cutting and pasting answers from the e-snaps application.

In addition to the completed local application form, applicants must include copies of the required back up documentation as a PDF. The required documents and instructions for their uses are described in greater detail in the sections below, and include:

1. HMIS report verifying bed coverage
2. HMIS report verifying ability to generate, system-wide APRs, AHAR, and the CAPER
4. Project Leveraging chart from e-snaps.
5. HMIS generated report on data completeness as described on page 5 of this application

Please ensure the PDF is titled with the name of the project.

**Ranking and Tiering**

**There are differences from last year’s NOFA and thereby Alameda County’s local process:**

HUD is still requiring CoC’s to rank their projects in two tiers, with Tier 1 projects assured of funding and Tier 2 projects highly at risk. Last year the Tier 2 amount was 3.5% of the total package. **This year it is 5%**. Alameda County’s Grant Inventory Worksheet has our Annual Renewal Demand at $24,820,761. Five percent of that is an estimated $1,241,038 to be ranked in Tier 2, leaving a Tier 1 amount of $23,579,723. HUD will first fund all the projects ranked in the Tier 1 up to the Tier 1 amount. Projects ranked below this amount will fall into Tier 2. HUD will consider any project that has even a portion of its budget in Tier 2 as wholly in Tier 2 for these purposes.

HUD will fund Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards nationally to **all** Tier 1 projects, up to the amount of funding it has available nationally. Different than last year, HUD will prioritize permanent housing projects, both renewal and new, before other types of renewals are funded in Tier 2 (See page 49 of the 2013 NOFA). Because of Sequestration it is expected that HUD will be able to fund fewer Tier 2 projects than it did last year.
In order to maximize the amount of Tier 2 funds our community might recapture, Transitional Housing and Support Services Only renewals, who’s scores place them into Tier 2 in the initial rating and ranking, will not be included in the package, their funds will be reallocated to new permanent housing project(s).

The HMIS project may receive up to 100 points. The application form and the scoring tool are tightly linked. As you prepare the application you may want to detach the scoring chart at the end of this RFP and use it along side many of the sections in order to self score.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be considered for inclusion in Tier 1. Projects scoring below that are subject to reallocation.

In addition to the total score projects receive, reviewers may use additional factors to break ties and/or to adjust the final order in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, and meet other local objectives for a strong and balanced package that maximizes points for the entire Continuum.

If more projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then the lowest scoring projects above the 60 point threshold will still be placed in Tier 2, subject to the adjustments described above.

If fewer projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then there will be funds in Tier 1 available for new permanent housing, subject to the adjustments described above.

New projects that are included in Tier 1 will be ranked after all renewals included in Tier 1.

Download a Word version of this application from the EveryOne Home website at www.everyonehome.org. Save your completed application as a PDF and attach to an email to everyonehome@acgov.org to submit as described on page 1.

Voluntary reductions or eliminations of grants
Given that a reduction of total HUD funding is assured, with projects ranked in Tier 2 likely to be eliminated, projects may wish to assist the CoC to meet the 5% reduction by opting to voluntarily reduce the amount of renewal funds they are requesting. Grants that have consistently under spent may wish to consider this. Projects that determine they are unlikely to receive the minimum score on their local application may elect not to submit. Page 1 of the application has a space to indicate if the amount requested is less than the amount indicated on the Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW) and by how much. Projects cannot request more than what is listed on the GIW. Those projects wishing to withdraw from consideration can do so by completing items 1.a-d of the application and submitting a PDF of that application page to everyonehome@acgov.org.

For questions regarding the completion of the local application, please contact EveryOne Home at everyonehome@acgov.org. All questions received on or prior to December 27th will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.

For questions regarding the completion of the Project Application in e-snaps, please contact Riley Wilkerson at riley.wilkerson@acgov.org. Answers to questions regarding the Project Application may be shared with other applicants if they are considered germane to other applicants.
ALAMEDA COUNTY LOCAL RENEWAL APPLICATION

GENERAL SECTION (section worth up to 40 points; 18 for activity type, 22 points for alignment with HUD priorities)

a. Project Name: ____________________________

b. Applicant Name: ____________________________

c. □ This project is not submitting a request for HUD funding in 2013. If you are not submitting a project application please complete item d. below, make a PDF of this page and submit it via email to everyonehome@acgov.org.

d. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application or withdraw it from consideration: ____________________________

e. Primary Activity Type:  □ PH (PSH or RRH)  □ TH  □ SSO  □ HMIS  □ CoC Planning

f. Capacity

   Number of records in data system: ____________________________

   Annual Growth in records: # of records added in program year 10/1/2012-9/30/13 ____________________________

   # of active user licenses ____________________________ # of member agencies ____________________________

h. Service Area:  Primary location of Project (city): ____________________________

   Areas of the County served by Project (list specific cities or regions): ____________________________

i. Amount of application: $____________________

   Does this amount match what is listed in the GIW? □ Yes  □ No.

   If no what is the amount by which the request is being reduced? $____________________

j. End date of current HUD grant: ____________________________

k. Please insert the General Description of your project as included in the HUD Project Application Form in e-snaps: ____________________________
I. Does this project or the applicant agency have any of the following issues: 1) Any audit findings from a HUD monitoring that are overdue or have not been satisfactorily resolved; 2) A current outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon; 3) Audit findings from any auditor that have not been resolved?

☐ No  ☐ Yes

If yes, explain status of issues:

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (Section worth up to 45 Points). The following section is related to project performance related to HMIS’s contributions to the Continuum of Care’s performance

Performance Factor A: Bed Coverage

Excluding those for victims’ services, what percentage of the C of C bed capacity is covered by HMIS? This includes all emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing, and permanent supportive housing.

☐ %

Performance Factor B: Generating Required Reports

Does the HMIS system generate the following reports?

- Annual Performance Review  ☐ No  ☐ Yes
- Annual Homeless Assessment Report  ☐ No  ☐ Yes
- CAPER  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Performance Factor C: Point in Time Count and Sub-populations

Was the sheltered point-in-time count conducted in January of 2013?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Was it submitted in HDX by 4/30/2013?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Did it include all sub-population data?  ☐ No  ☐ Yes
SPENDING (Section worth up to 4 points)

HUD and Congress have both emphasized the importance of spending all allocated grant funds in a timely fashion. In light of certain cuts in this funding round, it is all the more important that we send back as little money as possible from grants that remain funded.

a. All applicants must complete this chart, even if the project had no funds remaining in the most recent grant year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unspent funds</th>
<th>Dates of grant year</th>
<th>Amount of Total Grant awarded</th>
<th>Amount unspent and returned</th>
<th>% of grant award unspent (Amount unspent / Amount of Total Grant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recently completed grant year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. If this project had remaining grant funds in the most recent year, please explain briefly why and what steps have been taken to increase expenditures in the current and coming years if returned funds were over 5% of the grant value:

HMIS DATA QUALITY (Section worth up to 18 points)

a. Indicate the percent of unduplicated records with null or missing values:

   %

b. Indicate the percent of unduplicated records with refused or unknown values:

   %

Attach a data quality report as back-up documentation.

Leverage (Section worth up to 2 points)

Please attach a copy of the leveraging chart included in the Project Application in e-snaps. Leverage letters do not need to be submitted with the local application, but do need to be on file with HCD, the collaborative applicant prior to package submission on 2/3/13.

Please insert the summary information into the fields below.

a. Total amount and % leveraged beyond the match requirement:

   $   %
QUALITY ASSURANCE (Section worth up to 10 points)

Narrative: Please use the space below to describe policies, procedures and actions project implements to ensure valid program entry and exit dates, regular training and TA for users, continual updates to data quality, and outcome reports for programs and system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be scored</th>
<th>2013 Proposed max value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Type = 18 Points Maximum</td>
<td>HMIS = 18 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Factor A: Bed Coverage = 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>15 for bed coverage of 86% or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 points for 64% or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points under 64% with plan to increase coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 points for coverage under 64% and no plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Factor B: Generating required reports = 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>15 points if HMIS can generate APR, AHAR, CAPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 points if HMIS can generate 2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points if HMIS can generate 1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 points if HMIS cannot generate these reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Factor C: Point in Time Count and sub populations = 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td>15 points if shelter PIT was conducted in Jan ’13, submitted in HDX by 4/30/13, and included sub population data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 points if 2 of 3 occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 points if 1 of 3 occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 points if these tasks were not complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expending the grant = 4 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Had no unexpended funds in the last grant year = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had unexpended funds in the last grant year greater than 5% of grant amount and is voluntarily reducing grant = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had unexpended funds in the last grant year and has provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers) = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount, is not a rental assistance program, has not provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers), and is not reducing grant amount = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality = 18 Points Maximum</td>
<td>18 points if system has below 10% of null or missing data, and below 10% or refused or unknown responses (VII.6.e pg. 46 of NOFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 points if 1 of 2 criteria is met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 points if neither are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage = 2 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Has non-CoC funding support of at least 25% of project budget (not including required match) = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has non-CoC funding support of 10-24% of project budget (not including required match) = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has non-CoC funding support of less than 10% of project budget (not including required match) = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance = 10 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Up to 10 points for narrative that describes clear policies to ensure valid program entry and exit dates, regular training and TA for users, continual updates to data quality, and outcome reports for programs and system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness and Clarity of App = 3 Points Maximum</td>
<td>Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Possible Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HMIS DATA QUALITY (Section worth up to 2 points)
Please run a copy of the Data Completeness Report Card, Report 0252 (EE v.5) for October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013. Attach a copy of the Tab B “Project Summary” page only, as a PDF.

a. Insert your average percentage here: [ ] (from top of Overall Summary)

b. Self score (please insert score from scoring chart here): [ ]

The Data Completeness Report Card can be found here in the InHOUSE HMIS Reporting:

Leverage (Section worth up to 3 points)

Please attach a copy of the leveraging chart included in the Project Application in e-snaps. Leverage letters do not need to be submitted with the local application, but do need to be on file with HCD, the collaborative applicant prior to package submission on 2/3/13.

Please insert the summary information into the fields below.

a. Total amount leveraged: $ [ ]

b. Amount of grant request: $ [ ]

c. Percent of grant request leveraged by project: [ ]

d. Self score (please insert score from scoring chart here): [ ]
QUALITY ASSURANCE (Section worth up to 14 points)

Narrative: Please use the space below to describe policies, procedures and actions the project and its sponsor take to ensure continuous quality improvement. How does the agency stay abreast of and implement best practices in the field? How is quality of service, consumer satisfaction and program performance assessed and maintained? Please address how data is used in planning and program management as well as how often it is updated and data quality reports run and errors corrected. How is staff trained and managed to ensure high quality of care?

Performance Improvement:

Did project have to submit a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) last year for any of the following? If yes, please describe the improvements the project committed to in that plan and whether they resulted in meeting the local benchmark or a 10% improvement from last year?

Outcome A- Housing  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort

Outcome B- Income  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort

Spending  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort

HMIS data Quality  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort
Points for Rating and Ranking of Renewal Projects and Self Score Chart
Total points available = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Primary Activity type – 18 Points maximum</td>
<td>- Permanent Housing (PH) = 18 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transitional Housing = 9 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SSO Linked to Permanent Housing = 9 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All other SSO = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HUD Priorities = 8 Points maximum</td>
<td>- Provides PSH to 100% of chronically homeless households = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides PSH and fills 100% of turnover with chronically homeless households = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides PSH and has committed to fill 85% of turnover to chronically homeless = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides Rapid Rehousing to families = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides PSH and has committed to fill 50% of turnover to chronically homeless households = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not provide Rapid Rehousing to families or PSH prioritized chronically homeless households = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Serving Target Populations = 4 Points maximum</td>
<td>One point will be awarded for each target population that is over 50% of client’s served by a project = total 4 possible points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Veterans = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Youth = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Domestic Violence = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unsheltered Homeless = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Using Housing First Approach = 6 Points maximum</td>
<td>Narrative up to 6 points as determined by application scorers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Outcome Performance – 38 Points maximum</td>
<td>See Sector Specific Benchmarks and Self Scoring Charts on the following pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Spending = 4 Points maximum</td>
<td>- Had no unexpended funds in the last grant year = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount and is voluntarily reducing grant = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year and has provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers) = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount and is a rental assistance program = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount, is not a rental assistance program, has not provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers), and is not reducing grant amount = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 HMIS: Data Completeness Report Card = 2 Points maximum</td>
<td>- Greater than or equal to 95% = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Greater than or equal to 90% and below 95% = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Below 90% = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Leverage = 3 Points maximum | Project leverages more than 150% of HUD budget = 3 Points  
|   |                            | Project leverages 100%-150% of HUD budget = 1.5 Points  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Project leverages 100% or less of HUD budget = 0 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9 | Quality Assurance = 14 Points maximum | -Narrative up to 8 points as determined by application scorers.  
|   |                            | -Points for each performance measure that was met in last year’s application, or by achieving the benchmarks set in the 2012 Performance Improvement Plans (PIP) submitted last year.  
|   |                            | □ Housing = 2 Points if met benchmark last year or met goal of PIP  
|   |                            | □ Income = 2 Points if met benchmarks last year or met goal of PIP  
|   |                            | □ Spending = 1 Point if met benchmarks last year or met goal of PIP  
|   |                            | □ HMIS = 1 Point if met benchmarks last year or met goal of PIP |
| 10| Completeness = up to 3 Points maximum | Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered. |
## Scoring for Outcome Measures, by Sector

### 1. Permanent Supportive Housing and SSOs tied to PH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Retains Permanent Housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exiting with income, for those entering with no income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* for sector = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 7.5 percentage points of local benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark

### 2. Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Obtains Permanent housing</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exiting with income, for those entering with no income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 20 percentage points of local benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 30 percentage points of local benchmark = 3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark
### 3. SSO Street Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Obtains Permanent housing</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 10 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exiting with income, for those entering with no income.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 2.5 percentage points of local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 5 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark*

### 4. SSO Drop-In Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Obtains Permanent housing</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 10 points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exiting with income, for those entering with no income.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 2.5 percentage points of local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 5 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>- Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark

5. SSO Employment Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Obtain Permanent housing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exits with Earned Income</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 20 percentage points of local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 20 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg. 38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark
MEMORANDUM

To: Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants
From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home
Date: January 31, 2014
Re: 2013 HUD Continuum of Care Consolidated Application notice of availability for review

EveryOne Home and the Collaborative Applicant have completed the Alameda County 2013 HUD Continuum of Care Consolidated Application. The submitted CoC application (exhibit 1), the project applications (exhibit 2), and the Project Priority List are now available for review on the EveryOne Home website.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

If you have questions, please email everyonehome@acgov.org
Answer: Question b. need only be addressed if a project had more than 3% of its funding unexpended. If less than that percentage was left over, please state that information. While no additional information is required, it is strongly encouraged that you provide a very brief explanation to ensure that your project receives the full four points.

13. I am attempting to answer a narrative question with no word or character length restrictions and the text box will not expand any further. I'm not finished with my answer – what should I do?

Answer: If you feel you have more to write and a text box will not continue to expand, please do the following:
- Complete as much of your answer as your application will allow in the space designated for it.
- If the text box will not continue expanding, please make a note at the end of your answer, underlined in bold, directing your application's reviewers to a supplemental attachment.
- Continue your answer in another document, which can be submitted with your local application, also in PDF form. Please also list the name of your project at the top of any supplemental application materials.

Questions received at bidder's conference on 12/10/13 through Sunday, 12/15/13:

1. HUD has said that if a project has any portion of its budget fall below the Tier 2 funding line the whole project will be considered part of Tier 2. Will the NOFA Committee do the same thing? (From bidders conference)

Answer: No, as stated on page two of the new and renewal application instructions, the NOFA committee reserves the flexibility to make adjustments to the final project priority list in order to create the strongest package that meets the needs of our community. The amount of the grant is one of the factors that will be taken into consideration and extends to adjusting the amount of a project budget if it falls in both tiers. Should the situation arise, the NOFA Committee will contact the project in question and determine what a workable change in the budget will be for both the project and the package.

2. How is HUD defining "youth" as a priority population? (From bidders conference)

Answer: Page 7 of the NOFA describes "unaccompanied youth" as a priority population and defines the age range as between ages 16-24 on page 39. A project can serve youth in the entire age range or focus on youth ages 16-17 or 16-24 and still get the full point for this question.

3. Why are you measuring Outcome Measure D, "Returns to Homelessness", for a year after exit to permanent housing? For those projects in which people are permanently housed already, should you measure the program exit into homelessness? (From bidders conference)
Alameda County Local Application Process
For the 2013 HUD Continuum of Care NOFA
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Question received on 12/17/2013 (via email):

1. How will local government investments into owned SHP properties be rated in this process?

Answer: The Committee elected not to give points for local government investments into owned SHP properties. The Committee will consider each project case by case based on where it falls in the rating and ranking. As stated in the application instructions, the Committee can adjust the order of ranking as necessary to strengthen the package and protect vital elements of our system of care. The impact of defunding residential buildings is a factor to be considered. Staff can be directed by the Committee to request additional information about physical plant and local funding to assist in their deliberation.

2. In relationship to Outcomes Measure 2b, ‘existing with income for those entering with no income’, how will projects with very low exiting numbers be scored?

Answer: It is true that each person’s outcome carries greater weight in smaller projects, and that is the case whether the outcomes are poor or excellent. Eliminating results with fewer than 5 exits, could help projects with a few bad exits, but it could also hurt a project that had all good exits. Therefore, the Committee has elected to maintain the approach used in last year’s NOFA process—all projects, except those exiting zero people, will be scored on all outcomes measures.

Questions received on 12/23/13 through 12/27/13 (via email):

1. The NOFA Instructions indicate we should use version 5 of the Data Completeness Forms, what about version 6?

Answer: Instructions say that you should use Data Completeness Report Card 0252 (EE v5). Version 5 was recently replaced by (EE) v6. Please use that. In the prompts, select the specific project under the ‘select provider’ prompt, and do not include services. Example is provided below:

- [Image of data completeness forms]

Public folder
  - REQUIRED TO RUN
  - Agency and General Reports
  - AROBE
  - ANNA
  - ARCC
  - ART Gallery Reports and Resources
  - ART Gallery Report Manuals
  - ART Gallery Reports
    - 0243 - Data Completeness Report Card (SSn) - v6
    - 0252 - Data Completeness Report Card (EE) - v6
  - 2013-08-30 14:07
Prompts should include the following:

Select Provider: select the specific project

Include Services: NO

Reply to prompts before running the query.

- FEMA Provider - Default Provider -
- Enter Start Date - 10/01/2013
- Enter End Date PLUS 1 Day - 10/31/2013
- Select Provider(s) - SELECT YOUR PROVIDER
- FEMA Provider - Default Provider -
- Include Services in Report Card? Yes

If you have already submitted your application and included services in the Data Report Card Report, it could have lowered your score. If that is the case, you may resubmit your application with the correct version of the report and your revised score.

Questions received on 12/16/13 through 12/23/13 (via email):

1. Is question C in the Housing Assistance Summary of the Project Detail question of the new project application “not applicable” to a Rapid Rehousing for Families project?

Answer: Correct, it is not applicable to Rapid Rehousing for families projects.

2. On the Timing section of the new project application, question E proposed term of this grant instructs a reference to the HUD NOFA page 16. Where are term options on Page 16 of the NOFA?

Answer: The reference to page 16 was not correct. The discussion of grant terms starts at the bottom of page 20 and continues on page 21 of the 2013 NOFA.

3. What is the time frame that can be used for data from the APR?

Answer: We have asked that all projects run the APR for the same time period, 10/1/12 through 9/30/13.
4. For new projects that are the second type described (those converting current TH and SSO to PH), what is the deadline for notifying HCD/EveryOne Home of intent to convert?

Answer: Projects are strongly encouraged to notify HCD/EveryOne Home by noon on December 23rd to begin discussions. Please note, if you submit a local application creating a new project out of one you intend to convert without having notified HCD/EveryOne Home by January 3rd of your plans, the proposal is at risk of not being included in the package.

5. Question: I can’t find some of the outcomes measures in the application is telling me to use. Can you please provide some guidance?

Answer: Some of the Instructions in the first column of the Outcomes Measure charts (pp.10-112), which name the reports and which measure they correspond to (A, B, C, D) are incorrect. Please use the following guidance:

For Permanent Supportive Housing, SSOs tied to PH:
- A: question 27 of the APR
- B: HMIS Outcomes Report
- C: 26a2 and 26b2 of the APR
- D: the Returns to Homelessness Report (provided to projects by EveryOne Home staff)

For all other project types:
- A: HMIS Outcomes Report
- B: HMIS Outcomes Report
- C: 26a2 and 26b2 of the APR
- D: Returns to Homelessness Report (provided to projects by EveryOne Home staff)

6. Do projects submitted as conversions from TH to PSH have a chance of ending up in Tier 1 or will all new projects get placed in Tier 2?

Answer: Yes, new projects that are conversions of an existing project into permanent housing have a chance of ranking in Tier 1 depending on the proposal’s score and the scores of other new projects and renewals. New projects will be ranked below renewals that meet the threshold score of 60%
and are included in Tier 1, but they are not automatically relegated to Tier 2. For further information, please see instructions on page 2 of the new project application.

7. Once I complete the e-snaps application for a renewal, should I hit the submit button?

Answer: Yes, hit the submit button.

8. Who is on the NOFA committee, and what are their affiliations? Are any additional people involved in NOFA process?

Answer: The NOFA committee is comprised of individuals who represent non-conflicted organizations or county departments. This means that they are employed by agencies/departments which do not receive any funding from HUD, and who are not current or perspective CoC funding applicants. A downloadable PDF with the full list of committee members and their affiliations can be found on the EveryOne Home website at the following link: http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html. The NOFA committee is supported by several EveryOne Home staff—namely: Executive Director Elaine de Colligny, Program Specialist Jackie Ballard, and Administrative Assistant Alexi Lozano. EveryOne Home staff facilitate the work of the NOFA Committee; they do not rate or rank the local applications. Additionally, Riley Wilkinson, lead staff for HCD’s role as collaborative applicant, handles the Grant Inventory Worksheet, manages the E-snaps submissions of project applications, supports projects technical questions to the local HUD office, and is available to the Committee for technical questions. Because HCD is also an applicant for HMIS and specific projects, he does not participate in Committee meetings or any discussion of the local application scoring criteria development or ranking of projects.

9. What is the criteria and methodology by which each project will be scored? Will there be a final arbiter in the decision making process, e.g., can a project be arbitrarily changed and/or changed, with cause, by anyone?

Answer: The criteria for scoring each project is articulated in the project applications which were released at the 12/10/13 community meeting and can be downloaded from the EveryOne Home website at the following link: http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html. Those applications include a scoring matrix that enables renewing projects to determine the majority of their points via self-scoring. There are two narratives that are scored, worth 6 and 8 points respectively, and 3 points for application completeness that will be scored at the discretion of the reviewers. Each renewal application will be scored by 3 reviewers, the scores will be averaged, and the review committee will meet to discuss scores and the ranking order before they are finalized and published to the applicants.
The Continuum of Care Interim Regulations published in July of 2012 explicitly charged each local Continuum of Care with the responsibility of rating and ranking projects for inclusion in the CoC’s annual funding request to HUD. The CoC must establish a “non-conflicted” group to execute this responsibility. As indicated at the 12/10/13 community meeting, the NOFA Committee, established by the EveryOne Home Board, is the final arbiter for the local rating and ranking process. [Follow this link: http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html to review the PowerPoint presentation describing the local process.]

Projects will be evaluated as submitted. They will not be changed by the NOFA Committee. Reviewers, who are members of the NOFA Committee, will rate and rank project applications, and the Committee as a whole will decide what projects are included in the package. They will negotiate with the project whose initial rating places it partially in both Tiers to reduce the budget so that it fits completely in Tier 1, and with new projects on their total budgets based on the final reallocation amount available for new permanent housing.

10. Will the process through which the committee came to its decisions, including the scoring notes and related documentation justifiable by each individual who participates in the local scoring process, be made public?

Answer: The ranking of all projects submitted will be made public on January 17th through direct communication to the applicants and posting on the EveryOne Home website. Each applicant will receive its own scores. Applicants that wish to review score sheets and reviewers comments can make an appointment to come to the EveryOne Home office to do so. Reviewers’ names will be redacted from the notes.

11. How should projects answer the question of “snap” as to whether or not they participate in a Coordinated Assessment?

Answer: Projects should answer “No.” Our community is still developing our coordinated intake and assessment, which EveryOne Home and HCD will address in the CoC narrative portion of our collaborative application.

12. If my project had less than 5% funds left unexpended last year, what do I need to address in question b. under Spending?
Answer: This is a new measure being applied to projects this year. It will be measured using the report created for returns to homelessness system-wide, which we have been measuring and reporting on for three years in the system-wide Outcomes Progress Report. The NOFA Committee feels that using the same measure for all projects this year is the most consistent and fair, and will therefore measure the outcome as described in the application. Community comments will be taken under advisement for future NOFA rounds.

Questions Received via e-mail, through 12/15/13:

4. For Outcome Measure B, “Entering with No Income, % who Obtain Some Income”, how would projects which had no one exit the project who came in with no income be scored? (Asked at bidder conference and in an email dated 12/13/13)

Answer: Applications are scored as a percentage of total possible points. For most applicants that will be a percentage of 100 points. In cases where there is no data for a given measure—such as exiting with income after entering with none or the spending measure when a grant has not completed its first term, the points from that question will be eliminated from the total possible points and the percentage will be based on a lower total. For example, projects that do not have data for Outcome Measure B will be scored on an 88 point scale versus a 100 point scale.

5. Where did the 56% benchmark for Outcome Measure C, “Access to Mainstream Benefits”, come from? (via email 12/10/13)

Answer: On page 38 of the NOFA, HUD indicates that it will grant full points on this measure for communities that have 56% of their participants obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits. This includes both stayers and leavers with one or more source of non-cash benefits. The data for stayers will come from either the intake form or the annual update. The data for leavers will come from the exit form. Non-cash benefits were chosen to measure this outcome because the APR Income cash chart does not distinguish between earned and mainstream benefits, and this measure is currently not captured in the HAMS Outcomes Report.

6. What are the factors that will be used to determine a highly rated answer versus a lower rated answer to the narrative question (s), “Utilizing a Housing First Approach”, in the General Section of the renewal application? (via email 12/12/13)

Answer: Answers that get full points for this question will demonstrate an understanding of Housing First Principles and clearly describe how they are implemented in the project. The factors considered and the weight they are given will vary depending on the project type. For example, SSO projects not tied to permanent housing and transitional housing projects would want to address how the project focuses on getting participants permanently housed as soon as possible, versus using the maximum time allowable for the program—24 months in the case of TH. Whereas SSO tied to permanent housing and permanent housing projects would discuss how housing stability is prioritized and maintained. In general, as noted on page 5 of the local application, entry requirements should be “no-barrier” or “low barrier”, obtaining or maintaining permanent housing should be prioritized and emphasized with participants; people should not be offered housing as a reward for clinical successes or lose it for clinical setbacks, such as relapse. All projects should address entry requirements—those with sobriety or income requirements would not get full points. All projects should also address how program agreements/lease violations are handled. Projects that use drug testing, and exit people for loss of
sobriety, would not get full points, nor would projects that exit tenants for non-participation in services. For more information on the Housing First Approach the following resources may be helpful:


d. http://100khomes.org/read-the-manifesto/housing-first

7. In the Quality Assurance section on page 15 of the renewal application, a number of sub-questions are asked that make up the 8 possible points for that narrative. Please clarify the relative worth of each sub question. (via email 12/12/13)

**Answer:** The sub-questions are intended as prompts for what to cover in the narrative. They do not have a set relative worth, as they will apply differently to each project. For example, there may be areas of quality assurance where the project has a long way to go, but has worked really hard and improved, and remains focused on this effort. That could carry similar value to a project which is doing really well on the same factor, and has the infrastructure in place to maintain its performance. Narratives that are comprehensive and specific will score better than answers that offer general assertions about a project’s commitment to quality assurance, data accuracy, consumer satisfaction, etc.

**Questions for E-SNAPS:**

1. How do we answer question 19 in 1E? (via email 12/13/13)

**Answer:** The answer is “Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.”
Date: January 17, 2014  
TO: Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants  
From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home  
Subject: Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)’s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% ($1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SSO projects’ scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount. Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community’s application.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct grantee only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant to scoring information to your project partners. If you are the lead agency on multiple projects, all scores will be listed in the same attachment, but in their own individual tables. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community’s Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIER 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>InHOUSE</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COACH Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI)- SHP</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HOPE Housing</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russell Street Residence (RSR)</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PH-RRH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Southern Alameda County Housing/Jobs Linkages</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek S+C</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spirit of Hope 1</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Housing Fast Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek SHP</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tri-City/FESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>APC Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>SSO - PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bessie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Bonita House, Inc.</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network</td>
<td>LifeLong Medical Care</td>
<td>SSO - PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Turning Point FY11</td>
<td>Fred Finch Youth Center</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NCWC- North County Women’s Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - FACT</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Harrison House Family Services Program</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ashby House</td>
<td>Operation Dignity, Inc.</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rubicon Berkeley Employment Services</td>
<td>Rubicon Programs Inc.</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Homeless Outreach for People Empowerment</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Families in Transition Scattered Sites</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>Yvette A. Flunder Foundation</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>South County Sober Housing</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Banyan House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>McKinley Family Transitional House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>SSO-PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rosa Parks House</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Self-Sufficiency Project</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>SSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIER 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>Alameda County Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>North County Family Rapid Rehousing</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>PH-RRH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALAMEDA COUNTY EVERYONE HOME
2013 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR NEW PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Alameda County EveryOne Home is inviting applications for new permanent housing projects to serve homeless individuals and/or families. Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Projects must be for chronically homeless individuals or families. Rapid Rehousing (RRH) must be for families. New projects can be proposed in one of two ways:

1. A new permanent housing project using funds reallocated from local projects that fall into Tier 2 and/or do not achieve the minimum score for inclusion in the package. The exact amount of this pool of funds is contingent on what projects are reallocated. The pool could be up to $1,241,000 dollars. Projects funded in this way can be either PSH or RRH.

2. Projects that are currently transitional housing or support services only projects that want to convert to permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing.

Note: Any organization considering applying for projects of the 2nd type (Conversion) must notify the Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department and EveryOne Home immediately. Projects of this type will only be accepted in the competition if preliminarily approved for conversion.

Applicants responding to this RFP should be very familiar with the HUD NOFA issued November 9, 2012, and with the detailed guidance for completing new applications. See [www.hudhre.info](http://www.hudhre.info). Applicants are expected to know the eligible types of assistance, eligible populations, required match and other requirements from HUD.

Local new project applications are due electronically to [everyonehome@acgov.org](mailto:everyonehome@acgov.org) by 4:00 pm Friday January 3, 2013. Due to the competitive nature of the process and rigid HUD timing requirements, applications received after that time will not be considered.

All new projects received by the deadline will be reviewed and applicants will be notified by January 20th, 2014 whether they have been selected to submit a final application to HUD. Projects selected to submit must complete the New Project Application in e-snaps by January 28th. Selected projects may be required to make project changes to their project application in order to ensure they comply with HUD new project thresholds, fit into the appropriate Tier, and other requirements.

**Ranking and Tiering**

HUD is requiring the CoC’s submit their application with projects placed in a ranked order.

1. HUD will first fund all the projects in the first “Tier” (Tier 1) which will total as close as possible to $23,579,723 (our local annual renewal demand amount decreased by the mandatory 5% HUD reduction).

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
2. Projects following below this amount will be the list for Tier 2. HUD will fund any Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards nationally to all Tier 1 projects, up to the amount of funding it has available nationally. As the amount of additional funds that HUD will obtain is unknown, projects in Tier 2 are not certain to be funded. HUD will prioritize permanent housing projects in Tier 2. Given the Sequester’s impact on available funds, it is highly unlikely that any renewals of TH and SSO will be funded from Tier 2. We are therefore only including permanent housing projects in Tier 2.

New Project Applications may receive up to 100 points. The scoring sheet attached to the end of this RFP provides the breakdown of points by section.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be considered for inclusion in Tier 1. New Projects scoring below that will not be included in the package at all. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the RFP, and to self-score their project on the performance indicators as soon as possible in order to determine if they will meet the minimum score.

In addition to the total score projects receive, reviewers may use additional factors to break ties and/or to adjust the final order in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, and meet other local and national objectives for a strong and balanced package that maximizes points for the entire Continuum. Factors that may be considered include:

- the percent of chronically homeless persons served;
- the geographic diversity of the projects included in Tier 1;
- the projected impact of the loss of any residential buildings on homeless people.

If more renewal projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then the lowest scoring projects above the 60 point threshold will still be placed in Tier 2, subject to the adjustments described above.

If fewer projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then there will be funds in Tier 1 available for new permanent housing, subject to the adjustments described above.

New projects that are included in Tier 1 will be ranked after all renewals included in Tier 1.

Download a Word version of this application from the EveryOne Home website at www.everyonehome.org. Save your completed application as a PDF and attach to an email to everyonehome@acgov.org to submit as described on page 1.

For questions regarding the completion of this application, please contact EveryOne Home at everyonehome@acgov.org. All questions received on or prior to December 27, 2013 will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.
GENERAL SECTION (Worth up to 32 points for project type, meeting HUD priorities, and using Housing First)

a. Project Name: 

b. Applicant Name: 

c. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application: 

d. Project type:  (Type an “X” inside checkbox to indicate selection.)

1.  
   
   [ ] New Permanent housing project from reallocated funds:
   
   a.  [ ] Permanent supportive housing
   
   i. Is this project exclusively for chronically homeless?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
   
   (If answer is no, not eligible)

   b.  [ ] Rapid rehousing for families

2.  
   
   [ ] New Permanent housing project from an existing project conversion
   
   a.  [ ] Permanent supportive housing
   
   i. Is this project exclusively for chronically homeless?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
   
   (If answer is no, not eligible)

   b.  [ ] Rapid rehousing for families

Please note: Projects wishing to convert some or all of their projects from TH or SSO to PH must have notified Alameda County HCD and EveryOne Home of their intent to convert and have been preliminarily approved for conversion. Because conversion requires sun setting the current project, which may need to occur before new HUD funds are in place, the project needs to establish that bridge funding is in place or likely so that no persons will have to exit the prior project into homelessness.

Because final pool for reallocation is still not known, we are asking for projects to provide a budget range for their proposals. The maximum amount a single project can request is $1,240,000. This is the amount of Tier 2 funds. The Continuum may have more or less than this amount to allocate to new projects.

e. Amount of application:  
   
   Minimum $  Maximum $ 

f. Does this project include acquisition, new construction or rehabilitation?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

g. Number of Units/Subsidies

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
1. Total units/subsidies in project for homeless persons: 

2. Total beds for homeless persons: 

3. Total units in project for chronically homeless (CoC funding can only apply to PSH units for the homeless this must be 100% of units included in application): 

4. If this application is for a project that includes additional units for other populations other than homeless, total units in Project: 

*If this application is for a project which will include more units than those covered by funds requested in this application, please attach a table of all units, their affordability levels, and the target populations with your application.*

h. List all partners in this project and their role(s), and whether they will be a “subrecipient” per HUD’s definition. Add additional rows as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Role (Developer, Service Provider, Property Manager, Rental Assistance administrator, etc.)</th>
<th>Sub recipient? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Primary location of Project (city): 

j. Areas of the County served by Project (list specific cities or regions): 

l. **Utilizing a Housing First Approach:** [HUD defines Housing First as; “a model of housing assistance that is offered without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary goals.”] Please describe how the project will employ a Housing First approach.

**DEMONSTRATED CAPACITY of Applicant, Subrecipient(s) and Other Partners (Worth up to 30 points)**

*(As much as possible, these questions have been chosen to be identical to those that will be required in e-snaps if selected for submission. Question numbers from the New Project Application in e-snaps are noted in parentheses after the question where applicable. Most word limitations are locally established.)*

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
a. (500 words or less) Describe the experience of the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities in the application, given funding and time limitations (2.B.1)*

b. (250 words or less) Describe the experience of the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) in leveraging other Federal, state, local and private funds (2.B.2)*

c. Describe the basic organization and management structure of the applicant and subrecipients (if any.) Include evidence of internal and external coordination and adequate financial accounting system. (2.B.3)*

d. Has this set of partners or agencies worked together previously on a similar project? Please explain.

e. Are there any unresolved monitoring or audit finding for any HUD grants (including ESG) operated by the application or potential subrecipients?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, describe the unresolved monitoring or audit findings.

f. Quality Assurance

Please use the space below to describe policies, procedures and actions the project and its sponsor take to ensure continuous quality improvement. How does the agency stay abreast of and implement best practices in the field? How is quality of service, consumer satisfaction and program performance assessed and maintained? Please address how data is used in planning and program management as well as how often it is updated and data quality reports run and errors corrected. How is staff trained and managed to ensure high quality of care?
**Past Performance on Relevant Outcome Measures:**
Complete the Outcome chart below for all partners in this application with previous experience with relevant projects of similar type. Applicants applying for Permanent Supportive Housing should complete the chart for all or five (whichever is less) Permanent Supportive Housing projects they currently operate which report data in HMIS, and for any SSO tied to permanent housing they or any service partner in the application operate. For example, if the applicant currently operates one or more PSH or S+C programs, complete a column in the chart with data from Outcomes Report run for 10/1/12-9/30/13 for each of these programs. If the applicant or a services partner currently operates an SSO that provides services in Permanent Housing, complete a column in the chart with data from the same time period for each of these programs.

1. **Outcomes Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Agency Name</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>Project 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type (PSH, RRH, SSO tied to PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.1: Obtaining Permanent Housing (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13 for RRH; insert N/A for PSH and SSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.2: Permanent Housing Retention &gt; 6 months (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13 for PSH and SSO’s; insert N/A for RRH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B: Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure C: Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits (insert percent for the 12 months ending 9/30/13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If the applicant or any partners did not reach or exceed the benchmark on any of the indicators above appropriate to the sector, please explain how the benchmark level of performance for the project in this application will be achieved.

3. If the applicant or any partners do(es) not have relevant HMIS data (similar program type) to demonstrate ability to meet or exceed performance benchmarks, please describe how the project will achieve performance benchmarks. Include data from sources other than HMIS if available and relevant.

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
Instructions for completing outcomes charts
The following measures should come from the HMIS Outcomes Report: 1) People Obtaining Permanent Housing for RRH 2) Adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with income for all projects. All projects should run the Outcomes report from HMIS for the following periods--10/1/11-9/30/12 and 10/1/12-9/30/13-- and attach a copy of the "Program Summary" Tab page only for each report. Please attach a copy of the Outcomes Report Program Summary pages for each project included in the chart.

To be used by Rapid Rehousing for Outcome A.

To be used by all other program types for Outcome B.

### Transitional Housing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Homeless %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>80.%</td>
<td>80.%</td>
<td>76.%</td>
<td>54/71</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>57/71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing - entered w/housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 36 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to permanent or interim housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults exiting with employment income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency/Process Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Homeless %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People exiting to Known Destination</td>
<td>94.%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90.%</td>
<td>64/71</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>67/71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Obtain permanent housing within 60 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adults who gain employment, 50% do so within 13 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
From APRs (for PSH and SSO tied to Permanent Housing Only): Permanent Supportive Housing Projects and SSO projects connected directly to Permanent Housing must produce the retention information from Question 27. All projects should run the APR for 10/1/12-9/30/13 and attach a copy to the application for each project included in the chart. Using the formula below and the sample table identifying each cell value, calculate the 6 month retention rate. If the applicant did not meet the benchmark, run an APR for the dates listed above (10/1/11-9/30/12) and calculate the rate for six months of retention both years to identify whether the performance was 10 percentage points greater than the previous year.

Housing Retention > 6 months: \((P - H - I - J + G) - A - B - C / (P - H - I - J + G) = \% \text{ of persons retaining permanent housing for 6 months or more.}\)

### 27. Length of Participation by Exit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
From APRs (for all project types) produce the Access to Mainstream Benefits information from 10/1/12-9/30/13. Using questions 26a2 and 26b2 below from the APR, calculate use of mainstream benefits as follows:

\[(B+G)/(E+J) = \% \text{ of adults non-cash mainstream benefits}\]

26a2. Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status - Leavers

**Client Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status**
**Number of Non-Cash Benefits by Number of Persons - Leavers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26b2. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources - Stayers

**Client Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status**
**Number of Non-Cash Benefits by Number of Persons - Stayers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DETAIL

**Project Summary**

a. (750 words or less) Provide a description that addresses the entire scope of the proposed project. (3B.1)*

b. (200 words or less) Describe the specific population to be served and how this project will meet their needs.

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
Housing Assistance summary

(300 words or less) If applicable, describe the proposed development activities and the responsibility that the applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) will have in developing, operating and maintaining the property.


d. If applicable, indicate the type of rental assistance (ex. TBRA, SRA): (3b.6a and 6b)*

1. Indicate the maximum length of rental assistance:

2. Describe the method for determining the type, amount and duration of rental assistance that participants can receive.

3. What agency will administer the rental assistance? (must be a PHA or a unit of State or local government.)


e. Will participants be required to live in a particular structure, unit, or locality, at some point during their participation? Yes No

If yes, please describe (3B.7)*


f. Will the project use an existing homeless facility or incorporate activities provided by an existing project? Yes No

If yes, please explain.


Services and Outreach

(300 words or less) describe how participants will be assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing (4A.4)*


h. (300 words or less) Describe specifically how participants will be assisted to both increase their employment and/or income and to maximize the ability to live independently (4A.5)*


i. (200 words or less) Describe the outreach plan to bring homeless persons into the project (4C.3)*

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
TIMING

a. (no word limit, please be concise but specific and thorough) Describe the estimated schedule for the proposed activities, the management plan and the method for assuring effective and timely completion of the work (3B.2)*

b. By what date is the first person/household expected to be housed by this project?

c. By what date is the project expected to be at capacity?

d. (no word limit, please be concise but specific and thorough) If this project is a conversion project (an existing SHP TH or SSO grant that is converting to permanent housing), please list the expiration date of the current grant, and describe how activities will be continued or transitioned before a new grant agreement so that no currently served person becomes homeless.

e. What is the proposed term of this grant? (See HUD NOFA p. 16 for options)
# BUDGET

a. Please complete the budget form below or attach a similar form. This form is the summary budget of the HUD new project application in e-snaps. (7J)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Costs</th>
<th>Annual Assistance Requested</th>
<th>Grant Term</th>
<th>Total Assistance Requested for Grant term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Leased Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Leased Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Housing Relocation and Stabilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Short-term/Medium-term Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Long-term Rental Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supportive Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HMIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Subtotal costs requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Admin (up to 10% allowed by HUD, but 7% is the maximum for full points locally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total Assistance Plus Admin Requested (sum lines 9 and 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cash Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In-kind Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Total Match (sum lines 12 and 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Budget (sum lines 11 and 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Budget Narrative: (300 words or less) Briefly describe how the funds will be used for the project and the source of matching funds.


c. If the project includes short- or medium-term rental assistance, please describe how the budget for short- or medium term financial assistance and the budget for housing stabilization was developed (applicants are encouraged to provided a table or chart if useful) and the average estimated cost per person or household assisted, and average estimated length of assistance.


*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013
d. If the project includes long-term rental assistance, please complete the table below or attach a similar one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>FMR</th>
<th># of Months</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. If the project includes any new construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation, please include a complete development budget, and sources and uses. You may use a format that is currently acceptable to State or local government housing sources. (Attach separately.)

f. If the project includes operating funds, please include a complete annual operating budget, and a 15 year operating budget. (Attach separately.)

**LEVERAGING**
Please complete the leveraging chart below or attach a similar chart from e-snaps. Add additional rows as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contribution (e.g. cash, in-kind)</th>
<th>Name the Source of the Contribution</th>
<th>Type of Source (government, Private)</th>
<th>Date of Written Commitment</th>
<th>Value of Written Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leverage letters do not need to be submitted with the local application, but do need to be on file with HCD, the collaborative applicant, prior to package submission on 2/3/13.

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
## SCORING FOR NEW PROJECTS
Total points available = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description of basis for assigning points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Primary Activity</td>
<td>18 points</td>
<td>Permanent Housing (PH) = 18 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 HUD priorities=chronically homeless or rapid rehousing for families | Up to 8 points | Provides PSH to 100% of chronically homeless households = 8 Points  
Provides Rapid Rehousing to families= 4 Points |
| 3 Using Housing First Approach | Up to 6 points | Applicant will offer housing assistance without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary. |
| 4 Demonstrated Capacity of Grantee and Partners | Up to 30 points | Applicant and any subrecipients have recent relevant experience performing similar activities; If application has subrecipients, applicant organizations have experience working together; No applicant or subrecipient has outstanding monitoring or audit issues or issues are explained; applicant and partners meet or exceed local outcome measure benchmarks or have credible explanation how the proposed project will meet them. Applicant has strong quality assurance plan in place. |
| 5 Project Detail | Up to 16 points | Project description describes the type and purpose of project and the target population; project meets a local need; project is well-designed to meet the identified need; services proposed are appropriate to meet housing, income and independent living goals; outreach plans are well-defined. |
| 6 Timing | Up to 8 points | Project has a clear schedule for the proposed activities; project is likely to begin serving homeless people quickly and to reach full capacity within one year; if project is a conversion project, a reasonable transition plan is established. |
| 7 Budget | Up to 8 points | Budget is reasonable for type of project and clearly articulated; Required match of at least 25% is included; Other project funds needed for project are committed or likely; Project is cost effective compared to other similar new permanent housing applications; if a conversion project a clear strategy is identified to ensure no persons are made homeless if there is a funding gap. |
| 8 Leverage | Up to 3 points | Project leverages more than 150% of HUD budget = 3 Points  
Project leverages 100%-150% of HUD budget = 1.5 Points  
Project leverages 100% or less of HUD budget = 0 Points |
| 9 Completeness and Clarity of Application | Up to 3 points | Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered. |

*Refers to 2012 E-Snaps application, may be slightly different to 2013*
ALAMEDA COUNTY EVERYONE HOME
INSTRUCTIONS FOR RENEWAL PROJECT APPLICATIONS

As it did last year, HUD is requiring all projects submitting from a local Continuum of Care (CoC) to be rated and ranked by the CoC and included in the collaborative application. In order to complete the rating and ranking, the HUD Continuum of Care NOFA process includes a local application to EveryOne Home and a project application to HUD. All applicants submitting projects for renewal must complete this local application in addition to the Renewal Project Application in e-snaps. A separate application is available for new projects that will be created through any reallocation of funds that will occur.

Renewal projects must complete the following application electronically and submit via email to everyonehome@acgov.org by 4:00:00 pm Friday, January 3, 2014.

The Renewal Application in e-snaps must also be completed by January 3, 2014. Applicants are encouraged to complete the e-snaps application earlier, as some questions below can be answered by cutting and pasting answers from the e-snaps application.

In addition to the completed local application form, applicants must include copies of the required back up documentation as a PDF. The required documents and instructions for their uses are described in greater detail in the sections below, and include:

1. The project’s InHouse Demographics Report for October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013.
2. InHOUSE Outcomes Report, “Program Summary” Pages only, run to cover the last two years, starting October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013 as the current period and October 1, 2011-September 30, 2012 as the prior period.
3. Questions 26, charts a2 & b2, and 27 of the APR for the 12 months ending September 30, 2013. This is used to calculate 6 month retention (only applies to PSH and SSO projects attached to Permanent Housing) and access to mainstream benefits (all project types)
4. The Returns to Homelessness Report for October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013. EveryOne Home or HMIS staff will run and send PDF’s to each project.
5. Project Leveraging chart from e-snaps.
7. Any Performance Improvement Plans submitted last year-except Exits to Known Destinations.

Please ensure the PDF is titled with the name of the project.

Ranking and Tiering

There are differences from last year’s NOFA and thereby Alameda County’s local process:

HUD is still requiring CoC’s to rank their projects in two tiers, with Tier 1 projects assured of funding and Tier 2 projects highly at risk. Last year the Tier 2 amount was 3.5% of the total package. This year it is 5%. Alameda County’s Grant Inventory Worksheet has our Annual Renewal Demand at $24,820,761. Five percent of that is an estimated $1,241,038 to be ranked in Tier 2, leaving a Tier 1 amount of $23,579,723. HUD will first fund all the projects ranked in the Tier 1 up to the Tier 1 amount.
Projects ranked below this amount will fall into Tier 2. HUD will consider any project that has even a portion of its budget in Tier 2 as wholly in Tier 2 for these purposes.

HUD will fund Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards nationally to all Tier 1 projects, up to the amount of funding it has available nationally. Different than last year, HUD will prioritize permanent housing projects, both renewal and new, before other types of renewals are funded in Tier 2 (See page 49 of the 2013 NOFA). Because of Sequestration it is expected that HUD will be able to fund fewer Tier 2 projects than it did last year.

In order to maximize the amount of Tier 2 funds our community might recapture, Transitional Housing and Support Services Only renewals, who’s scores place them into Tier 2 in the initial rating and ranking, will not be included in the package, their funds will be reallocated to new permanent housing project(s).

Renewal Projects may receive up to 100 points. The application form and the scoring tool are tightly linked. As you prepare the application you may want to detach the scoring chart at the end of this RFP and use it along side many of the sections in order to self score.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be considered for inclusion in Tier 1. Projects scoring below that are subject to reallocation. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the RFP, and to self-score their project on the performance indicators as soon as possible in order to determine if they will meet the minimum score.

In addition to the total score projects receive, reviewers may use additional factors to break ties and/or to adjust the final order in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, and meet other local objectives for a strong and balanced package that maximizes points for the entire Continuum. Factors that may be considered include:

- the geographic and population diversity of the projects included in Tier 1;
- the projected impact of the loss of any residential buildings on homeless people;
- the expiration date and amount of the grant.
- Whether projects attempted to convert from TH to PH and were denied by HUD

If more projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then the lowest scoring projects above the 60 point threshold will still be placed in Tier 2, subject to the adjustments described above.

If fewer projects than there are funds for score a minimum of 60 points, then there will be funds in Tier 1 available for new permanent housing, subject to the adjustments described above.

New projects that are included in Tier 1 will be ranked after all renewals included in Tier 1.

Download a Word version of this application from the EveryOne Home website at www.everyonehome.org. Save your completed application as a PDF and attach to an email to everyonehome@acgov.org to submit as described on page 1.

Voluntary reductions or eliminations of grants
Given that a reduction of total HUD funding is assured, with projects ranked in Tier 2 likely to be eliminated, projects may wish to assist the CoC to meet the 5% reduction by opting to voluntarily reduce the amount of renewal funds they are requesting. Grants that have consistently under spent may wish
to consider this. Projects that determine they are unlikely to receive the minimum score on their local application may elect not to submit. Page 1 of the application has a space to indicate if the amount requested is less than the amount indicated on the Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW) and by how much. Projects cannot request more than what is listed on the GIW. Those projects wishing to withdraw from consideration can do so by completing items 1.a-d of the application and submitting a PDF of that application page to everyonehome@acgov.org.

For questions regarding the completion of the local application, please contact EveryOne Home at everyonehome@acgov.org. All questions received on or prior to December 27th will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.

For questions regarding the completion of the Project Application in e-snaps, please contact Riley Wilkerson at riley.wilkerson@acgov.org. Answers to questions regarding the Project Application may be shared with other applicants if they are considered germane to other applicants.
ALAMEDA COUNTY LOCAL RENEWAL APPLICATION

GENERAL SECTION (section worth up to 40 points; 18 for activity type, 22 points for alignment with HUD priorities)

a. Project Name: ____________________________

b. Applicant Name: ____________________________

c. □ This project is not submitting a request for HUD funding in 2013. If you are not submitting a project application please complete item d. below, make a PDF of this page and submit it via email to everyonehome@acgov.org.

d. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application or withdraw it from consideration: ____________________________

e. Primary Activity Type:  □ PH (PSH or RRH) □ TH □ SSO □ HMIS □ CoC Planning

f. If SSO, please indicate type of SSO project, per local designation: □ Drop in □ Street Outreach □ Employment □ Services tied to PH

g. Capacity

Number of Units in project: ____________________________ or □ Not applicable

Point in Time Capacity: Persons served at a point in time ____________________________

Households served at a point in time ____________________________

Annual Capacity: Persons served in a year ____________________________

Households served in a year ____________________________

h. Service Area: Primary location of Project (city): ____________________________

Areas of the County served by Project (list specific cities or regions):

i. Amount of application: ____________________________

Does this amount match what is listed in the GIW? □ Yes □ No.

If no what is the amount by which the request is being reduced? ____________________________
j. End date of current HUD grant: [ ]

k. Please insert the General Description of your project as included in the HUD Project Application Form in e-snaps:

l. If renewing for a lower amount, please describe how the project will continue to be able to meet its program outcomes and performance targets:

m. Mainstream Resources: Please describe how this project systematically assists homeless persons to identify and apply for mainstream benefits with other federal agency program such as TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, SCHIP, WIC, etc.:

n. Education:

   1. Does this project have an active collaboration with one or more local school districts to identify homeless individuals and families and ensure individuals and families understand their eligibility for educational services? Please describe.

   2. Does the project have established policies to require that all children are enrolled in school? Please describe.

o. Does this project or the applicant agency have any of the following issues: 1) Any audit findings from a HUD monitoring that are overdue or have not been satisfactorily resolved; 2) A current outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon; 3) Audit findings from any auditor that have not been resolved?

   ☐ No   ☐ Yes

If yes, explain status of issues:

p. HUD Priorities—Ending Chronic Homelessness: If project is Permanent Supportive Housing or Services tied to Permanent Supportive Housing how does it serve chronically homeless individuals and families?

   ☐ Exclusively (100%) All units in project are dedicated to the chronically homeless
Not all units are dedicated, but by policy and practice a portion of turnover units are prioritized to chronically homeless:  

- 100%  
- 85%  
- 50%

Is this policy:

- In place and operational  
- In place and will be operationalized within 6 months  
- Under consideration

What percent of clients served in the last year were chronically homeless?  

(Must be verifiable in attached HMIS demographics report from 10/1/12-9/30/13)

N/A, this is not a PSH project and/or this is not a specific target population for this project.

q. HUD Priorities—Rapidly Rehousing Families: Is this project Rapid Rehousing for Families?  

- Yes  
- No

r. HUD Priorities--Target Populations: Does this project serve 50% or more of the following populations?  

- Veterans  
- Youth  
- Domestic Violence survivors  
- Unsheltered Homeless  

(Must be verifiable in attached HMIS demographics report from 10/1/12-9/30/13)

s. HUD Priorities--Utilizing a Housing First Approach: [HUD defines Housing First as; “a model of housing assistance that is offered without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary goals.”] Please describe how the project employs a Housing First approach. These principles can be applied to TH and SSO projects as well as PH and all projects can earn points for this narrative.

\[\text{Project's Housing First Approach Description} \]

\[\text{These principles can be applied to TH and SSO projects as well as PH and all projects can earn points for this narrative.} \]

\[\text{t. Does this project include one or more buildings (housing or service site) that is owned or long-term leased by the grantee or a subrecipient? If so, please describe the options for the building(s) if this project were not refunded.} \]

\[\text{Building Options Description} \]

\[\text{u. If this project is an SSO or TH project, is it considering converting to permanent housing?*} \]

\[\text{Yes, in 2014} \]

\[\text{Considering for 2014} \]

\[\text{Yes, in 2015} \]

\[\text{Considering for 2015} \]

What technical assistance would be helpful in making or executing this decision?*  

\[\text{Technical Assistance Description} \]

*We understand that conversion is very challenging and may not always be possible or in the best interest of the project. A positive response to these questions does not constitute a commitment.
PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (Section worth up to 38 Points). The following section is related to project performance on local and HUD required outcomes. Please read the instructions carefully and complete Table 1, 2, or 3 below (according to program type).

INSTRUCTIONS

From InHOUSE Outcomes report:  All projects should run the Outcomes report from HMIS for the following periods--10/1/11-9/30/12 and 10/1/12-9/30/13-- and attach a copy of the “Program Summary” Tab page only for each report. Fill in the corresponding table based on the report for those measures that apply to your program type only. See the scoring pages for the project type, for the benchmark, and to self-score.

To be used by Transitional Housing and SSOs not tied to PH, for Outcome A.

To be used for SSO Employment only, for Outcome B.

To be used by all other program types for Outcome B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitional Housing Summary</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>Hmlss %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>80. %</td>
<td>57/71</td>
<td>76. %</td>
<td>54/71</td>
<td>80. %</td>
<td>45/56</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing - entered w/housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 36 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Exiting to permanent or interim housing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults exiting with employment income</td>
<td>34. %</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>34. %</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>26. %</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33. %</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency/Process Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People exiting to Known Destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Obtain permanent housing within 60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults who gain employment, 50% do so within 13 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach a copy of the Outcomes report to the application.
From APRs (for PSH, RRH, and PSH and SSO tied to Permanent Housing Only): Permanent Supportive Housing Projects and SSO projects connected directly to Permanent Housing must produce the retention information from 10/1/12-9/30/13 question 27. Using the formula below and the sample table identifying each cell value, calculate the 6 month retention rate. If the applicant did not meet the benchmark, run an APR for the dates listed above (10/1/12-9/30/13) and calculate the rate for six months of retention both years to identify whether the performance was 10 percentage points greater than the previous year.

Housing Retention > 6 months: \((P - H - I - J + G) - A - B - C / (P - H - I - J + G) = \% \text{ of persons retaining permanent housing for 6 months or more.}\)

Attach a copy of Question 27 from the 10/1/12-9/30/13 APR, or from the last two APR’s if the project did not meet benchmarks this year but did make the 10 point improvement.

### 27. Length of Participation by Exit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Participation by Exit Status</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From APRs (for all project types) produce the Access to Mainstream Benefits information from 10/1/12-9/30/1. Using questions 26a2 and 26b2 below from the APR, calculate use of mainstream benefits as follows:

\[(B+G)/(E+J) = \%\text{ of adults non-cash mainstream benefits}\]

### 26a2. Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status - Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 26b2. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources - Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach charts from Question 26a2 from the 10/1/12-9/30/13 APR or from the last two APR’s if the project did not meet benchmarks this year but did make the 10 point improvement.
1. Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing, and SSOs tied to Permanent Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use APR for Outcomes A-C and Returns to Homelessness Report for Outcome D</th>
<th>Benchmark for applicable sector</th>
<th>Difference between project performance and benchmark (+/-)</th>
<th>If project performance was not at or above the benchmark, was it 10 points greater than the previous year? Y/N</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. % of person who exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 12 months*</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EveryOne Home staff and/or HMIS staff will generate these reports, which will be provided to you by 12/17/13.

2. Transitional Housing, SSO Street Outreach and SSO Drop-In Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use Outcomes Report for Outcome A;</th>
<th>Benchmark for applicable</th>
<th>Difference between project</th>
<th>If project performance was not at or above the benchmark, was it 10</th>
<th>Self Score: Please</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Measure</td>
<td>APR for Outcomes B-C and Returns to Homelessness Report for Outcome D</td>
<td>sector</td>
<td>performance and benchmark (+/-)</td>
<td>points greater than the previous grant year? Y/N</td>
<td>see scoring sheet for score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. People maintaining/ retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. % of person who exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 12 months*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EveryOne Home staff and/or HMIS staff will generate these reports, which will be provided to you by 12/17/13.

### 3. SSO Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use Outcomes Report for Outcome A; APR for</th>
<th>Benchmark for applicable sector</th>
<th>Difference between project performance</th>
<th>If project performance was not at or above the benchmark,</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Page 11 of 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes B-C and Returns to Homelessness Report for Outcome D</th>
<th>and benchmark (+/-)</th>
<th>was it 10 points greater than the previous grant year? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> Adults who obtain or maintain earned income</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong> % of person who exited to permanent housing and returned to homelessness within 12 months*</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EveryOne Home staff and/or HMIS staff will generate these reports, which will be provided to you by 12/17/13.
SPENDING (Section worth up to 4 points)

HUD and Congress have both emphasized the importance of spending all allocated grant funds in a timely fashion. In light of certain cuts in this funding round, it is all the more important that we send back as little money as possible from grants that remain funded.

a. All applicants must complete this chart, even if the project had no funds remaining in the most recent grant year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unspent funds</th>
<th>Dates of grant year</th>
<th>Amount of Total Grant awarded</th>
<th>Amount unspent and returned</th>
<th>% of grant award unspent (Amount unspent / Amount of Total Grant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recently completed grant year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. If this project had remaining grant funds in the most recent year, please explain briefly why and what steps have been taken to increase expenditures in the current and coming years if returned funds were over 5% of the grant value:


c. Is this project classified as Rental Assistance?

☐ Yes  ☐ No
HMIS DATA QUALITY (Section worth up to 2 points)
Please run a copy of the Data Completeness Report Card, Report 0252 (EE v.5) for October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013. Attach a copy of the Tab B “Project Summary” page only, as a PDF.

a. Insert your average percentage here: [Percentage] (from top of Overall Summary)

b. Self score (please insert score from scoring chart here): [Score]

The Data Completeness Report Card can be found here in the InHOUSE HMIS Reporting:

Leverage (Section worth up to 3 points)
Please attach a copy of the leveraging chart included in the Project Application in e-snaps. Leverage letters do not need to be submitted with the local application, but do need to be on file with HCD, the collaborative applicant prior to package submission on 2/3/13.

Please insert the summary information into the fields below.

a. Total amount leveraged: [Amount]

b. Amount of grant request: [Amount]

c. Percent of grant request leveraged by project: [Percentage]

d. Self score (please insert score from scoring chart here): [Score]
QUALITY ASSURANCE (Section worth up to 14 points)

Narrative: Please use the space below to describe policies, procedures and actions the project and its sponsor take to ensure continuous quality improvement. How does the agency stay abreast of and implement best practices in the field? How is quality of service, consumer satisfaction and program performance assessed and maintained? Please address how data is used in planning and program management as well as how often it is updated and data quality reports run and errors corrected. How is staff trained and managed to ensure high quality of care?

Performance Improvement:

Did project have to submit a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) last year for any of the following? If yes, please describe the improvements the project committed to in that plan and whether they resulted in meeting the local benchmark or a 10% improvement from last year?

Outcome A- Housing  
☐ Yes  ☐ No
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort

Outcome B- Income  
☐ Yes  ☐ No
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort

Spending  
☐ Yes  ☐ No
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort

HMIS data Quality  
☐ Yes  ☐ No
If yes, then describe what improvements were benchmarked, and results of that effort
## Points for Rating and Ranking of Renewal Projects and Self Score Chart

Total points available = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** Primary Activity type – 18 Points maximum | - Permanent Housing (PH) = 18 Points  
- Transitional Housing = 9 Points  
- SSO Linked to Permanent Housing = 9 Points  
- All other SSO = 0 Points |
| **2** HUD Priorities = 8 Points maximum         | - Provides PSH to 100% of chronically homeless households = 8 Points  
- Provides PSH and fills 100% of turnover with chronically homeless households = 6 Points  
- Provides PSH and has committed to fill 85% of turnover to chronically homeless households = 4 Points  
- Provides Rapid Rehousing to families = 4 Points  
- Provides PSH and has committed to fill 50% of turnover to chronically homeless households = 2 Points  
- Does not provide Rapid Rehousing to families or PSH prioritized chronically homeless households = 0 Points |
| **3** Serving Target Populations = 4 Points maximum | One point will be awarded for each target population that is over 50% of client’s served by a project = total 4 possible points  
- Veterans = 1 Point  
- Youth = 1 Point  
- Domestic Violence = 1 Point  
- Unsheltered Homeless = 1 Point |
| **4** Using Housing First Approach = 6 Points maximum | Narrative up to 6 points as determined by application scorers. |
| **5** Outcome Performance – 38 Points maximum    | See Sector Specific Benchmarks and Self Scoring Charts on the following pages. |
| **6** Spending = 4 Points maximum                | - Had no unexpended funds in the last grant year = 4 Points  
- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount and is voluntarily reducing grant = 4 Points  
- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year and has provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers) = 4 Points  
- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount and is a rental assistance program = 2 Points  
- Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount, is not a rental assistance program, has not provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers), and is not reducing grant amount = 0 Points |
| **7** HMIS: Data Completeness Report Card = 2 Points maximum | - Greater than or equal to 95% = 2 Points  
- Greater than or equal to 90% and below 95% = 1 Point  
- Below 90% = 0 Points |
| 8 | Leverage = 3 Points maximum | □ Project leverages more than 150% of HUD budget = 3 Points  
□ Project leverages 100%-150% of HUD budget = 1.5 Points  
□ Project leverages 100% or less of HUD budget = 0 Points |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9 | Quality Assurance = 14 Points maximum | -Narrative up to 8 points as determined by application scorers.  
-Points for each performance measure that was met in last year’s application, or by achieving the benchmarks set in the 2012 Performance Improvement Plans (PIP) submitted last year.  
□ Housing = 2 Points if met benchmark last year or met goal of PIP  
□ Income = 2 Points if met benchmarks last year or met goal of PIP  
□ Spending = 1 Point if met benchmarks last year or met goal of PIP  
□ HMIS = 1 Point if met benchmarks last year or met goal of PIP |
| 10 | Completeness = up to 3 Points maximum | Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered. |
### Scoring for Outcome Measures, by Sector

#### 1. Permanent Supportive Housing and SSOs tied to PH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retains Permanent Housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting with income, for those entering with no income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* for sector = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 7.5 percentage points of local benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark

#### 2. Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtains Permanent housing</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting with income, for those entering with no income</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 12 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 20 percentage points of local benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 30 percentage points of local benchmark = 3 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 30 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark
### 3. SSO Street Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Obtains Permanent housing</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 10 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exiting with income, for those entering with no income.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 12 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 2.5 percentage points of local benchmark = 8 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 5 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is greater than 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark

### 4. SSO Drop-In Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Obtains Permanent housing</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 10 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10 points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Exiting with income, for those entering with no income.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 12 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 2.5 percentage points of local benchmark = 8 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 5 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56% (NOFA pg.38)</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points&lt;br&gt;☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point&lt;br&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark

5. SSO Employment Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Obtain Permanent housing</td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 6 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Exits with Earned Income</td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 12 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 8 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 20 percentage points of local benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is &gt; 20 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Obtains/mainstream benefits</td>
<td><strong>56% (NOFA pg.38)</strong></td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 6 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 2 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td><strong>&lt;10%</strong></td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point&lt;br/&gt;☐ Is &gt; 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark
2013
HUD Continuum of Care NOFA

Local NOFA and Request for Proposals Meeting
Presented by EveryOne Home
December 10, 2013
Key Dates for 2013

- **7/14/2012**: Continuum of Care Interim Rule released
- **10/17/2013**: Community meeting on NOFA options
- **11/22/2013**: C of C NOFA released
- **12/10/2013**: Local Application Released
- **1/3/2014**: Date by which local apps due and renewal e-snaps must be complete
- **1/20/2014**: Date by which local applicants must be notified of status
- **2/3/2014**: C of C application due to HUD
- **3/18/2014**: Approximate date for 1st round of award notifications
The 2013 HUD NOFA: It’s different alright

2012
Submission Had 3 Major Elements
COC Application which was scored
Project Applications
Priority Listings
All Elements covered a 1 year funding cycle
COC Application (Exhibit 1) that earns the points
Project Applications (Exhibit 2) that must be rated and ranked

2013
Submission has same major elements, but the COC Application scoring will be applied to both the 2013 and 2014 NOFA
Our COC score impacts our access to additional funds for Tier II projects
The 2013 HUD NOFA: It’s different alright

2012
Required CoCs to rank projects in two tiers with Tier II subject to defunding
- Tier II was 3.5% of total package--$870,000 for us.
- All renewals in Tier II were funded last year
All renewals were funded before new projects in each tier

2013
Maintains the two-tier ranking requirement
- Tier 2 was 5% of total package—about $1.2 mil. for us.
- Projects in Tier 2 are unlikely to be funded this year.
Permanent Housing will be funded first for both renewals and reallocations
The 2013 HUD NOFA: It’s different alright

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed breakdown of 130 pts</td>
<td>Detailed breakdown of 150 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Performance = 34 pts</td>
<td>CoC Strategic Planning &amp;Performance = 69 pts*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Strategic Planning = 55</td>
<td>CoC Service Coordination = 28 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Services &amp; Structure = 14</td>
<td>Recipient Performance = 15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging = 6</td>
<td>Housing, Services &amp; Structure = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS = 13</td>
<td>Leveraging = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Point in Time Count = 8</td>
<td>HMIS = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 16 pts for reducing chronic homelessness by dedicating and expanding PSH units in package (pg. 36)
2013 HUD CoC NOFA

**Scoring and Process Still**
- Emphasizes performance of both CoC and projects
- Allows reallocation of unspent funds and “low performing” projects to “new” permanent housing.
  - “HUD strongly encourages CoC’s to take advantage of this option” (pg. 9)

**New This Year**
- Demonstrates commitment to permanent housing, gives extra points for rapid rehousing for families, and PSH for chronic homeless. (p. 36 and 38)
- Gives points for using a Housing First approach. (p. 41)
- Prioritizes targeting the chronically homeless and increasing beds available to them even in non-dedicated units.
Tiering in the 2013 CoC NOFA

**Alameda County’s Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = $24,820,761***

ARD is the total amount of all the CoC’s projects that will be eligible for renewal this year.

HUD does not currently have enough funding for all renewals. Thus, HUD has established the following tiering process.

**Alameda County TIER 1 = $23,579,723***

Tier 1 is the CoC ARD less 5%.

HUD will first allocate funding to projects in Tier 1 for all CoC’s. All projects in Tier 1 are expected to be funded.

**TIER 2 = difference in renewal demand**

Tier 2 represents the difference in renewal demand. In Alameda County, $1,241,038 of renewal demand will fall into Tier 2.

HUD will not begin funding projects in Tier 2 (for any CoC) until ALL grants in Tier 1 (for all CoC’s) have been funded. Projects in Tier 2 are very vulnerable to not receiving funding.

*These numbers are all estimates that may be tweaked by a few thousand by HUD.
HUD will fund ALL projects in Tier 1 before funding ANY projects in Tier 2.

HUD will fund Tier 1 projects in the following priority order. Because ALL Tier 1 projects are expected to be funded, this order is essentially inconsequential in Tier 1.

**HUD’s Selection Priority for Tier 1 Projects:**

1) Renewal RRH and PSH projects
2) New PSH projects created through reallocation
3) New RRH projects for families
4) Renewal TH
5) CoC Planning costs
6) UFA costs
7) SSO projects for centralized intake
8) Renewal HMIS
9) All other SSO renewals

#5 through #7 do not apply to our CoC

* These numbers are all estimates that may be tweaked by a few thousand by HUD...
Once ALL Tier 1 projects for ALL CoC’s have been funded, HUD will begin allocating funding to projects in Tier 2 as much as funding allows.

HUD will begin by funding projects of its first Selection Priority, beginning with the highest-scoring CoC and continuing through the lower-scoring CoC.

HUD will then move down to its second Selection Priority, highest-scoring CoC through lowest-scoring CoC and so on, until funding runs out.

### HUD’s Selection Priority for Tier 2 Projects:

1. Renewal PSH and RRH projects
2. New PSH projects created through reallocation
3. New RRH projects created through reallocation
4. Renewal Transitional Housing project
5. CoC Planning costs
6. UFA costs
7. SSO projects for centralized intake
8. Renewal HMIS
9. All other SSO renewals

#4through #9 will not apply to our CoC
Where could funding for Tier 2 projects come from?

Currently, HUD only has enough funding for all projects ranked in Tier 1 nationwide.

Funding for projects ranked in Tier 2 will become available depending on how much funding HUD is able to recapture from previously unspent funds and/or unallocated Tier 1 funding.

The higher our CoC score is, the higher the likelihood of our Tier 2 projects receiving funding will be.

When will projects be notified of whether they will receive funding?

**Tier 1 Projects:**
HUD will notify Tier 1 projects 45 days after the NOFA deadline. All Tier 1 projects are expected to be funded.

- NOFA deadline: February 3\(^{rd}\), 2014
- Tier 1 projects notified: 2\(^{nd}\) half of March, 2014

**Tier 2 Projects:**
HUD will notify Tier 2 projects *after* Tier 1 projects, but no specific timing has been announced. Depending on how quickly HUD is able to assess the amount of funding available for Tier 2, these projects could be notified anytime during 2014 after March. There is no guarantee that any Tier 2 projects in our package will be funded.
Local Process and Priorities
Our Local Process

• In August the EveryOne Home Leadership Board appointed a NOFA Committee charged with:
  ▫ Soliciting community input
  ▫ Evaluating the HUD NOFA
  ▫ Determining the local application strategy for maximizing the dollars and effectiveness of the package.
  ▫ Approving the local RFP, rating and ranking the proposals, and
  ▫ Approving the final selection and ordering of projects to be included in the package.
The NOFA Committee

Jill Dunner, Consumer and EveryOne Home Leadership Board Member

Damon Francis, Alameda County Public Health Department

Grace Kong, City of Hayward

Duane Poe, Black Bay Area United Fund

Angela Robinson-Pinon, Alameda County Planning Department

Marnell Tinson, Consumer

Moe Wright, BBI Construction
The Committee’s Approach

- Participated in the October Community Meeting and helped develop NOFA analysis and review NOFA options.

- Met three times since to develop the application and approach being outlined today.
The Committee’s Approach

- We built on the groundwork of last year for using performance standards in funding decisions.

- Committed to rate and rank in the most fair way possible, given the intensive constraints being placed upon us by the 5% cut.

- Used rating and ranking criteria we believe will maximize our scoring for the C of C application (exhibit 1), thereby positioning us to get as much money from Tier 2 as possible.
What We Heard

The feedback we heard from the community at the meeting:

▫ Desire to see Alameda County Philosophy incorporated into this process, not just to fall in line with HUD’s priorities only.
▫ Be mindful of the “real cost” to cutting programs.
▫ Consider partial across the board cuts.
▫ Be conscious of geography and populations served.
▫ Time constraints make reallocation extremely challenging.
▫ Be careful that the decisions we make do not make anyone end up homeless.
The NOFA Strategy

• Emphasizes performance again this year:
  ▫ Higher performing projects will be ranked in Tier 1, The lowest performing renewals will be ranked in tier 2.
  ▫ Projects must score a minimum of 60 points for inclusion in Tier 1
  ▫ We removed ‘exiting to known destination’ and replaced it with ‘access to mainstream benefits’ and ‘returns to homelessness’
  ▫ We are still scoring the expending of grant funds.
  ▫ We are keeping data accuracy and completeness as a performance measure.
The NOFA Strategy

- Prioritizes Permanent Housing, which means:
  - No C of C Planning Grant will be included in the package.
  - Transitional Housing and SSO renewals who score into Tier 2 will not be included in the package. They will be reallocated into permanent housing.
The NOFA Strategy

Additional Strategies:

- We welcome voluntary reductions to grants.
- As a renewing project and essential for C of C funding, HMIS will be in tier 1.
- The Committee will take into account geographic and population diversity, loss of housing, grant expiration and whether projects have tried to convert as possible basis for adjusting the rating and ranking.
NOFA Strategy and Local Apps

The Committee did its best to create a process that:

• Responds to requirements and addresses cuts dictated by HUD
• Creates the strongest application for submission
• Focus our efforts on strategies to target the most vulnerable people, and focuses our resources in the most strategic way possible.
• Deploys proven strategies and target resources to best practices, maximizes dollars at the front line, and uses data and performance to make choices
Renewal Applications
Renewal Project Applications

• Complete Project Application in e-snaps

• Complete Local application and email to EveryOneHome@acgov.org

• Include back-up documentation in a PDF

• Both parts due January 3, 2014, by 4:00:00 pm
Overview

• Application includes questions needed by EveryOne Home to complete CoC Application (e.g. Mainstream resources, education)

• Application focuses on performance on various indicators – aligns with the information required in CoC Application and HUD concerns and priorities

• Lower performers will be designated at Tier 2 and may funding may be reallocated to fund new permanent housing projects.
General Section

• Information about Project and applicant
• Information needed for CoC Application
• Points on this section for:
  – Project Type – up to 18 points
  – HUD’s priorities -- 22 points
    – Does PSH for CH or RRH for families
    – Serves certain target populations
    – Uses a Housing First Approach
Outcome Measures

• Using information from HMIS and from APR’s, complete outcomes measure charts for the project types.
• Points on this section up to 38
Outcome Measures

• Measures required and benchmarks different for different program types

  A. Obtains or Retains Permanent Housing (16 pts)

  B. Exiting with income, for those entering with no income

  or

  B. Exiting with earned income (for SSO Employment Programs only) (12 pts)

  C. Obtains/maintains mainstream benefits (6 pts)

  D. Returns to Homelessness (4 pts)
Info from HMIS outcome reports

- Clients may have multiple exits in this category. The count is duplicated by client so the percentage is calculated based on all exits.

**Transitional Housing Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Types in Data</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>Hmss %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People obtaining permanent housing</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>57/71</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>54/71</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>45/56</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing - entered with housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People maintaining/retaining permanent housing &gt; 36 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to streets or shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to permanent or interim housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults exiting with employment income</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>10/29</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults entering with no income, an increase in those who exit with an income</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency/Process Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2012 - Sep 29, 2013</th>
<th>Current Basis</th>
<th>Hmss %</th>
<th>Homeless @ Entry</th>
<th>Oct 1, 2011 - Sep 30, 2012</th>
<th>Prior Basis</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People exiting to Known Destination</td>
<td></td>
<td>67/71</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>64/71</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>52/56</td>
<td>(95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain permanent housing within 60 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of adults who gain employment, 50% do so within 13 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N/A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Info from APR
(PSH, RRH, and SSOs tied to housing only)

Housing Retention >6 months: \((P - H - I - J + G) - A - B - C / (P - H - I - J + G) = \% \text{ of persons}\)
Info From APR (all program types)

26a2. Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status - Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26b2. Number of Non-Cash Benefit Sources - Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know / Refused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(B+G)/(E+J) = \% of adults with non-cash mainstream benefits\]
Returns to Homelessness

• EveryOne Home / HMIS staff will generate this report, which will be provided by December 17, 2013.

• Use this report to complete measure D for all program types.
Spending

• Points on this section up to 4
• Report on amount of unspent funds for past years; explain any issues
• This year, Rental Assistance programs will be considered differently and get 2 pts even if under spent, but must explain
HMIS

• Report on data quality for required Universal data elements using Bowman “Data Quality Report Card”
• Points on this section up to 2
• Points based on percent of data quality must be higher than 95% to get 2 points, 90% to get 1
# Data quality report card

## Data Completeness Report Card (EE)

**Summary by Provider**

**Date Range:** 1/1/12 - 11/28/12

### Grade Based on Average Percentage

| B | 94.64% |

### Universal Data Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universal Data Element</th>
<th>Required for</th>
<th>Number of Applicable Entry Exits</th>
<th>Number of Non-Null Values</th>
<th>Percentage Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Number*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Status*</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabling Condition*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified Disability</td>
<td>Disab = Y</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Prior to Program Entry*</td>
<td>Adults &amp; UY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code of Last Permanent Address*</td>
<td>Adults &amp; UY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless (Y/N)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>Homeless = Y or Literally Homeless</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Status*</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Not Included</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Received (Y/N) (Entry)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Received (Y/N) (Exit)</td>
<td>All Exits</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Source at Entry</td>
<td>Income = Y (Entry)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Source at Exit</td>
<td>Income = Y (Exit)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Amount at Entry</td>
<td>Income = Y (Entry)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Amount at Exit</td>
<td>Income = Y (Exit)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cash Benefit Received (Y/N) (Entry)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cash Benefit Received (Y/N) (Exit)</td>
<td>All Exits</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cash Source at Entry</td>
<td>Non-Cash = Y (Entry)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cash Source at Exit</td>
<td>Non-Cash = Y (Exit)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>Adults &amp; UY</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = MUI Universal Data Elements
Leveraging

- Complete Leveraging Chart in e-snaps
- Summarize amounts in local application
- Points on this section up to 3
- Points based on ratio of leveraging to HUD request
- See self scoring sheet for details
Quality Assurance

• Worth 14 points

• Narrative on use of best practices, customer satisfaction, performance monitoring, use of data staff training and quality of care

• Whether had to submit a PIP last year and if met goals in PIP or 10% increase.
New Applications
New Project Applications

• Complete Local application and email to EveryOneHome@acgov.org
• Due January 3, 2014 at 4:00:00pm
• Notified by January 20, 2014
• If selected to submit, complete Project Application in e-snaps by January 28, 2013
• Local app draws strongly from HUD app
New projects

• New projects are those that use reallocated funds from other projects or reductions from other projects
  or
• Those that are TH or SSO that want to convert to PSH or RRH

• Those projects which want to convert should have already been in discussion with HCD and EveryOne, and possibly HUD
General Section

• Basic information about project, applicant and subrecipients
  
  • Primary Activity = PH = 18 points
  • Serve chronically homeless = 8 points
  • Or RRH for families = 4 points
  • Housing First Approach = 6 points
Demonstrated Capacity of Applicant

- Section worth 30 points
- Section describes applicant team, roles, experience, performance on similar projects, and monitoring or audit issues and quality assurance
- Points for strong experience of partners, no outstanding issues or explanation of issues, strong past performance or explanation of how Performance will be ensured
### Past Performance of Team members on similar projects

**Outcomes Chart (pg 5 of New Project RFP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Agency Name</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>Project 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type (PSH, RRH, SSO tied to PH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.1: Obtaining Permanent Housing for RRH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A.2: Permanent Housing Retention &gt; 6 months for PSH and SSO’s tied to perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure B: Of those adults entering with no income % who obtain some income for all project types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure C: Adults obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits for all projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project details

• Section worth 16 points
• Section describes overall project, target population, housing assistance, and supportive services to be provided
• Points for well-designed project, appropriate services and outreach plan to population and need
Timing

• Section worth 8 points
• Section describes project timing, management plan (if applicable), and dates to begin Housing people and reach capacity
• Points for clear, realistic schedule and ability to begin serving homeless people quickly
• Reach full capacity within a year
Budget

- Section worth 8 points
- Points for reasonable and clear budget for type of project; Required match is included; Other project funds needed for project are committed or likely; Project is cost effective compared to other similar new permanent housing applications
- If project is converting ensure no persons made homeless if there will be a funding gap between new and old project
Leverage

- Section worth 3 points
- Section consists of leverage chart
- Points for leveraging ratio to budget request.
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
[Docket No. FR-5700-N-31B]
Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014
Continuum of Care Program Competition

OVERVIEW INFORMATION

A. **Federal Agency Name:** U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Community Planning and Development.

B. **Funding Opportunity Title:** Notice of Funding Availability for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program.

C. **Announcement Type:** Initial Announcement.

D. **Funding Opportunity Number:** The funding opportunity number is **FR-5700-N-31B.**

   The OMB Approval number is 2506-0112.

E. **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number:** 14.267.

F. **Deadline:** The deadline for submitting applications to HUD for the FY 2013 – FY 2014 Continuum of Care Program Competition (CoC Program Competition) will have separate deadlines for FY 2013 and FY 2014 funding requests. For FY 2013 funds, the deadline for submitting applications is **7:59:59 p.m. eastern time, February 3, 2014.** Applicants will be required to complete and submit their applications in e-snaps at [www.hud.gov/esnaps](http://www.hud.gov/esnaps). See Section VI of this NOFA for application submission and timely receipt requirements.

   The deadline for submitting the documentation required for FY 2014 funds will be announced in a subsequent Notice to be published by HUD, but will be no earlier than 60 days after Congress enacts an appropriation funding the Department for the balance of FY 2014. See Section I.B.2 of this NOFA for information on when and how to apply for FY 2014 funds.

G. **For Further Information:** HUD staff will be available to provide general clarification on the content of this NOFA. HUD staff cannot assist applicants in preparing their applications to submit for funding.

1. **Local HUD CPD Field Office.** Questions regarding specific program requirements should be directed to the local HUD CPD Field Office, a directory of which can be found at [www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/staff/fodirectors/index.cfm](http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/about/staff/fodirectors/index.cfm).

2. **Training and Resources.** CoCs and project applicants that need assistance completing the applications in e-snaps or understanding the program requirements under the CoC Program may access the CoC Program interim rule, training materials, and program
resources via the OneCPD Resource Exchange at www.onecpd.info.

3. **The OneCPD Ask A Question (AAQ).** CoCs, Collaborative Applicants, and project applicants that require information and technical support concerning this NOFA and the applications in e-snaps may submit an electronic inquiry via the OneCPD AAQ at www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question. The AAQ is accessible 24 hours each day. Starting on the day prior to the application deadline for FY 2013 funds, the AAQ will respond only to emergency technical support questions up to the deadline of 7:59:59 p.m. eastern time.

H. **General Section Questions.** The Notice of FY 2013 Policy Requirements and General Section to HUD’s FY 2013 NOFAs for Discretionary Programs (General Section) is applicable to both FY 2013 funding and FY 2014 funding made available under the CoC Program competition. The General Section can be found at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail. The Notice of FY 2014 Policy Requirements and General Section to HUD’s FY 2014 NOFAs for Discretionary Programs will not apply to FY 2014 funding made available under this NOFA.

Questions regarding the General Section should be directed to the Office of Strategic Planning and Management, Grants Management and Oversight Division at (202) 708-0667 (this is not a toll-free number). Persons with hearing or speech impairments may access these numbers via TTY by calling the Federal Information Relay Service at (800) 877-8339.

**Additional Overview Information**

1. **Available Funds.** For the CoC Program Competition, approximately $1.7 billion is available for FY 2013 after adjustments were made as a result of sequestration. HUD does not anticipate that this will be adequate to fund all existing projects eligible for renewal with FY2013 funds. HUD may add to this amount any available funds that have been carried over or recaptured from previous fiscal years. All of the requirements for applying for FY 2013 funds, including requirements for the entire CoC Consolidated Application and the total amount of funding available, are contained in this NOFA.

For FY 2014, the level of funding for the CoC Program is not yet known. The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-46, approved October 17, 2013) funds HUD operations and programs at FY 2013 levels, but provides such funding only through January 15, 2014. Nevertheless for purposes of expediency and efficiency, this FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program NOFA (CoC Program NOFA) will award funds made available for the CoC Program under FY 2013 and FY 2014. When the level of funding is known for FY 2014, HUD will announce this amount through separate notice. In this separate notice; HUD will also publish the deadlines for submitting the information required by HUD. For more information on applying for FY 2014 funds under this NOFA, see Section I.B.2.

2. **Eligible Applicants.**

   a. **CoC Consolidated Applications.** CoCs were required to designate a Collaborative
Applicant to submit the CoC Consolidated Application on behalf of the CoC as part of the FY 2013 CoC Registration process. Collaborative Applicants will not be able to access the CoC Consolidated Application in e-snaps if the CoC does not have an approved Registration. The Collaborative Applicant approved by HUD during the FY 2013 registration process must be the same entity that submits the CoC Consolidated Application – which includes the CoC Application, Priority Listings that list all project applications accepted and ranked or rejected in the CoC local competition, and the Project Application – during the CoC Program Competition. CoCs should not attempt to change Collaborative Applicants during the CoC Program Competition without HUD’s prior approval. HUD will approve Collaborative Applicant changes after the FY 2013 CoC Registration process under circumstances that include:

i. an error made by the Collaborative Applicant when entering the Collaborative Applicant’s name in the CoC Applicant Profile,
ii. the Collaborative Applicant chosen by the CoC is no longer in business,
iii. the Collaborative Applicant withdrew, or
iv. the CoC withdrew the Collaborative Applicant.

b. In cases where the CoC needs to change the Collaborative Applicant approved during Registration, the CoC must notify the local HUD CPD field office in writing stating the reason for the Collaborative Applicant change. The notice to HUD must provide documentation of the CoC’s approval of the change (e.g., a copy of the meeting minutes, to include the date and attendees).

c. Project Applicants. Eligible project applicants for the CoC Program are identified in Section V.A.

d. Amendments to FY 2013 Registration. If a geographic area that includes projects eligible to apply for renewal funding during the CoC Program Competition was not claimed by a CoC with an approved FY 2013 CoC Registration, a contiguous CoC or the Balance of State CoC may contact HUD in writing to request that its Registration and FY 2013 Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW) be amended to include the unclaimed geographic area and the renewal projects. Additionally, if a CoC with an approved FY 2013 CoC Registration failed to include an eligible project on the CoC’s FY 2013 GIW during the FY 2013 CoC Registration the CoC will have the opportunity to amend its FY 2013 GIW to make those changes. Projects eligible for renewal in FY 2014 should not be added to this list as there will be a separate, modified CoC Registration process, for FY 2014 funds under the CoC Program Competition (see section 1.B.2 of this NOFA for more information). Any changes to the FY 2013 GIW after CoC Registration must be approved by the local HUD CPD field office, in consultation with HUD Headquarters, within 7 days after the publication of the this NOFA. The due date of final HUD-approval for FY 2013 GIW changes is **December 4, 2013 by 5:00 pm local time.** Collaborative Applicants will be required to attach the HUD-approved FY 2013 GIW that contains the final FY 2013 Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) to the CoC Application. No changes to the FY 2013 GIW will be considered after the 7-day grace period.
3. **Additional Information Regarding FY 2013-FY 2014 CoC Program Competition (CoC Program Competition).** All requirements for applying for FY 2013 funds, including requirements for the entire Consolidated Application and the total amount of funding available, are contained in this NOFA. Applicants should read this information carefully and respond to all submission requirements and deadlines as described. The **February 3, 2014** deadline established in this NOFA applies to the following (see Section I.B.2 of this NOFA for more information):
   a. 2013/2014 CoC Application
   b. FY 2013 Project Applications; and
   c. FY 2013 Priority Listings.

Because the amount of funding available for FY 2014 is not yet known, HUD will publish at a later date any additional application requirements and the submission deadline for FY 2014 funds. Applicants will not be required to submit a separate CoC Application for FY2014 funds. The score received for the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application submitted by **February 3, 2014** will apply to funding requested for FY 2014 funds as well as FY 2013 funds. However, applicants will be required, at a minimum, to complete the following to apply for FY 2014 funds:
   a. A modified FY 2014 CoC Registration that will establish the CoC’s FY 2014 Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN) and FY 2014 ARD amounts, and that will allow Collaborative Applicants to be designated by HUD as Unified Funding Agencies (UFAs). During this modified registration process, changes in claimed geography will not be allowed;
   b. FY 2014 Project Applications. These will be submitted in e-snaps and may be for CoC planning costs, UFA costs, renewal projects eligible for FY 2014 funds, and new projects created through reallocation;
   c. FY 2014 Priority Listing that provides HUD with the projects submitted for FY 2014 funding in priority order; and,
   d. A HUD-2991 for all required projects.

The deadline for submission of documentation for FY 2014 funding as described above will be no earlier than 60 days after Congress enacts an appropriation funding the Department for the balance of FY 2014.

4. **Eligible Costs.** 24 CFR 578.37 through 578.63 identify the eligible costs for which funding can be requested for the CoC Program. HUD will reject any requests for ineligible costs.

5. **Match.** 24 CFR 578.73 describes match requirements.

6. **Requirements.** The following requirements apply to funding available under this NOFA:
   a. **DUNS number and SAM.** Project applicants are required to register with Dun and Bradstreet to obtain a DATA Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number, if they have not already done so, and complete or renew their registration in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR)/System for Award Management (SAM) per the General Section, III.C.2.b. and c. HUD will not enter into a grant agreement with an entity that does not
have a DUNS Number or an active SAM.

b. **Major natural disaster areas.** HUD will award at least the minimum score, 34.5 out of 69 points for questions associated with Section VII.A.1 of this NOFA in the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application for CoCs with one or more projects directly impacted by a major disaster, as declared by President Obama under Title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Act, in the 12 months prior to the deadline for submitting the application for FY2013 funds.

7. **Local Competition Deadlines.** 24 CFR 578.9 requires CoCs to design, operate, and follow a collaborative process for the development of an application in response to a NOFA issued by HUD. As part of this collaborative process, CoCs should implement internal competition deadlines to ensure transparency and fairness at the local level. The implementation of deadlines that meet the standards outlined below for FY 2013 Project Applications will be considered as part of scoring criteria as detailed in Section VII.A.4.f.

   a. **Project Applications.** All project applications were required to be submitted to the CoC no later than 30 days before the application deadline.

   b. **CoC Notification to Project Applicants.** The CoC notified all project applicants no later than 15 days before the application deadline regarding whether their project applications would be included as part of the CoC Consolidated Application submission. Any project applicants that submitted projects that were rejected by the CoC must have been notified in writing, outside of e-snaps, with an explanation for the decision to reject the project(s).

8. **CoC Transparency.** In order to receive the maximum number of points available in Section VII.A.4.f, the CoC must have in place a process to make all parts of the CoC Consolidated Application available to its community for inspection and to notify community members and key stakeholders that the application is available. If the CoC does not have a website, the CoC should post this information to a partner website within the CoC (e.g., county/city website). The process must be conducted in a manner that is accessible for persons with disabilities and persons with limited English proficiency.

**FULL TEXT OF THE ANNOUNCEMENT**

**I. Funding Opportunity Description.**

**Program Description:** The CoC Program is designed to promote a community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness; to provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, States, and local governments to quickly re-house the homeless while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused by homelessness; to promote access to and effective utilization of mainstream programs by the homeless; and to optimize self-sufficiency among those experiencing homelessness.

A. **Authority:** The CoC Program is authorized by subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, (42 U.S.C. 11381–11389) (the Act). The FY 2013 funds for the CoC Program were authorized by the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6, approved March 26, 2013) (the “HUD Appropriations Act”).
FY 2014 funds available, to date, for the CoC Program were authorized by the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-46, approved October 17, 2013).

B. **Summary of the Application Process:** The FY 2013- FY 2014 CoC Program Competition (CoC Program Competition) is administered under the CoC Program interim rule. Applicants should review and follow the steps as outlined below to ensure that applications are complete and submitted on time. Documents referenced in this section can be found on the OneCPD Resource Exchange at www.onecpd.info. While this NOFA applies to both FY2013 and FY2014 funds, the process for submitting required documentation differs according to the funding year as described below.

**1.** The following requirements apply to the application process for FY 2013 funds:

a. Collaborative Applicants must have completed the FY 2013 CoC Registration in accordance with the Notice of Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Opportunity to Register and Other Important Information for Electronic Application Submission for Continuum of Care Program Competition (FY 2013 CoC Registration Notice) published on August 23, 2013.

b. Project applications submitted to the CoC for inclusion on the FY 2013 Priority Listings as part of the CoC Consolidated Application must be reviewed and either accepted or rejected by the CoC. All projects approved by the CoC must be ranked as Tier 1 or Tier 2 as described in Section II.B.10 of this NOFA. The purpose of this two-tiered approach is for CoCs to clearly indicate to HUD which projects are prioritized for funding in the event that the national total Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) exceeds the $1.7 billion of FY 2013 funds available through this NOFA. In this case, funding will only be available for projects ranked in Tier 1. CoCs that receive a higher score have a better chance of being awarded projects ranked in Tier 2, depending on the availability of carryover or recaptured funds to be used in FY 2013 under the CoC Program Competition.

c. The Collaborative Applicant, including any Collaborative Applicant designated by HUD as a Unified Funding Agency (UFA), is responsible for submitting the CoC Consolidated Application in e-snaps on behalf of the CoC. The CoC Consolidated Application is made up of the following three parts:

1. The FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application. The Collaborative Applicant must provide information about the CoC planning body, governance structure, overall performance, and the strategic planning process. This part of the application is scored and will determine the order in which CoCs are funded. This score will apply to funds requested under FY 2013 and FY 2014. For more information on the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, see Section VI.B.1.a. of this NOFA.

2. The FY 2013 Project Applications. A project application must be completed by project applicants for CoC planning, UFA costs, new projects created through reallocation, and renewal project requests. New project applicants applying for
funds through reallocation or renewal projects must provide a description of the proposed project including who the project will serve, the type of housing and services that will be provided, and what budget activities are being requested. Project applicants applying for CoC planning or UFA costs must provide a description of the activities that will be carried out with grant funds for CoC planning or UFA costs. For more information on the Project Application, see Section VI.B.1.b of this NOFA.

(3) The FY 2013 Priority Listings. There are four separate Project Listing forms in e-snaps that make up the Priority Listing, which lists the new projects created through reallocation, renewal, CoC planning, and UFA costs project applications that the CoC intends to submit. The Priority Listing ranks the projects in order of priority and identifies any project requests rejected by the CoC. The Collaborative Applicant cannot correctly complete this part of the CoC Consolidated Application until all Project Applications have been submitted to the CoC. Further, the Collaborative Applicant will be required to certify that there is a demonstrated need for all ranked permanent housing renewal projects on the applicable Project Listing. For more information on the Priority Listings, see Section VI.B.1.c.

2. Because the amount of funding available in FY 2014 is not yet known, HUD will publish at a later date any additional application requirements and the deadline for FY 2014 funds. The deadline for the information described below will be no earlier than 60 days after Congress enacts an appropriation funding the Department for the balance of FY 2014. At a minimum, the following requirements apply to the application process for FY 2014 funds under the CoC Program Competition:

a. Collaborative Applicants must have completed the FY 2013 CoC Registration as well as complete a modified FY 2014 CoC Registration process. The modified FY 2014 CoC Registration will establish the CoC’s FY 2014 Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN) and FY 2014 ARD amounts, and will allow Collaborative Applicants to apply to HUD for UFA designation. During this modified registration process, changes in claimed geography from the FY 2013 CoC Registration will not be allowed.

b. The FY 2014 Project Applications. A project application must be completed by project applicants for CoC planning, UFA costs, new projects created through reallocation, and renewal project requests. Project applications submitted to the CoC for inclusion on the FY 2014 Priority Listings must be reviewed and either accepted or rejected by the CoC. All projects approved by the CoC must be ranked as Tier 1 or Tier 2 as will be described when HUD publishes the additional requirements and deadline for FY 2014 funds. The purpose of this two-tiered approach is for CoCs to clearly indicate to HUD which projects are prioritized for funding in the event that the national total FY 2014 ARD exceeds the amount of FY 2014 funds made available. In this case, funding will only be available for projects ranked in Tier 1. CoCs that receive a higher score on the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application have a better chance
of being awarded projects ranked in Tier 2, depending on the availability of carryover or recaptured funds to be used in the CoC Program Competition.

c. The FY 2014 Priority Listings. There are four separate Project Listing forms in e-snaps that make up the Priority Listings, which lists the new projects created through reallocation, renewal, CoC planning, and UFA costs project applications that the CoC intends to submit. The Priority Listing ranks the projects in order of priority and identifies any project requests rejected by the CoC. The Collaborative Applicant will not be able to correctly complete this part of the FY 2014 requirements until all Project Applications have been submitted to the CoC.

d. Form HUD-2991: Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan for FY 2014 projects.

3. The following requirements apply to the application process for both FY 2013 and FY 2014 funds

a. CoCs and applicants should read this NOFA in its entirety in conjunction with the CoC Program interim rule in order to gain a comprehensive understanding and to comply with CoC Program requirements. This NOFA frequently makes reference to citations from the CoC Program interim rule (24 CFR part 578). Applicants should review the General Section of the NOFA, published on July 23, 2012 and the General Section Technical Correction, published October 13, 2012.

b. CoCs should consider the policy priorities established in this NOFA in conjunction with local priorities to determine the ranking of new projects created through reallocation, CoC planning, UFA costs, and renewal project requests. See Section II of this NOFA for more information on HUD’s homeless policy priorities.

c. HUD will conduct a threshold review of ranked projects for all CoCs that submit the CoC Consolidated Application by the application submission deadline.

d. HUD intends to announce conditional funding for Tier 1 renewal projects within 45 days of the application submission deadline(s) of the CoC Program Competition.

e. HUD will score FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Applications in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section VII.A of this NOFA. HUD will announce any additional Conditional Awards (new projects created through reallocation, CoC planning funds, UFA costs, if applicable, and Tier 2 renewals) after scoring is complete, depending on availability of funding, and in accordance with the selection criteria outlined in Section VII.B.1.b of this NOFA. CoCs that receive a higher score have a better chance of being awarded projects ranked in Tier 2, depending on the availability of carryover or recaptured funds to be used in the CoC Program Competition.

II. HUD’s Homeless Policy and Program Priorities

A. Homeless Policy Priorities. The General Section establishes specific policy priorities, two
of which each program NOFA must include unless an exception is explicitly stated. While HUD will award up to two points for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing under this NOFA (per Section VII), HUD will not award points on the General Section policy priorities. Rather, this NOFA focuses on the Administration goals articulated in *Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness.* The goals of *Opening Doors* are consistent with the Department’s homeless goals as stated in HUD’s Strategic Plan.

FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC applications submitted to HUD for the CoC Program Competition will be evaluated in part based on the extent to which the CoC demonstrates efforts in place that further the achievement of HUD’s goals through community-level implementation of the homeless policy priorities and activities listed below.

For more information on the CoC Program Competition scoring and selection criteria, see Section VII. Below is a description of HUD’s policy priorities for the CoC Program Competition.

1. **Strategic Resource Allocation.** Each CoC must comprehensively review all existing projects within its geographic area, using CoC-approved scoring criteria and selection priorities, to determine the extent to which each project is still necessary and addresses the listed policy priorities above. Funds for projects that are determined to be underperforming, obsolete, or ineffective should be reallocated to new projects that are based on proven or promising models.

2. **Ending chronic homelessness.**

   a. **Increasing Beds:** In order to increase the number of beds specifically for the chronically homeless and work towards the goal of ending chronic homelessness by 2015, CoCs will be able to apply for new projects created through reallocation for permanent supportive housing (PSH) that propose to exclusively serve the chronically homeless—which includes individuals and households with children—as defined in 24 CFR 578.3, as part of its comprehensive strategy to end chronic homelessness. Chronically homeless and permanent supportive housing are defined in 24 CFR 578.3. Consistent with the interim rule, the chronically homeless includes individuals and families who have a qualifying disabling condition and meet the criteria of chronic homelessness.

   b. **Targeting:** The chronically homeless should be given priority for PSH beds as vacancies become available through turnover. PSH renewal projects serving specific disabled subpopulations (e.g., persons with mental illness or persons with substance abuse issues) must continue to serve those groups, as required in the current grant agreement. However, the chronically homeless within the specified subpopulation should be prioritized for entry.

   c. **Housing First** is a model of housing assistance that is offered without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation
requirements, and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary
goals. Research shows that it is effective for the chronically homeless with mental
health and substance abuse disorders, resulting in fewer inpatient stays and less
expensive interventions than other approaches. PSH projects should use a Housing
First approach in the design of the program.

3. Ending family homelessness.

a. **Rapid Re-Housing** is a model of housing assistance that is designed to assist the
homeless, with or without disabilities, move as quickly as possible into permanent
housing and achieve stability in that housing. Rapid re-housing assistance is time-
limited, individualized, and flexible, and is designed to complement and enhance
homeless system performance and the performance of other homeless projects. While
it can be used for any homeless person, preliminary evidence indicates that it can be
particularly effective for households with children.

b. CoCs may apply for new projects created through reallocation for rapid re-housing to
serve homeless households with children. Rapid re-housing projects must serve
households with children living on the streets or in emergency shelter.

4. Removing Barriers to CoC Resources.

CoCs should review system and project level eligibility criteria to identify and remove
barriers to accessing services and housing that are experienced by homeless individuals
and families.

a. **Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System:** Centralized or coordinated
assessment is a key step in assessing the needs of the homeless requesting assistance
and matching the needs of those households to the most appropriate housing and
service options. The CoC Program interim rule requires the implementation of a
centralized or coordinated assessment system.

b. **Transitional Housing:** HUD recognizes that transitional housing can be an effective
tool in many communities for addressing the needs of specific subpopulations—such
as homeless youth, domestic violence survivors, and the homeless with substance
abuse issues. However, recent research shows that transitional housing is generally
more expensive than other housing models serving similar populations, it is often
more service-intensive than most homeless households need, and that the criteria for
entry into many transitional housing programs are so rigorous that transitional
housing beds are under-utilized because homeless households cannot overcome the
barriers to entry. HUD is strongly encouraging CoCs and recipients to carefully
review the transitional housing models within the geographic area for cost-
effectiveness, performance, and for the number and type of criteria used to determine
eligibility for the program and determine if rapid re-housing may be a better model
for the CoC’s geographic area.
c. *Prioritizing Households Most in Need:* CoCs should prioritize those who are identified as most in need (e.g., those who have been living on the street the longest, homeless households with children living in unsheltered situations, those that are considered most medically vulnerable) for placement into appropriate housing.

5. **Maximizing the use of mainstream resources.**

a. HUD strongly encourages CoCs and project applicants to ensure that they are maximizing the use of all mainstream services available. While the CoC Program interim rule allows for the payment of certain supportive service costs and Supportive Services Only projects, it is more efficient for CoCs to use mainstream resources where possible and use HUD funds for housing-related costs. CoCs should proactively seek and provide information to recipients within the geographic area about mainstream resources and funding opportunities.

b. CoCs should be actively preparing for implementation of the Affordable Care Act by determining how these funds may be used by recipients to serve the homeless. While this will vary by state, CoCs should also be encouraging project recipients to participate in enrollment and outreach activities to ensure eligible households take advantage of new healthcare options.

6. **Building partnerships.**

a. CoCs should proactively seek to engage in partnerships with Public Housing Agencies (PHA) within their geographic area. HUD encourages CoCs to partner with PHAs, for example, to create homeless preferences or adopt strategies to assist current program participants to access PHA housing resources as they become ready to do so. CoCs and PHAs are encouraged to read and use the following HUD Notice (PIH 2013-15) published June 10, 2013: *Guidance on housing individuals and families experiencing homelessness through the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs.*

b. CoCs should assess the extent to which philanthropy plays a role within the community. CoCs and project recipients should consider how to engage with philanthropic organizations in a way to maximize resources and increase progress towards ending homelessness.

7. **Other Priority Populations:** While new funding opportunities through reallocation will only be available for the chronically homeless and homeless households with children, HUD also expects CoCs to consider the needs of other homeless populations that may be prevalent in the CoC’s geographic area, especially the needs of veterans and their families and unaccompanied youth (section VII.A.1.f of this NOFA). The CoC Program Competition will include points on the extent to which the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application demonstrates that these populations are served:
a. **Veterans:** CoC Program funded projects should, to the extent possible, prioritize veterans who are ineligible for VA services and their families. CoCs should work closely with the local Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and coordinate CoC resources with VA-funded housing and services (e.g., HUD-VASH, Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF)).

b. **Homeless Youth:** CoCs should be able to identify and describe the needs of homeless youth within the geographic area and the current programs designed to serve this population, including performance.

**B. CoC Program Implementation.** The following list highlights important information that applicants should consider as they are preparing the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application and Project Application(s). This is not an exhaustive list of considerations or requirements—all applicants and CoC stakeholders should carefully review the CoC Program interim rule for comprehensive information. Additionally, all applicants and CoC stakeholders should carefully review the notice containing the additional application requirements and deadline for FY 2014 funds under the CoC Program Competition when it is published.

1. Due to funding limitations, HUD will not consider requests for new funding outside of the reallocation process, CoC planning, and UFA costs.

2. In the CoC Program Competition, CoCs may use reallocation to create new PSH projects that serve the chronically homeless; or,

3. Through reallocation, CoCs may create new rapid re-housing projects for homeless households with children.

4. Any changes to the FY 2013 GIW after CoC Registration must be approved by the local HUD CPD field office, in consultation with HUD Headquarters, within 7 days after the publication of the FY 2013 – FY 2014 CoC Program NOFA (CoC Program NOFA). The due date of final HUD-approval for changes to the FY 2013 GIW is **December 4, 2013 by 5:00 pm local time.** Collaborative Applicants will be required to attach the HUD-approved FY 2013 GIW that contains the final HUD-approved FY 2013 ARD to the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application. No changes to the FY 2013 GIW will be considered after the 7-day grace period. It is crucial that CoCs ensure the final FY 2013 GIW is accurate and only those projects that are eligible for renewal in FY 2013 are listed. Projects eligible for renewal in FY 2014 should not be added to this list as there will be a separate, modified CoC Registration process, including a new GIW, for FY 2014 funds under the CoC Program Competition (see section I.B.2 of this NOFA for more information). New projects that were awarded funding in the FY 2012 CoC Program Competition must have an executed grant agreement by December 31, 2013 in order to be eligible for renewal with FY 2013 funds. HUD will remove the annual renewal amount from a CoCs FY 2013 ARD if it determines that any project listed on a CoC’s final FY 2013 GIW was a new project awarded in the FY 2012 CoC Program Competition that did not have an executed grant agreement by December 31, 2013. HUD’s removal of an ineligible renewal project from the FY 2013 GIW attached to the
FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application will affect the CoC’s Tier 1 funding line for FY 2013 funds.

5. SHP renewal project applicants that were approved by HUD during the FY 2013 CoC Registration process to change a project budget line item from leasing to rental assistance must provide a commitment letter from an entity eligible to administer rental assistance (a State, unit of general local government, or a public housing agency). Project applicants must have the commitment letter that is dated by the application submission deadline and will be required to provide it to the local HUD CPD field office after announcement of the award and before the grant agreement is signed. If the applicant is unable to provide a commitment letter that is dated before the submission deadline, the applicant must agree to change the project back to leasing and comply with all of the requirements of leasing under the CoC Program or HUD will not renew the grant. Only those Supportive Housing Program projects that are renewing for the first time in FY 2013 under the CoC Program were eligible to request the change from leasing to rental assistance, which must have been approved during the FY2013 CoC Registration process.

6. Eligible renewal projects requesting rental assistance will now be permitted to request a per-unit amount less than the Fair Market Rent (FMR), based on the actual rent costs per unit. This change will help to reduce the number of projects receiving rental assistance that have large balances of unspent funds remaining at the end of the operating year. Project applicants must ensure that the amount requested will be sufficient to cover all eligible costs as HUD cannot provide funds beyond what is awarded through the competition. Project applications for rental assistance cannot request more than 100 percent of the published FMR. New project applications must adhere to 24 CFR 578.51(f) and must request the full FMR amount per unit. See Section III.I.1 for additional information regarding FMR adjustments for projects receiving funds for rental assistance.

7. Under this NOFA, CoCs will be evaluated on the extent to which they are prioritizing the chronically homeless in all CoC Program-funded permanent supportive housing—not just those units that are dedicated to that population. CoCs should prioritize the chronically homeless for placement as units become available through turnover. For more information, see Section VII.A.1.a.3 and 4 of this NOFA.

8. CoCs were required to submit their FY 2013 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) Data and Point-in-Time (PIT) Data directly to the HUD Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX) website by the submission deadline of April 30, 2013. CoCs that did not meet the established deadline for HIC and PIT submission will not be eligible to receive the maximum number of points available as described in Sections VII.A.4.g and VII.A.7.a of this NOFA.

9. In order to receive the maximum number of points available as described in Section VII.A.4.f of this NOFA, CoCs must:

a. establish an internal CoC-deadline for project applications to be submitted to the CoC
that is no later than 30 days before the application submission deadline; and

b. notify, in writing and outside of e-snaps, all project applicants who submitted their project applications to the CoC by the CoC-established deadline whether their project application(s) will be accepted (and ranked on the Priority Listings) or rejected by the CoC within 15 days of the application deadline. Where a project is being rejected, the CoC must indicate the reasons for the rejection. Per 24 CFR 578.35(b), project applicants that believe they were not allowed to participate in a fair and open process and that were rejected by the CoC may appeal the rejection directly to HUD by submitting as a Solo Application prior to the application deadline.

10. Based on the estimated FY 2013 ARD for each CoC that has a HUD-approved Registration, it is anticipated that the national annual renewal demand for FY 2013 funds under the CoC Program Competition will exceed the $1.7 billion available under this NOFA. Therefore, HUD anticipates that the available funding will be inadequate to renew all existing projects eligible to renew for FY 2013 funds in the CoC Program Competition. To ensure that CoCs have the ability to indicate to HUD which projects are of the highest priority for FY 2013, HUD is requiring that CoCs rank projects in Tier 1 or Tier 2.

The tiers are financial thresholds. Tier 1 is equal to the CoC’s FY 2013 ARD approved in the Registration process, less 5 percent. Tier 2 is the amount remaining in FY 2013 ARD plus the approved amounts for CoC planning and UFA costs. HUD will publish final FY 2013 ARD and Tier 1 amounts for each CoC no later than 15 days after publication of this NOFA. Any project that falls only partially in Tier 1 will be considered by HUD as falling entirely in Tier 2.

The CoC must assign a unique rank to each project that it intends to submit to HUD for FY 2013 funding. HUD strongly advises CoCs to rank higher those project applications the CoC determines are high priority, high performing, and meet the needs and gaps as identified by the CoC. HUD will select projects as described in Section VII.B.1.b. Projects placed fully outside of the CoC’s maximum award amount will be reviewed by HUD only in accordance with 24 CFR 578.35 (Appeal).

11. Only one CoC project application for CoC planning costs may be submitted per CoC per fiscal year appropriation. Only one project application for UFA costs can be submitted for HUD-approved UFAs per funding year. The applications for planning and UFA costs must be submitted by the Collaborative Applicant.

12. CoCs must consult with Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) recipients within the geographic area on the plan for allocating ESG funds and reporting on and evaluating the performance of ESG recipients and subrecipients. Each CoC will be required to describe how it is coordinating, or if that is not already occurring, how coordination with ESG recipients will occur and what processes are required to be in place at the CoC level to ensure this requirement is met. See Section VII.A.2.c for more information about scoring criteria related to coordinating with ESG recipients.
13. All CoCs must have an HMIS that has the capacity to collect unduplicated counts of individuals and families experiencing homelessness and provide information to project subrecipients and applicants for needs analysis and funding priorities. Additionally, CoC and ESG recipients must participate in the local HMIS (unless a recipient is a domestic violence provider in which case it must use a comparable database and provide de-identified information). For many communities, the inclusion of ESG recipients and subrecipients in HMIS will mean an increase in users that the HMIS must be able to accommodate. The HMIS Lead should continue to consider any unique needs that the HMIS may be required to address in order to accommodate these emergency shelter, street outreach, and homelessness prevention programs.

14. CoCs may request, in the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, that up to 10 percent of funding for each fiscal year awarded under this NOFA be approved to serve homeless households with children and youth defined as homeless under other federal statutes (paragraph 3 of the definition of homeless found at 24 CFR 578.3). Approved CoCs are limited to using only up to 10 percent of the total amount awarded for each fiscal year appropriation to the CoC to serve this population, and must determine which projects will be permitted to use some or all of their funding for this purpose. The only project types that can serve this population are transitional housing and supportive services only.

In order to be approved to serve this population, CoCs making this request must be able to demonstrate that serving this population is of equal or greater priority, which means that it is equally or more cost effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives of the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B) of the Act, especially with respect to children and unaccompanied youth, than serving the homeless as defined under paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of the definition of homeless in 24 CFR 578.3. CoCs must thoroughly describe how the requirements described in section 427(b)(1)(F) of the Act will be met. CoCs will be required to identify the specific project(s) that will use funding for this purpose (up to 10 percent of CoC total award) by submitting an attachment in e-snaps that states the following:

a. Project name(s); and
b. Amount of funding in the project or per project that will be used for this purpose.

Where HUD does not approve a CoC’s request, any awards for the projects proposed in FY 2013 and FY 2014 to be used for this purpose will be conditioned upon award that no funds may be used to serve this population. See 24 CFR 578.65 and 24 CFR 578.89 for more information about this limitation.

15. HUD continues to encourage CoCs to consider how the outcomes related to performance measures found in Section 427 of the Act will be collected at the local level. HUD strongly encourages communities to consider HMIS capacity in collecting the information necessary to report on the defined selection criteria that will be applied in future competitions. See Section VII.A.1 of this NOFA for details regarding
performance reporting for this competition.

III. Continuum of Care Program Requirements.

The CoC Program interim rule at 24 CFR part 578 details the requirements with which grants awarded under this competition must comply. Regulatory citations are provided below so that applicants can refer to specific areas of the CoC Program interim rule for details.

A. Definitions and Concepts. The definitions and concepts contained in this section include terms that are important for all applicants to understand in order to complete all parts of the CoC Program Consolidated Application.

1. Definitions from 24 CFR 578.3. The following terms are defined in 24 CFR 578.3. Applicants must refer to the CoC Program interim rule for the definitions contained in this section.

   a. Annual Renewal Amount (ARA)
   b. Applicant
   c. Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System
   d. Chronically Homeless
   e. Collaborative Applicant
   f. Continuum of Care
   g. Consolidated Plan
   h. Homeless
   i. Permanent Housing
   j. Permanent Supportive Housing
   k. Private Nonprofit Organization
   l. Program Participant
   m. Project
   n. Subrecipient
   o. Transitional Housing
   p. Unified Funding Agency

2. CoC Program NOFA Definitions. The following terms are not found in 24 CFR part 578, but are used in this NOFA to define concepts that pertain specifically to the CoC Program Competition application process.

   a. Consolidated Plan Certification. The statutory form in which a state or local official certifies that the proposed activities or projects are consistent with the jurisdiction’s Consolidated Plan and, if the applicant is a state or unit of local government, that the jurisdiction is following its Consolidated Plan.

   b. Housing Inventory Count (HIC). A complete listing of the community’s HUD and non-HUD funded beds dedicated to the homeless.

   c. Project Applicant. An applicant designated by the CoC to apply for CoC Program
funds to carry out activities related to a specific project(s) as defined in 24 CFR 578.3. This includes Collaborative Applicants that apply for planning funds.

d. **Rapid Re-housing.** A type of permanent housing meeting the requirements of 24 CFR 578.37 (a)(1)(ii).

3. **Concepts.** The concepts contained in this section are important for all applicants to understand in order to complete all parts of the CoC Program Consolidated Application. These concepts are used throughout this NOFA:

a. **Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) (24 CFR 578.17(b)(2)).** The total amount of all the CoC’s projects that will be eligible for renewal in the CoC Program Competition. A separate ARD will be established for each year of funding under this NOFA. It is the sum of the annual renewal amounts of all projects within the CoC’s geographic area eligible to apply for renewal in the CoC Program Competition, before any required adjustments to funding for leasing, rental assistance, and operating line items based on FMR changes.

b. **Beds Dedicated to the Chronically Homeless.** The total number of beds in the CoC’s geographic area that are dedicated specifically for use by the chronically homeless as reported in the CoC’s Housing Inventory Count (HIC). For these types of beds, when a participant exits the program, the bed must be filled by another chronically homeless participant unless there are no chronically homeless persons located within the geographic area.

c. **Housing First.** A model of housing assistance that is offered without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements, and rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary goals.

d. **Non-Dedicated Permanent Supportive Housing Beds.** Permanent supportive housing beds within a CoC’s geographic area that are not currently dedicated specifically for use by the chronically homeless. CoCs and projects are strongly encouraged to prioritize the chronically homeless in non-dedicated permanent supportive housing beds as they become available through turnover. For more information, see Section VII.A.1.a of this NOFA.

e. **Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN).** The amount of funds a CoC could receive based upon the geographic areas HUD approves as included in the CoC. To determine the homeless assistance need of a particular jurisdiction, HUD will use the formula set forth 24 CFR 578.17(a). Each year, HUD publishes the PPRN for each jurisdiction. A CoC’s PPRN is determined by adding the published PPRN of each jurisdiction located within the HUD-approved CoC geographic area.

f. **Reallocation.** Reallocation is when a CoC shifts funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects without decreasing the CoC’s ARD. New projects created through reallocation must meet the requirements set
forth in Section II.B.1 and the eligibility and project quality thresholds established by HUD in Section V.E.2 of this NOFA. In the CoC Program Competition reallocation can only be used to create new permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless, or rapid re-housing to serve homeless households with children.

B. Establishing and Operating the CoC. 24 CFR 578.5 and 24 CFR 578.7 detail the requirements for the establishment of a CoC and its operations.

C. CoC Geographic Area. 24 CFR 578.5 requires representatives from relevant organizations within a geographic area to establish a CoC to carry out the duties within the geographic area. The boundaries of identified CoC geographic areas may not overlap, and any overlapping geographies are considered Competing CoCs. HUD will follow the process at 24 CFR 578.35(d) to determine which CoC HUD will fund in the case of CoC geographic areas that overlap in whole or in part. See section VII.A.9 for more information about how HUD will award funding to projects in Competing CoCs.

D. Planning Duties of the CoC. Planning duties for CoCs are detailed in 24 CFR 578.7.

E. Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System. The definition of Centralized or Coordinated Assessment can be found at 24 CFR 578.3. Provisions at 24 CFR 578.7(a)(8) detail responsibilities of the CoC with regard to establishing and operating such a system. CoCs may use planning costs to design and plan for the implementation of a centralized or coordinated assessment system. These systems help communities assess the needs of program participants and effectively match the homeless with the most appropriate resources available to address their particular needs.

F. CoC Program Components. Provisions at 24 CFR 578.37 provide that CoC funds may be used for projects under five program components: permanent housing (including rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing), transitional housing, supportive services only, HMIS, and in some cases, homelessness prevention. Homelessness prevention is a component to be included in future CoC Program Competitions through the implementation of High Performing Communities (HPC), since only designated HPCs may carry out homelessness prevention activities through the CoC program. Therefore, the four components that will be funded in the CoC Program Competition are:

1. Permanent Housing;
2. Transitional Housing;
3. Supportive Services Only; and
4. HMIS.

The components are fully described at 24 CFR 578.37.

G. High Performing Communities. While the Act provides that HUD will designate no more than 10 HPCs in each of the first 2 years of the program, and, at 24 CFR 578.65, the rule establishes standards for qualifying as an HPC, the requirement to use HMIS data to qualify as an HPC and the requirements for applying to be an HPC make it impossible for HUD to
designate any HPCs in the CoC Program Competition due to the lack of data responsive to
the statutory selection criteria. The Act requires that HUD review at least 2 years of
community data for some of the selection criteria to determine whether a CoC may be
designated as an HPC. The standards for HPC qualification are clarified in 24 CFR
578.65(c) which was published July 31, 2012, which means CoCs do not have 2 full years of
community data available to report to HUD for review. Therefore, HUD will not designate
any HPCs in the CoC Program Competition.

H. Collaborative Applicant. HUD may only review CoC Consolidated Applications submitted
from the Collaborative Applicant that has been designated to submit the CoC Consolidated
Application on behalf of the CoC. The Collaborative Applicant will compile all parts of the
CoC Consolidated Application, including the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, the FY
2013 and FY 2014 Priority Listings, and all Project Applications for FY 2013 and FY 2014
funds the CoC has ranked for funding within the geographic area. Additionally, as set forth at
24 CFR 578.3, the Collaborative Applicant is the only entity that may apply for CoC
planning costs and UFA costs (if the Collaborative Applicant is designated to apply as an
UFA applicant) from HUD on behalf of the CoC that the Collaborative Applicant represents.

I. CoC Maximum Award. The process for determining a CoC’s maximum award amount is
detailed in 24 CFR 578.17(b). HUD is required to adjust awards for leasing, operating, and
rental assistance budget line items based on changes to the Fair Market Rents (FMR). All
adjustments for each fiscal year appropriation will be made prior to award announcement.
HUD will make these adjustments as follows:

1. Funds awarded for rental assistance will be adjusted in one of two ways:

   a. Funds awarded for rental assistance in all new projects and all renewal projects
      requesting the FMR will be adjusted by applying the FMR in effect at the time of
      application submission to HUD, including in the cases where the FMR for a
      specific area has decreased from the previous year.

   b. Funds awarded for rental assistance for renewal projects that request less than
      FMR, i.e., a per-unit amount based on the actual rent costs per unit, will be
      increased based on the average increase in FMR amounts within the CoC’s
      geographic area, weighted for population density. In the event that the FMR for a
      specific area decreased from the previous year, project applicants will not receive
      an award that exceeds the FMR after adjustment. If the FMR for the project
      applicant’s area decreased from the previous year, the project will be awarded the
      lesser amount of the per-unit amount requested by the project applicant, based on
      the actual rent costs per unit, or the FMR after adjustment.

2. Funds awarded for operating and leasing in permanent housing projects will be increased
   based on the average increase in FMR amounts within the CoC’s geographic area,
   weighted for population density. Because leasing and operating costs do not decrease
   relative to rent amounts for specific units (e.g., operating costs for 10 units that have rents
   of $500 are likely the same as for 10 units that have rents that are $450) adjustments to
leasing and operating line items will not include decreases if FMRs decrease in the geographic area. The operating and/or leasing budget line items in these projects will remain the same as in the most recent grant agreement or grant agreement amendment.

IV. Award Information

1. Amount Allocated. Approximately $1.7 billion of FY 2013 funds is available for funding after adjustments were made due to sequestration. Carried over or recaptured funds from previous fiscal years, if available, may be added to this amount. For FY 2014, the level of funding for the CoC program is not yet known. When the level of funding is known for FY 2014, HUD will announce this amount through separate notice.

2. Distribution of Funds. The distribution of funds will depend largely on HUD selection priorities and CoC locally determined priorities, overall demand, and renewal eligibility.

   a. Renewals. Awards made under the CoC Program, Supportive Housing Program (SHP), and Shelter Plus Care (S+C) are eligible for renewal for FY 2013 funds if they are currently operating and have a signed grant agreement with HUD that will expire during the period beginning January 1, 2014, and ending December 31, 2014. These projects are renewable under the CoC Program Competition as set forth in 24 CFR 578.33 of the interim rule to continue ongoing leasing, operating, supportive services, rental assistance, HMIS, and project administration costs.

   Awards made under the CoC Program, Supportive Housing Program (SHP), and Shelter Plus Care (S+C) will be eligible for renewal for FY 2014 funds if they have a signed grant agreement with HUD that will expire during the period beginning January 1, 2015, and ending December 31, 2015. These projects are renewable under the CoC Program Competition as set forth in 24 CFR 578.33 of the interim rule to continue ongoing leasing, operating, supportive services, rental assistance, HMIS, and project administration costs. HUD will publish at a later date any additional application requirements and the deadline for FY 2014 funds determining which awards will be eligible for FY 2014 funds (see section I.B.2 of this NOFA for more information).

   Applicants that were eligible under the SHP and S+C programs but are no longer eligible under the CoC Program, will continue to be eligible for renewal of leasing, operating, supportive service, rental assistance, HMIS and project administration costs under 24 CFR 578.33(d)(1), so long as their project continues to serve the same population and the same number of participants or units in the same type of housing as identified in their most recently amended grant agreement signed before August 30, 2012. No new Safe Haven projects will be funded; however, existing Safe Haven projects may be renewed to continue to carry out activities that are eligible costs under Subpart D of the CoC Program interim rule.

   b. Grant terms. The initial grant term for new project applications created through
reallocations may be 1-year, 2-years, 3-years, 4-years, 5-years, or 15-years. However, the following exceptions apply:

1. Any new project application created through reallocation that includes leasing—either leasing alone or leasing costs plus other costs (e.g. supportive services, HMIS, etc.)—may only request up to a 3-year grant term with funding for 3 years.

2. Any of the following new projects created through reallocation may request 1-year, 2-year, 3-year, 4-year, or 5-year grant terms with funding for the same number of years: operating costs, supportive services only, HMIS, and project administration.

3. Any new project applications created through reallocation that requests new construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation must request a minimum of a 3-year grant term and may request up to a 5-year grant term.

4. Any new projects created through reallocation requesting project-based rental assistance or sponsor-based rental assistance, or operating costs may request up to a 15-year grant term; however, the project applicants may only request up to 5 years of funds. Funding for the remainder of the term is subject to availability and applicants must apply for additional funds at such time and in such manner as HUD may require.

5. If an applicant requests funds for new construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation in addition to requesting funds for operating, supportive services, or HMIS, the funding will be for the 3 years requested, and the grant term will be 3 years plus the time necessary to acquire the property, complete construction, and begin operating the project. HUD will require recordation of a HUD-approved use and repayment covenant (a form may be obtained from the HUD CPD field office) for all grants of funds for new constructions, acquisition, and rehabilitation.

6. All renewal project applications, including rental assistance, and CoC planning costs, are limited to 1-year grant terms and 1-year of funding.

7. All new CoC planning or UFA costs applications are limited to 1-year grant terms and 1-year of funding.

V. Eligibility Information

A. Eligible Project Applicants. (24 CFR 578.15) Eligible project applicants for the CoC Program Competition are nonprofit organizations, States, local governments, and instrumentalities of State and local governments, and public housing agencies, as such term is defined in 24 CFR 5.100, without limitation or exclusion. For-profit entities are not eligible to apply for grants or to be subrecipients of grant funds.

B. Renewal Projects. Awards made under the CoC Program, SHP, and S+C programs are eligible for renewal for FY 2013 funds if they are currently in operation and have a signed grant agreement with HUD which will expire during Calendar Year (CY) 2014 (the period from January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014). HUD will not select renewal projects for an award for FY 2013 funds in the CoC Program Competition unless the grant agreement has been signed by both HUD and the recipient, and the project meets one of the following
additional eligibility requirements:

1. Any CoC Program, SHP, or S+C grants awarded in a preceding competition that expires in Calendar Year (CY) 2014 (the period from January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014).

2. Any S+C grant awarded prior to FY 2002 for which funding is expected to run out in CY 2014, and which has never applied for renewal funding.

3. Any SHP or S+C grant originally awarded in the FY 2007 Competition and, notwithstanding the expiration date, that has funds expiring in CY 2014 or later and has not been renewed in a previous competition. Funds for these grants will no longer be available after September 30, 2014. The Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS) requires that all draws for the grants awarded in the FY 2007 Competition be made no later than September 22, 2014. Funds from these expiring grants will be recaptured and returned to the U.S. Treasury and will no longer be available for expenditure, even if the end date established in the grant agreement is beyond September 30, 2014. Recipients are prohibited from accelerating their spending rate to spend down funds by September 22, 2014. HUD CPD field offices will monitor draws for affected grants to ensure that funds will be drawn only to reimburse the affected recipients for actual costs incurred in accordance with the project budget on, or before, the LOCCS availability of funds deadline. Grants awarded in the FY 2007 Homeless Assistance Competition are not eligible for renewal in the CoC Program Competition if they expired, or are expiring, in CY 2013 (time period from January 1, 2013, through December 31, 2013), were not renewed in a previous competition, or were not approved for extension into CY 2014. Grants awarded in FY 2007 that have an expiration date beyond CY 2014 must apply for renewal in the CoC Program Competition. The only exception is for any grant awarded as Shelter Plus Care that included rehabilitation that has a 10-year grant, which will expire in FY 2016.

4. The total request for each renewing project may not exceed the ARA approved by HUD for that project. Because funds for acquisition, new construction, and rehabilitation may not be renewed, grants being renewed whose original expiring award included those funds may only renew leasing, supportive services, rental assistance, operating, and HMIS, costs and may not exceed 10 percent in administrative costs. For information on Annual Renewal Amount, see Section III.A.3 of this NOFA.

5. HUD will recapture grant funds remaining unspent at the end of the previous grant period when it renews a grant.

6. HUD encourages the consolidation of appropriate renewal grants when the grants are with the same recipient, have the same component and expire in the same year. However, projects that have not yet been consolidated must submit separate project applications for individual renewal grants. Where a recipient intends to consolidate renewal grants, this action can be accomplished by the HUD CPD field office at the point of renewal grant agreement execution. Projects that have outstanding audit findings or
that are poor performers cannot be consolidated. Further, any grant that applied to move from SHP leasing to rental assistance in the CoC Program Competition cannot be consolidated. This paragraph does not apply to CoCs that are designated by HUD as a UFA, since UFAs will enter into a single grant agreement with HUD for the entire geographic area.

7. Shelter Plus Care projects renewing for the first time under this NOFA are allowed to indicate a higher number of units than approved in the original application on the GIW during the CoC Registration process. However, in order for HUD to approve this increase, the applicant must have provided their local HUD CPD field office with copies of all executed leases to support the higher number of units. This must have been completed prior to Registration as the increase in units affected the project’s ARA. HUD will consider the number of documented units under lease at the time of GIW submission the maximum number of units eligible for renewal in the FY CoC Program Competition.

C. New Projects.

1. Due to funding limitations, the only new projects that a CoC may apply for are those created through reallocation, CoC planning, and UFA costs (if applicable).

2. In order to expend funds within statutorily required deadlines, applicants funded for sponsor-based and project-based rental assistance must execute the grant award and begin providing rental assistance within 2 years. However, HUD strongly encourages all rental assistance to begin within 12 months of award. Applicants that are unable to begin rental assistance within the 12 month period should consult with the HUD CPD field office.

3. All applicants must meet statutory deadlines regarding the obligation of grant funds as stated in the HUD Appropriations Act. All subrecipients must meet applicant eligibility standards as described in Section V.E.2 of this NOFA. HUD will review project subrecipient eligibility as part of the threshold review process. Project applicants are required to submit documentation of subrecipients’ eligibility with the application.

D. Matching. 24 CFR 578.73 provides the information regarding match requirements.

E. Other Project Eligibility Requirements.

1. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements. To be eligible for funding under this NOFA, project applicants must meet all statutory and regulatory requirements in the Act and CoC Program interim rule. Project applicants can obtain a copy of the Act and the CoC Program interim rule on the OneCPD Resource Exchange or by contacting the NOFA Information Center at 1-800-HUD-8929 (1-800-483-8929).

2. Threshold Requirements:

   a. Ineligible Applicants. HUD will not consider an application from an ineligible
project applicant, including an application submitted for CoC planning funds or UFA costs from an applicant other than the Collaborative Applicant.

b. DUNS Number Requirement. All project applicants seeking funding under this NOFA must have a DUNS number and include the number in the Standard Form 424 (SF-424). The SF-424 must be submitted along with the project application in e-snaps. See Section III.C.2.b. of the General Section for additional information.

c. Active Registration in CCR/SAM. All project applicants seeking funding under this NOFA must have an active CCR/SAM registration. HUD will not issue a grant agreement for awarded funds to a project applicant until an active CCR/SAM registration has been verified. See Section III.C.2.c. of the General Section for additional information.

d. Project Eligibility Threshold. HUD will review all projects to determine if they meet the following eligibility threshold requirements on a pass/fail standard. If HUD determines that the applicable standards are not met for a project, the project will be rejected from the competition. Any project requesting renewal funding will be considered as having met these requirements through its previously approved grant application unless information to the contrary is received (i.e., monitoring findings, results from investigations by the Office of Inspector General, etc.). Approval of renewal projects is not a determination by HUD that a recipient is in compliance with applicable fair housing and civil rights requirements.

(1) Project applicants and potential subrecipients must meet the eligibility requirements of the CoC Program as described in the CoC program interim rule and provide evidence of eligibility required in the application (e.g., nonprofit documentation).

(2) Project applicants and potential subrecipients must demonstrate the financial and management capacity and experience to carry out the project as detailed in the project application and to administer federal funds. Demonstrating capacity may include a description of the applicant/subrecipient experience with similar projects and with successful administration of other federal funds.

(3) Project applicants must submit the required certifications as specified in this NOFA.

(4) The population to be served must meet program eligibility requirements as described in the Act, and the project application must clearly establish eligibility of project applicants. This includes the following additional eligibility criteria for certain types of projects.

(a) The only persons who may be served by any permanent supportive housing projects are those who come from the streets, emergency shelters, safe havens, institutions, or transitional housing.
i. Homeless individuals and homeless households with children coming from transitional housing must have originally come from the streets or emergency shelters.

ii. Homeless individuals and homeless households with children with a qualifying disability who were fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and are living in transitional housing are eligible for permanent supportive housing even if they did not live on the streets, emergency shelters, or safe havens prior to entry in the transitional housing. As participants leave currently operating projects, participants who meet this eligibility standard must replace them.

iii. Persons exiting institutions where they resided for 90 days or less and came from the streets, emergency shelter, or safe havens immediately prior to entering the institution are also eligible for PSH.

(b) Rapid Re-housing projects awarded under the CoC Program must serve individuals and families coming from the streets or emergency shelter.

(c) Projects originally funded as part of the FY 2008 Rapid Re-Housing for Families Demonstration must continue to adhere to the following requirements:

   i. Must serve households with dependent children residing on the streets or emergency shelters.
   ii. No more than 30 percent of the total eligible program activities may be used for supportive services, including case management.
   iii. Eligible supportive services are limited to housing placement, case management, legal assistance, literacy training, job training, mental health services, childcare services, and substance abuse services.
   iv. Eligible housing activities include leasing only.
   v. Continue to participate in and provide requested information to HUD for evaluation.

(d) Renewal projects originally funded under the Samaritan Housing Initiative must continue to exclusively serve 100 percent chronically homeless, unless there are no chronically homeless within the CoC geographic area. CoCs should not hold units vacant, but instead should prioritize other vulnerable and eligible households.

(e) Renewal projects originally funded under the Permanent Housing Bonus must continue to serve the homeless population in accordance with the respective NOFA under which it was originally awarded.

(f) Transitional housing and supportive services only projects may be eligible to use up to 10 percent of the total CoC funds to serve the homeless as
defined by other federal definitions. However, the CoC must be approved by HUD during the competition to serve the homeless as defined by other federal homeless definitions. No project may serve this population unless HUD approves the CoC during the competition. Section II.B.12 of this NOFA describes the process for gaining HUD approval to serve the homeless as defined under other federal definitions.

(5) The project must be cost-effective, including costs of construction, operations, and supportive services with such costs not deviating substantially from the norm in that locale for the type of structure or kind of activity.

(6) Project applicants, except Collaborative Applicants that only receive awards for CoC planning costs and, if applicable, UFA costs, must agree to participate in a local HMIS system. However, in accordance with Section 407 of the Act, any victim service provider that is a recipient or subrecipient cannot disclose, for purposes of HMIS, any personally identifying information about any client. Victim service providers must use a comparable database that meets the needs of the local HMIS.

(7) Whether project applicants administer their programs or activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified homeless with disabilities. This means that programs or activities must be offered in a setting that enables the homeless with disabilities to interact with others without disabilities to the fullest extent possible.

e. Project Quality Threshold. HUD will review new project applications created through reallocation to determine if they meet the following project quality threshold requirements with clear and convincing evidence. Any project requesting renewal funding will be considered as having met these requirements through its previously approved grant application unless information to the contrary is received (i.e., monitoring findings, results from investigations by the Office of Inspector General, etc.). These projects are required to meet the requirements outlined in this section of the NOFA. The housing and services proposed must be appropriate to the needs of the program participants and the community. A determination that a project meets the project quality threshold is not a determination by HUD that a recipient is in compliance with applicable fair housing and civil rights requirements.

(1) To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, new project applications created through reallocation must receive at least 5 points based on the criteria below. New project applications created through reallocation that do not receive at least 5 points will be rejected.

(a) Whether the type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the program participants (1 point);
(b) Whether the type, scale, location of the supportive services, and the mode of transportation to those services fit the needs of the program participants (1
point);
(c) Whether the specific plan for ensuring program participants will be individually assisted to obtain the benefits of the mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible to apply meets the needs of the program participants (1 point);
(d) Whether program participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs (1 point);
(e) Whether program participants are assisted to both increase their incomes and live independently using mainstream housing and service programs in a manner that fits their needs (1 point);
(f) Whether at least 75 percent of the proposed program participants come from the street or other locations not meant for human habitation, emergency shelters, or safe havens (1 point); and
(g) Whether amenities (e.g., grocery stores, pharmacies, etc.) are accessible in the community (1 point).

(2) To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, the Collaborative Applicant’s application for new CoC planning funds must receive at least 3 points based on the criteria below. Applications that do not receive at least 3 points will be rejected. Applications for UFA costs are not subject to a threshold review, as UFA status was determined as part of Registration.

(a) The proposed planning activities that will be carried out by the CoC with grant funds are compliant with the provisions of 24 CFR 578.7 (2 points); and
(b) The funds requested will improve the CoC’s ability to evaluate the outcome of both CoC Program-funded and ESG-funded projects (2 points).

(3) Additionally, HUD will assess all new projects for the following minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards. To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, all new projects must meet all of the following criteria:

(a) Project applicants and potential subrecipients must have satisfactory capacity, drawdowns, and performance for existing grant(s), as evidenced by timely reimbursement of subrecipients, regular drawdowns, and timely resolution of any monitoring findings;
(b) For expansion projects, project applicants must clearly articulate the part of the project that is being expanded. Additionally, the project applicants must clearly demonstrate that they are not replacing other funding sources; and
(c) Project applicants must demonstrate they will be able to meet all timeliness standards per 24 CFR 578.85. Project applicants with existing projects must demonstrate that they have met all project renewal threshold requirements of this NOFA. HUD reserves the right to deny the funding request for a new project, if the request is made by an existing recipient that is found to have significant issues related to capacity, performance, or unresolved
audit/monitoring finding related to one or more existing grants.
Additionally, HUD reserves the right to withdraw funds if no APR is submitted on the prior grant.

**f. **Project Renewal Threshold.** A CoC must consider the need to continue funding for projects expiring in CY 2014 and CY 2015.** Renewal projects must meet minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards identified in this NOFA or they will be rejected from consideration for funding. When considering renewal projects for award, HUD will review information in LOCCS; Annual Performance Reports (APRs); and information provided from the local HUD/CPD Field Office, including monitoring reports and A-133 audit reports as applicable, and performance standards on prior grants, and will assess projects using the following criteria on a pass/fail basis:

1. Whether the project applicant’s performance met the plans and goals established in the initial application as amended;
2. Whether the project applicant demonstrated all timeliness standards for grants being renewed, including that standards for the expenditure of grant funds have been met;
3. The project applicant’s performance in assisting program participants to achieve and maintain independent living and record of success, except HMIS-dedicated projects are not required to meet this standard; and
4. Whether there is evidence that a project applicant has been unwilling to accept technical assistance, has a history of inadequate financial accounting practices, has indications of project mismanagement, has a drastic reduction in the population served, has made program changes without prior HUD approval, or has lost a project site.

HUD reserves the right to reduce or reject a funding request from the project applicant for the following reasons:

(a) Outstanding obligation to HUD that is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon;
(b) Audit finding(s) for which a response is overdue or unsatisfactory;
(c) History of inadequate financial management accounting practices;
(d) Evidence of untimely expenditures on prior award;
(e) History of other major capacity issues that have significantly affected the operation of the project and its performance;
(f) History of not reimbursing subrecipients for eligible costs in a timely manner, or at least quarterly; and
(g) History of serving ineligible program participants, expending funds on ineligible costs, or failing to expend funds within statutorily established timeframes.

**g. Resolution of Outstanding Civil Rights Matters Threshold.** In order for a project application to be eligible for rating and ranking by HUD, the project applicant and the
proposed subrecipient must meet the civil rights threshold requirements in Section III.C.2.d. of the FY 2013 General Section.

**h. Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan.** For each applicant that is not a State or unit of local government, the applicant must submit a certification by the jurisdiction in which the proposed project will be located that the applicant’s application for funding is consistent with the jurisdiction’s HUD-approved consolidated plan. The certification must be made in accordance with the provisions of the consolidated plan regulations at 24 CFR part 91, subpart F. Form HUD-2991 must be used and must list all new projects created through reallocation, CoC planning, UFA costs, and renewal projects within the jurisdiction that are consistent with the Consolidated Plan.

For a project applicant that is a State or unit of local government, the jurisdiction must certify that it is following its HUD-approved Consolidated Plan.

3. **Other HUD Requirements.** The list below highlights requirements contained in the General Section (and in other regulations) that are especially important for CoCs and project applicants to review in detail. This is not an exhaustive list of all HUD requirements. All of the requirements of the General Section apply to the CoC Program, except as otherwise specified in this NOFA.

An applicant may obtain a copy of the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA and a copy of the General Section Technical Correction on line at [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail/2013gensec](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail/2013gensec). Note that the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA is critical and must be carefully reviewed to ensure an application can be considered for funding, with the exception of reference to the www.grants.gov application process and other exceptions specifically listed in this NOFA. The CoC Program uses an electronic system outside of www.grants.gov called e-snaps. Notification of the availability of the application will be released via HUD’s websites located at [www.hud.gov](http://www.hud.gov) and [www.onecpd.info](http://www.onecpd.info). To sign up for HUD’s CoC Program email-based listserv, go to [www.onecpd.info/mailinglist/](http://www.onecpd.info/mailinglist/).

- **Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.** See 24 CFR 578.93 for specific requirements related to Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.
- **Equal Access to Housing in HUD Programs Regardless of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity.** See the Federal Register dated February 1, 2012, Docket No. FR 5359-F-02 and Section III.C.3.g. of the General Section.
- **Debarment and Suspension.** See Section III.C.2.e. of the General Section. Additionally, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that all subrecipients are not debarred or suspended. (24 CFR 578.23((3)(c)(4)(v)
- **Delinquent Federal Debts.** See Section III.C.2.g. of the General Section.
- **Compliance with Fair Housing and Civil Rights.** See Section III.C.3.a. of the General Section.
- **Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited**

g. Economic Opportunities for Low- and Very Low-income Persons (Section 3). See Section III.C.3.d. of the General Section.

h. Real Property Acquisition and Relocation. See Section III.C.3.i. of the General Section.


j. Prohibition Against Lobbying Activities. See Section III.C.3.k. of the General Section.

k. Participation in HUD-Sponsored Program Evaluation. See Section III.C.3.m. of the General Section.

l. Environmental Requirements. Notwithstanding provisions at 24 CFR 578.31 and 24 CFR 578.99(a) of the CoC Program interim rule, and in accordance with Section 100261(3) of MAP-21 (Pub. L. 112-141, 126 Stat.404), activities under this NOFA are subject to environmental review by a responsible entity under HUD regulations at 24 CFR part 58.

(1) For activities under a grant to a recipient other than a State or unit of general local government that generally would be subject to review under part 58, HUD may make a finding in accordance with 24 CFR 58.11(d) and may itself perform the environmental review under the provisions of 24 CFR part 50 if the recipient objects in writing to the responsible entity’s performing the review under part 24 CFR part 58.

(2) Irrespective of whether the responsible entity in accord with 24 CFR part 58 (or HUD in accord with 24 CFR part 50) performs the environmental review, the recipient must supply all available, relevant information necessary for the responsible entity (or HUD, if applicable) to perform for each property any required environmental review. The recipient also must carry out mitigating measures required by the responsible entity (or HUD, if applicable) or select alternative property.

(3) The recipient, its project partners, and their contractors may not acquire, rehabilitate, convert, lease, repair, dispose of, demolish, or construct property for a project under this NOFA, or commit or expand HUD or local funds for such eligible activities under this NOFA, until the responsible entity (as defined by 24 CFR 58.2(a)(7)) has completed the environmental review procedures required by 24 CFR part 58 and the environmental certification and Request for Release of Funds (RROF) have been approved or HUD has performed an environmental review under 24 CFR part 50 and the recipient has received HUD approval of the property. HUD will not release grant funds if the recipient or any other party commits grant funds (i.e., incurs any costs or expenditures to be paid or reimbursed with such funds) before the recipient submits and HUD approves its RROF (where such submission is required).

m. Drug-Free Workplace. See Section III.C.3.q. of the General Section.

n. Safeguarding Resident/Client Files. See Section III.C.3.s. of the General Section.

o. Compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006

p. Lead-Based Paint Requirements. For housing constructed before 1978 (with certain statutory and regulatory exceptions), CoC Program recipients must comply with the requirements of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 4801, et seq.), as amended by the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 4851, et seq.); and implementing regulations of HUD, at 24 CFR part 35; the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at 40 CFR part 745, or State/Tribal lead rules implemented under EPA authorization; and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration at 29 CFR 1926.62 and 29 CFR 1910.1025.

VI. Application and Submission Information

A. Application Package. The submission summary in e-snaps provides the list of elements required to complete each part of the application. A Collaborative Applicant will not be able to submit an application to HUD until all required parts are completed. Once available, the CoC Consolidated Application, including the CoC Application, Project Application, and Priority Listings may be accessed at www.hud.gov/esnaps.

Content and Form of Application Submission. The CoC Consolidated Application for funds under this NOFA includes a FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, which describes the CoC’s plan for ending homelessness, its system-level performance, and addresses the selection criteria specified in Section VII of this NOFA; Project Applications for the project(s) that the CoC listed on its Priority Listings; and the Priority Listings which contain all project applications submitted to the CoC for funding consideration that are either ranked or rejected. As stated in Section I.B of this NOFA, CoCs will be required to submit separate Project Applications and Priority Listings for 2013 and 2014 funds. CoCs will not be required to submit a new CoC Application for 2014 funds. Additional information on the process for FY2014 funds will be published through separate Notice.

1. CoC Consolidated Application. An entire CoC Consolidated Application must be submitted by the Collaborative Applicant on behalf of the CoC. The application will include the following parts, all of which will be submitted electronically either through e-snaps or as an uploaded attachment (for more information see the Training on e-snaps at https://www.onecpd.info/e-snaps/guides/coc-program-competition-resources/) to be considered for funding:

a. The FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, including:
   (1) The CoC plan with all charts and narratives completed as applicable;
   (2) All required attachments, including:
      a. Form HUD-2991, Certification of Consistency with the Consolidated Plan. For each applicant that is not a state or unit of local government, the applicant must submit a certification by the jurisdiction in which the proposed project will be located that the applicant’s application for funding is consistent with the jurisdiction’s HUD-approved consolidated plan. Form HUD-2991 must be used and must include a list of all projects submitted for funding on the
CoC’s Priority Listings;
b. HUD-approved GIW;
c. CoC Ranking Process Document, that was made publically available to all project applicants before the application submission deadline;
d. CoC Governance Charter for HMIS;
e. Copy of Public Solicitation for Project Applications;
f. List of Projects to Serve persons defined as homeless under paragraph 3 of the homeless definition (if funding to serve this population is requested); and
g. List of Permanent Supportive Housing Projects that have agreed to and will prioritize the chronically homeless, as well as the number/percentage of units for each project made available through turnover.

b. 2013 Project Application(s), including, for each project application:
   (1) Project application charts, narratives, and attachments;
   (2) SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance;
   (3) The SF-424 Supplement, Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunities for Application is for private nonprofit applicants only and completion/submission of this survey is voluntary;
   (4) Documentation of Applicant and Subrecipient Eligibility. All project applicants must attach documentation of eligibility. Subrecipient eligibility must also be attached to the project application.
   (5) Applicant Certifications;
   (6) Form HUD-2880, Applicant/Recipient Disclosure/Update Report must be attached for each project. Form HUD-2880 must include the correct amount of HUD assistance requested and must be dated no earlier than September 1, 2013;
   (7) SF-LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying of Activities (if applicable);
   (8) Applicant Code of Conduct. The Code must be attached in e-snaps or on file with HUD at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/conduct; and
   (9) Form HUD-50070, Certification for a Drug-Free Workplace dated no earlier than September 1, 2013.

c. The 2013 Priority Listings, including the ranking of all project applications approved by the CoC to be submitted with the CoC Consolidated Application, with every project assigned a unique rank number.

2. Solo applicants—eligible project applicants that attempted to participate in the CoC planning process in the geographic area in which they operate, that believe they were denied the right to participate in a reasonable manner—may submit an application to HUD and may be awarded a grant from HUD by following the procedure found in 24 CFR 578.35. Solo applicants must submit their project application to HUD by 7:59:59 p.m. eastern time, February 3, 2014 or, for FY 2014 project applications, the deadline in the subsequent Notice published by HUD.

3. The General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA contains certifications that the applicant
will comply with fair housing and civil rights requirements, program regulations, and other federal requirements, and (where applicable) that the proposed activities are consistent with the HUD-approved Consolidated Plan of the applicable State or unit of general local government.

B. Submission Dates and Times.

1. Application Deadline Date
   a. Completed applications must be submitted to HUD on or before 7:59:59 p.m. eastern time on February 3, 2014. The deadline for submitting the documentation required for FY 2014 funds will be set by notice, but the deadline will be no earlier than 60 days after Congress enacts an appropriation funding the Department for the balance of FY 2014. See Section I.B.2 of this NOFA for information about applying for FY 2014 funds.

   b. Provisions at 24 CFR 578.9 require CoCs to design, operate, and follow a collaborative process for the development of an application in response to a NOFA issued by HUD. As part of this collaborative process, CoCs must implement internal competition deadlines to ensure transparency and fairness at the local level. The implementation of deadlines that meet the standards outlined below for FY2013 Project Applications will be considered as part of scoring criteria as detailed in Section VII.A.4.f.

   (1) Project Applicants. All project applications were required to be submitted to the CoC no later than 30 days before the application deadline.

   (2) CoC Notification to Project Applicants. The CoC notified all project applicants no later than 15 days before the application deadline regarding whether their project applications would be submitted as part of the CoC Consolidated Application. Any project applicants that were rejected by the CoC must be notified in writing, outside of e-snaps, with an explanation for the decision to reject the project application. CoCs that fail to provide such notice will not receive the maximum number of points available in Section VII.A.4.f.

   c. All applicants may access the OneCPD Ask A Question (AAQ) any time prior to 7:59:59 p.m. Eastern Time, on the application submission deadline date for FY 2013 funds. Applicants that are experiencing technical difficulty should contact the AAQ immediately for assistance and document their attempts to obtain assistance. HUD strongly encourages CoCs to allow ample time to resolve any technical difficulties that may be encountered during the submission of the application to HUD. Applicants should not wait until the final minutes before the application submission deadline to submit CoC Consolidated Application.

   d. In order for the CoC Consolidated Application to be considered complete and properly submitted for review by HUD in the CoC Program Competition, the Collaborative Applicant must submit the entire CoC Consolidated Application by the
submission deadline which includes: the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, the CoC Priority Listings, and the project applications on behalf of the CoC. Under this NOFA, the CoC Priority Listings continue to be a separate submission in e-snaps in order to improve system performance. Note that the “Submit” button will not be available on the Submission Summary of the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application until all required sections of the application have been completed. Collaborative Applicants should review the Submission Summary form carefully to ensure that no sections state “Please Complete.” The CoC Priority Listings are a separate submission; therefore, CoCs must ensure that the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listings, along with the applicable Project Applications, are submitted in e-snaps prior to the application deadline.

e. Collaborative Applicants must print a copy of the Submission Summary form from both the FY 2013/FY2014 CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listings before closing their internet browser after the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application and CoC Priority Listings have been submitted to HUD. This is the Collaborative Applicant’s receipt of submission and proof of compliance with the application deadline. Collaborative Applicants whose applications are determined to be late and that are unable to provide HUD with a record of submission that verifies the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application and CoC Priority Listings were submitted prior to the application deadline date and time will not receive funding consideration.

f. HUD strongly suggests that applicants utilize the “Export to PDF” functionality of e-snaps to print a hard copy of all submission documents for their records. This can be completed prior to or after submission.

C. Intergovernmental Review. Not Applicable.

D. Funding Restrictions. Not Applicable.

E. Other Submission Requirements

1. Waiver of Electronic Submission Requirements. The regulatory framework of HUD’s electronic submission requirement is the final rule established in 24 CFR 5.1005. CoCs seeking a waiver of the electronic submission requirement must request a waiver in accordance with 24 CFR 5.1005. HUD regulations allow for a waiver of the electronic submission requirement for good cause. For the Continuum of Care Program Competition, HUD is defining good cause as follows:

a. there are no computers that could be used by applicants and/or the Collaborative Applicant that are newer than 5 years old anywhere within the CoC’s geographic area, or

b. there are no computers that could be used by applicants and/or the Collaborative Applicant anywhere within the CoC’s geographic area, or

c. there is no internet access that could be used by applicants and/or the Collaborative Applicant anywhere within the CoC’s geographic area. HUD will grant waivers only
If the waiver is granted, the Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs’ response will include instructions on how many copies of the paper application must be submitted, as well as where to submit them. CoCs that are granted a waiver of the electronic submission requirement will not be afforded additional time to submit their applications. Therefore, Collaborative Applicants seeking a waiver of the electronic submission requirement on behalf of the CoC should submit their waiver request with sufficient time to allow HUD to process and respond to the request. Collaborative Applicants should also allow themselves sufficient time to submit the application on behalf of the CoC so that HUD receives the application by the established deadline date. For this reason, HUD strongly recommends that if a Collaborative Applicant finds it cannot submit its application electronically and must seek a waiver of the electronic grant submission requirement, it should submit the waiver request to the Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs no later than 30 days after the publication date of this NOFA. To expedite the receipt and review of each request, Collaborative Applicants may fax their written requests to Ann Marie Oliva, Director at (202) 401-0053. If HUD does not have sufficient time to process the waiver request, a waiver will not be granted. Paper applications received without a prior approved waiver and/or after the established deadline will not be considered.

VII. Application Review Information

A. Criteria. CoC Consolidated Applications will be assessed based on a **150** point scale, plus a possible 6 bonus points. Per Section I. B. 2 of this NOFA, higher scoring CoCs have a better chance of being awarded projects ranked in Tier 2, depending on the availability of carryover or recaptured funds to be made available under this CoC Program Competition. No Collaborative Applicants have exercised the authority under section 422(j) of the Act. Therefore, no selection criteria based on section 427(b)(1)(A)(viii) is included in this NOFA. Additionally, for purposes of the requirements of section 427(b)(1)(B)(iv)(II) of the Act, HUD considers “all relevant subpopulations” to mean families, youth, veterans, victims of domestic violence, the unsheltered homeless, and the chronically homeless.

1. **CoC Strategic Planning and Performance:** In this section HUD will award up to 69 points based upon the CoC’s plan for and progress to reduce homelessness in its geographic area and decreasing the number of recurrences of homelessness, with a focus on chronic homelessness, particularly those who have had the longest experiences of homelessness.

As found in section 427(b)(1)(A) of the Act, CoCs will be evaluated on performance related to reducing homelessness, including performance for projects funded through the Emergency Solutions Grants program in the geographic area. Section 427(b)(1)(B) of the Act outlines required selection criteria regarding the CoC’s plan to meet specific goals. HUD will award a minimum of 34.5 out of the 69 points available in this section (VII.A.1) to CoCs with projects that have been impacted by a major disaster, as declared under Title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Act, in the 12 months prior to the opening of the
CoC Program Competition. Those CoCs in impacted areas must notify HUD in writing prior to the close of this CoC Program Competition. Send written notification to Ann Marie Oliva, Director, Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW Room 7256 Washington, DC, 20410.

a. Ending Chronic Homelessness. Under this NOFA, HUD will award up to 16 points to CoCs based on the extent in which CoCs furthers the achievement of HUD’s goals as articulated in HUD’s Strategic Plan and Opening Doors through planning and performance. The first goal in Opening Doors is to end chronic homelessness by 2015. CoCs will be evaluated based on the extent to which they are making progress to achieve this goal within the specified time frame. HUD will award up to:

(1) 3 points for CoCs that increased the total number of PSH beds dedicated for use by the chronically homeless as reported in the FY 2012 CoC Application.

(2) 2 points for CoCs that demonstrate and commit to a continued increase in the total number of PSH beds dedicated for use by the chronically homeless in 2014 and 2015.

(3) 2 points for CoCs that demonstrate they are currently prioritizing the chronically homeless in at least 30 percent of the existing PSH units that are not dedicated to serving the chronically homeless in the CoC, and that are made available through turnover. Maximum points will be awarded to CoCs that currently prioritize admission for the chronically homeless in at least 85 percent of the non-dedicated PSH units that are made available through turnover.

(4) 5 points for CoCs that commit to increasing the percentage of turnover in non-dedicated PSH units in which the chronically homeless are prioritized or if the commitment rate identified in this CoC Program Competition is currently at 85 percent, the CoC must maintain the 85 percent prioritization rate in 2014 and 2015. The numeric goals indicated here must be achievable as the CoC will be measured against these goals in future CoC Program Competitions through the use of the HIC and PIT data submitted in HDX. CoCs will be required to attach a list of project(s) to the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, including the name of the project(s) and indicating the number/percentage of units per project, that will commit to prioritizing PSH units specifically for the chronically homeless as PSH units are vacated by the existing participant to meet this CoC-wide goal.

(5) 4 points for CoCs that provide a clear description of the CoC’s plan between 2014 and 2015 to increase the number of PSH beds available for the chronically homeless, and that outlines specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to achieve the goal of ending chronic homelessness by 2015. Additionally, to receive the full points, CoCs must clearly identify the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for implementing this goal.

b. Housing Stability. Achieving housing stability – the ability to obtain and maintain permanent supportive housing or permanent housing – is critical for the homeless. HUD will award up to 10 points to CoCs based on the extent to which they demonstrate successful performance and further planning for this objective. HUD
will award up to:

(1) 4 points for CoCs that demonstrate for 2013 that at least 80 percent of CoC Program participants either remained in permanent housing, or exited from transitional housing to permanent housing (as reported in APRs submitted to HUD between October 1, 2012, and September 30, 2013).

(2) 3 points for CoCs that indicate that they will increase the percentage of CoC Program participants who remained in or exited to permanent housing to at least 80 percent in 2014 and 2015. The numeric goals indicated here must be achievable as the CoC will be measured against these goals in future competitions.

(3) 3 points for CoCs that provide a clear description of the CoC’s plan between 2014 and 2015 to improve the housing stability of participants in its CoC Program-funded projects, and that address the specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements proposed for 2014 and 2015. Additionally, CoCs must clearly identify the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for implementing this goal in order to receive full points.

c. Jobs and Income Growth. HUD will award up to 8 points to CoCs based on the extent in which CoC Program-funded projects assist project participants to increase income, which is one way to ensure housing stability and decrease the possibility of returning to homelessness. HUD will award up to:

(1) 2 points for CoCs that clearly demonstrate that participants in all CoC Program-funded projects obtained employment income during program participation as reported in all APRs submitted to HUD between October 1, 2012, and September 30, 2013. Maximum points will be awarded to CoCs where 20 percent or more of participants in CoC Program-funded projects have employment income.

(2) 1 point for CoCs that clearly demonstrate that participants in all CoC Program-funded projects increased their income from sources other than employment (as recorded in all APRs submitted to HUD between October 1, 2012, and September 30, 2013). Maximum points will be awarded to CoCs where 54 percent or more of participants in CoC Program funded projects have income from sources other than employment.

(3) 1 point for CoCs that indicate they will increase (or maintain) the percentage of participants in CoC Program-funded projects who increase their income through employment in a given operating year to at least 20 percent in 2014 and 2015. The numeric goal indicated here must be achievable as the CoC will be measured against these goals in future competitions.

(4) 1 point for CoCs that indicate that they will increase (or maintain) the percentage of participants in CoC Program-funded projects who increase their income from sources other than employment in a given operating year to at least 54 percent in 2014 and 2015. The numeric goal indicated here must be achievable as the CoC will be measured against these goals in future competitions.

(5) 3 points for CoCs that provide a clear description of the CoC’s plan between
2014 and 2015 to increase the percentage of project participants in all CoC Program-funded projects that increase their incomes from both employment and non-employment sources between. Additionally, CoCs must clearly identify the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for implementing this goal in order to receive full points.

d. Mainstream Benefits. HUD will award up to 7 points to CoCs based on the extent in which their CoC Program-funded projects assist project participants to obtain mainstream benefits, which is one way to ensure housing stability and decrease the possibility of returning to homelessness. HUD will award up to:

1. 2 points for CoCs that demonstrate that participants in CoC Program funded projects increase their mainstream benefits during program participation (as reported in all APRs submitted to HUD between October 1, 2012, and September 30, 2013). Maximum points will be awarded to CoCs where at least 56 percent of participants obtain mainstream benefits.

2. 2 points for CoCs that indicate that they will increase (or maintain) the percentage of participants in CoC Program funded projects who increase their mainstream benefits in a given operating year in 2014 and 2015. In order to receive the full points, CoCs must either have a rate of at least 56 percent that is maintained, or show a numerical increase from 2013 to 2015. The numeric goal indicated here must be achievable as the CoC will be measured against these goals in future competitions.

3. 3 points for CoCs that provide a clear description of the CoC’s plan in 2014 and 2015 to increase the percentage of project participants in all CoC Program funded projects that obtain mainstream. Additionally, CoCs must clearly identify the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for implementing this goal in order to receive full points.

e. Rapid Re-Housing. Rapid re-housing allows the homeless to be provided permanent housing quickly without spending long periods in shelter or transitional housing. HUD will award up to 10 points to CoCs based on the extent in which they are implementing a rapid re-housing model to reduce the number of homeless households with children. HUD will award up to:

1. 3 points for CoCs that plan to increase in the number of homeless households with children assisted through rapid re-housing programs between 2013 and 2015.

2. 3 points for CoCs that provide a clear description of how the CoC will increase the number of homeless households with children that are assisted with rapid re-housing (through the CoC Program, Emergency Solutions Grants program, or other sources), in 2014 and 2015, including specific strategies and actions the CoC will take to meet the numeric achievements being proposed. Additionally, CoCs must clearly identify the individual, organization, or committee that will be responsible for implementing this goal in order to receive full points.

3. 4 points to CoCs that provide a clear description of the written policies and
procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible homeless households will receive rapid re-housing assistance, the amount or percentage of rent that each program participant must pay, how often the rapid re-housing projects contact and assess program participants residing in these projects, and whether the rapid re-housing project(s) follow-up with the program participants after assistance ends. CoCs will be assessed on the responses as they pertain to both the CoC Program and the ESG Program.

f. **Opening Doors.** HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate how it is including the goals of *Opening Doors* in local plans established to prevent and end homelessness, including what steps the CoC is taking to assess existing barriers to entry and how they plan to remove them.

g. **Ending Family Homelessness.** HUD will award up to 4 points to CoCs that demonstrate the efforts to reduce the number of homeless households with children, including an outreach plan to reach this population.

h. **Addressing the Needs of Victims of Domestic Violence.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that demonstrate current efforts to address the needs of victims of domestic violence, including their families which include a clear description of services and safe housing from all funding sources that are available within the CoC to serve this population.

i. **Ending Youth Homelessness.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that demonstrate current efforts to address youth homelessness, including a clear description of services and housing from all funding sources that are available within the CoC this population, and the extent to which resources are available for all youth or only specific to youth between the ages of 16 to 17 or 18 to 24.

j. **Reaching Unsheltered Homeless.** HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate efforts to identify and engage the homeless who routinely sleep on the streets or in other places not meant for human habitation, including the CoC’s outreach plan.

k. **Ending Veteran Homelessness.** HUD will award up to 4 points to CoCs that demonstrate the extent to which they are partnering or collaborating with HUD-VASH programs that are operating in the CoC’s geographic area. Additionally, CoCs should specifically describe how they are combating homelessness among veterans and their families, particularly those who are not eligible for homeless assistance through the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs programs. In order to receive maximum points, CoCs must include a complete description of services and housing available for veterans from all funding sources.

2. **CoC Coordination of Housing and Services.** HUD will award up to a total of 28 points based on the extent to which the CoC demonstrates that it coordinates its housing and service resources with other systems of care that serve the homeless, and that housing and
services within the CoC are coordinated.

a. Preventing Homelessness: HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that thoroughly describe the CoC’s strategy to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless and describe the success of the CoC at reducing the number of individuals and families who become homeless. To receive full points, CoCs must provide a brief narrative that specifically describes the current homelessness prevention efforts in place within the CoC’s entire geographic area, and how the jurisdictional Consolidated Plan(s) addresses issues and programs that are designed to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless. This narrative should include a discussion of any barriers to fair housing choice identified in the jurisdictions’ Analyses of Impediments that related to homeless populations. As part of the narrative, CoCs must describe how they coordinated with the Emergency Solutions Grants projects within their geography.

b. Discharge Planning. HUD will award up to 4 points to CoCs that clearly demonstrate how they coordinate with and/or assist in State or local discharge planning efforts to ensure that those discharged are not released directly to the streets, emergency shelters, or other McKinney-Vento Homeless assistance programs. CoCs must clearly indicate if there is a discharge policy in place mandated by the State or adopted by the CoC, specifically describe the efforts taken by the CoC against the routine discharge into homelessness and specifically identify the stakeholders and/or collaborating organizations that are responsible for ensuring there is a comprehensive discharge policy in place and followed for the following:
   (1) 1 point for foster care;
   (2) 1 point for health care;
   (3) 1 point for mental health; and
   (4) 1 point for corrections.

c. Consolidated Plan. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs where the Consolidated Plan for the jurisdiction(s) within the CoC includes the CoC’s strategic plan goals for addressing and reducing homelessness. To receive maximum points, CoCs must specifically list the goals that pertain to addressing and reducing homelessness.

d. Emergency Solutions Grants. HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate how the CoC consults with ESG jurisdiction(s) within the CoC geographic area to determine how ESG funds are allocated, coordination with ESG recipients and how ESG-funded projects are evaluated.

e. Coordination with Other Funding Sources. Coordination with other programs that provide housing and services to the homeless is critical to reducing homelessness in the CoC’s geographic area. HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that clearly demonstrate coordination with other Federal, State, local, private, and other entities serving the homeless and those at risk of homelessness in the planning and operation of projects. The CoC must clearly and specifically describe how it participates in and/or coordinates with other funding and service opportunities that include, but are
not limited to Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Runaway and Homeless Youth, Head Start programs, philanthropic organizations and foundations, and other housing and service programs funded through Federal, State, or local government resources.

f. **Public Housing Agencies.** Coordinating and engaging with Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) in a meaningful way is strongly encouraged. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that can clearly demonstrate how they are currently engaged with or are attempting to engage with local PHA(s). Maximum points will be awarded to CoCs that can demonstrate ways in which they are partnering with one or more PHA in efforts to prevent and end homelessness.

g. **Housing First Approach.** HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs based on the extent to which the CoC uses a Housing First approach. To receive maximum points, at least 75 percent of the CoC’s permanent supportive housing project applications submitted for FY2013 funds must report that they follow a Housing First approach, and the CoC must describe specific steps it has taken to implement this approach in permanent supportive housing CoC-wide.

h. **Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System.** CoCs should have a centralized or coordinated assessment system covering the CoC’s geographic area. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that can demonstrate the existence of a centralized or coordinated assessment system and describe how the system is used to ensure that the homeless are placed in the appropriate housing and service types based on their level of need.

i. **Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that demonstrate recipients have implemented specific strategies that affirmatively further fair housing as detailed in 24 CFR 578.93(c).

j. **Educational Assurances.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that specifically describe how the CoC collaborates with local education authorities to assist in the identification of individuals and families who become or remain homeless and are informed of the eligibility for services under subtitle B of title VII of the Act (42 U.S.C. 11432 et. seq.). This includes demonstrating that the CoC has established polices that require homeless assistance providers to ensure all children are enrolled in early childhood programs or in school and connected to appropriate services in the community. HUD will award maximum points to CoCs that demonstrate that the CoC actively collaborates with local school districts and early childhood education providers to identify homeless households with children to ensure they understand their eligibility for educational services. CoCs must also demonstrate that ESG recipients are involved in this effort.

k. **Preventing Involuntary Family Separation.** Maintaining family unity is important when homeless households with children under the age of 18 enter homeless shelters or housing. HUD will award CoCs up to 2 points that demonstrate that the CoC is
collaborating with shelter and housing providers to ensure homeless households with children under the age of 18 are not denied admission and are not separated.

l. Affordable Care Act. HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that demonstrate how the CoC is preparing, with project recipients, for the implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in the state in which the CoC is located. The description should address the extent to which project recipients and subrecipients will participate in enrollment and outreach activities to ensure eligible households take advantage of the new healthcare options.

m. Resources for Services. CoCs should specifically describe the steps it is taking to work with recipients to identify other sources of mainstream resources funding for supportive services in order to reduce the amount of CoC Program funds being used to pay for supportive services costs. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that are able to demonstrate that they are identifying alternative sources for supportive services.

3. Recipient Performance. HUD will award up to 15 points to CoCs that clearly and specifically demonstrate steps taken to ensure that CoC Program funded projects meet performance measures as outlined by HUD. The 15 points will be awarded as follows:

a. Performance Monitoring. HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate that the CoC monitors the performance of recipients on HUD-established performance goals that are reported in the FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application and included in the strategic planning process (as listed in Section VII.A.1 of this NOFA), that address ending chronic homelessness, increasing housing stability, increasing project participant income and mainstream benefits, and the use of rapid re-housing to reduce homelessness among households with children.

b. Increasing Performance. HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate that recipients are assisted to meet HUD-established performance goals as listed in Section VII.A.1 of this NOFA.

c. Increasing Capacity. HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate how the CoC assists underperforming recipients to increase their capacity to implement program requirements (e.g., submission of timely reports, timely draws for funds, etc.) in order to successfully carry out the requirements of the Act, CoC Program interim rule, and local CoC priorities.

d. Reducing Homeless Episodes. HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that provide information to HUD on the length of time individuals and families remain homeless and specifically describe how the length of time that individuals and families remain homeless will be reduced in the community. To receive full points, a CoC must provide a narrative that describes specific efforts currently in place by the CoC to track length of time individuals and families remain homeless, and the planning process to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless. The
narrative must indicate how data from CoC and ESG funded projects are considered as well as how non-HUD funded projects are included.

e. **Outreach.** HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that demonstrate a thorough plan for reaching homeless individuals and families. To receive the full point, the CoC must provide information that demonstrates that 100 percent of the geographic area is considered, and that describes the specific outreach procedures in place that are used by the homeless service agencies to identify and engage homeless individuals and families, including their efforts to provide meaningful outreach to persons with disabilities and persons with limited English proficiency. Applicants must describe the procedures they will use to market their housing and supportive services to eligible persons regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, familial status, or disability who are least likely to apply in the absence of special outreach.

f. **Tracking and Reducing Returns to Homelessness.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that provide information to HUD on the extent to which individuals and families leaving homelessness experience additional spells of homelessness and specifically describe how the number of individuals and families who return to homelessness will be reduced in the community. In order to receive full points, the CoC must demonstrate the use of HMIS, or a comparable database, within the CoC to monitor and record returns to homelessness by participants who exit rapid rehousing, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing. Additionally, the CoC will be assessed on the processes that have been implemented by CoCs to reduce the number of additional returns to homelessness once the homeless have exited the homeless system.

4. **CoC Housing, Services, and Structure.** HUD will award up to 13 points to CoCs based on the extent to which a CoC demonstrates the existence of a coordinated, inclusive, and outcome-oriented community process, including an organizational structure(s) and decision making process for developing and implementing a CoC strategy that is inclusive of representatives from both the private and public sectors; has a fair and impartial project review and selection process; and has created, maintained and built upon a community-wide inventory of housing for the homeless.

a. **CoC Meetings.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that can clearly demonstrate that they conduct regular meetings that are open to the public and inclusive of the homeless and/or formerly homeless.

b. **Complaints.** CoC will receive up to 2 points if they did not receive any written complaints from recipients, subrecipients, applicants, or other members of the CoC as they relate to 24 CFR 578.7 and 578.9 within the 12 months before the CoC Program Application submission deadline. In the event the CoC did receive complaints, the Collaborative Applicant must address whether the complaints were resolved in a manner that was satisfactory and without retaliation to the entity who lodged the complaint. If the CoC indicates that no complaints were received as described above, but the local HUD CPD field office or HUD Headquarters is aware of complaints, the
CoC will not receive points for this section.

c. **Inclusive Structure.** CoCs must demonstrate an inclusive structure and application process. Each CoC will be scored on the extent to which it:

i. considers the full range of opinions from individuals or entities with knowledge of homelessness in the geographic area or an interest in preventing or ending homelessness in the geographic area when establishing CoC-wide committees, subcommittees, and workgroups. HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that demonstrate the most active CoC-wide committees, subcommittees, and workgroups established within the CoC that are directly involved in addressing homelessness prevention, as well as the goals for ending homelessness.

ii. is open to proposals from entities that have not previously received funds in prior Homeless Assistance Grants competitions. HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that clearly and specifically describe how the CoC works with homeless services providers that have expressed an interest in applying for HUD funds and what steps it takes to discuss and review proposals as well as provide valuable feedback and guidance.

d. **Project Application Performance Metrics.** Each CoC will be scored based on the extent to which it reviews and ranks projects using periodically collected data on the projects within the CoC in order to conduct analysis on the effectiveness of each project and to determine the extent to which each project has resulted in rapid return to permanent housing for those served by the project, taking into account the severity of barriers faced by the project participants. CoCs that provide a brief narrative that specifically describes the current or proposed efforts in place by the CoC to collect information and analyze the results will receive maximum points. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that are able to provide a clear description of the current processes in place or how they propose to collect and analyze the information.

e. **Accuracy of GIW.** Accurate GIWs are necessary for HUD to determine the final ARD amount for each CoC and, therefore, to determine the total national annual renewal demand for the CoC Program. To that end, HUD will award 1 point to CoCs that attach the final GIW that was approved by HUD either during CoC Registration or, if applicable, during the 7-day grace period following the publication of the CoC Program NOFA without changes. No points will be awarded to CoCs that attach a GIW that is not consistent with the final HUD-approved GIW.

f. **Ranking and Selection Process.** HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that demonstrate the use of a ranking and selection process for project applications that is based on objective criteria and that have been publicly announced by the CoC, including published written policies and procedures that include dated meeting minutes. The CoC will be required to submit written documentation of a rating and ranking/review process for all projects (new and renewal). This may be published
written policies and procedures for this CoC Program Competition in the CoC governance charter or a standalone document. Evidence of the rating and ranking/review process decision must be presented via dated meeting minutes and evidence that the meeting minutes were made available to the CoC’s full membership. Additionally, the CoC must post on its website all parts of the CoC Consolidated Application, including the Priority Listings, before the submission deadline and notify community members and key stakeholders that the application is available. CoCs that do not have a website, must post this information to a partner website within the CoC (e.g., county/city website). In the event that HUD is notified and confirms that a CoC did not notify project applicants who submitted their project applications to the CoC by the required deadline whether their project application(s) were accepted or rejected—in writing, outside of e-snaps and including the reasons for the rejection—no later than 15 days before the application deadline, the CoC will automatically receive 0 points for this selection criteria. If a project applicant appeals the decision by the CoC to reject of its project application, HUD will follow the process outlined in 24 CFR 578.35(b). This could result in HUD electing to fund the appealed project by de-funding or cutting other project(s), including renewal projects, within the CoC.

g. **Housing Inventory Count Submission.** HUD will award 1 point to CoCs that submitted the 2013 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) data in the HDX by the April 30, 2013, submission deadline. If a CoC did not submit the 2013 HIC by April 30, 2013, the CoC will receive 0 points.

5. **Leveraging.** HUD will award up to 5 points to CoCs that demonstrate the extent to which the amount of assistance to be provided to the CoC will be supplemented with resources from other public and private sources, including mainstream programs. CoCs that have 100 percent participation in leveraging from all project applications (including only those projects that have commitment letter(s) on file that are dated within 60 days of the CoC application deadline) and that have at a minimum 150 percent leveraging will receive the maximum points.

6. **Homeless Management Information System.** HUD will award up to 11 points to CoCs that clearly demonstrate the existence of a functioning HMIS that facilitates the collection of information on the homeless using residential and other homeless services and stores that data in an electronic format.

a. **HMIS Governance.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that have in place a HMIS governance charter. To receive maximum points, the CoC must attach a copy of the HMIS governance charter.

b. **HMIS Plans.** Each HMIS Lead should have the following plans in place: Privacy Plan, Security Plan, and Data Quality Plan. HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that describe how these plans are reviewed by the CoC and ensures that the HMIS Lead reviews and revises these plans on a regular basis.
c. **HMIS Funding.** As other HUD-funded programs, other federal agencies, State and local governments require the use of HMIS, the HMIS Lead should access funding provided for these additional requirements to ensure accuracy of the system information. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that demonstrate that the HMIS is supported by non-HUD sources. CoCs will be assessed on the total funding generated for the HMIS from all sources—HUD, other federal sources, State and local, private, etc.—that includes the amounts for all matching sources, both cash and in-kind. To receive maximum points, the CoC must demonstrate that at least 25% of the HMIS budget (not including required match) is supported through non-CoC Program cash or in-kind sources.

d. **Bed Coverage.** The CoC will be assessed on the bed coverage rate for each housing type within the CoC that includes: emergency shelter, Safe Haven, transitional housing, rapid re-housing, and PSH. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that record 86 percent or higher for the bed coverage rate. The bed coverage rate is the number of HMIS participating beds divided by the total number of year-round beds dedicated to the homeless in the geographic area covered by the CoC. Beds funded by victim service providers must not be included in this calculation. Further, if the bed coverage rate is 0 – 64 percent, the CoC must provide clear steps on how it intends to increase this percentage over the next 12 months to receive partial credit. Additionally, if the bed coverage rate was 0-64 percent in FY 2012, the CoC must provide the specific steps it has taken to increase the percentage.

e. **Data Quality.** The CoC must report the number of unduplicated client records with null or missing values for the Universal Data Elements on a single day, as selected by the CoC, within the last 10 days of January 2013. HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that have below 10 percent null or missing values and 10 percent of refused or unknown records as recorded in the HMIS will receive maximum points.

f. **Entry and Exit Dates.** The CoC will be assessed on the existing HMIS policies and procedures used to ensure that valid program entry and exit dates are recorded in the HMIS. HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that demonstrate the procedures in place to ensure program entry and exit dates are recorded in HMIS. Additionally, the CoC will be required to attach the HMIS policies and procedures where HUD will review to ensure there is a section that clearly describes the procedure of how entry and exit dates are recorded in HMIS.

g. **Required Reports.** HUD will award up to 1 point to CoCs that demonstrate that they are able to generate HUD required reports (e.g., APR, CAPER, etc.) from the HMIS system.

7. **Point-in-Time Count.** HUD will award up to 9 points to CoCs related to the collection, use and submission of the 2013 PIT count data.

a. **PIT Count and Data Submission.** HUD will award up to 3 points to CoCs that conducted a PIT count and reported the data in HDX. Maximum points will be
awarded to CoCs that:

1. conducted a sheltered and unsheltered PIT count during the last 10 days of January 2013,
2. submitted the PIT data for 2013 in HDX by April 30, 2013, and
3. provided the percentage of homeless service providers that supplied information on population and subpopulation data.

b. **Change in PIT Since 2012.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs that demonstrate an overall reduction in the number of individuals and families who have become homeless since the number reported in the FY 2012 CoC Program Competition. To receive full points, CoCs must demonstrate a decrease in the number of sheltered and unsheltered homeless individual individuals and families from the previous PIT count and compare it to the number of homeless individuals and families from the most recent PIT as reported in the Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX).

c. **Subpopulation Data.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs based on the CoC’s ability to collect and report accurate and quality subpopulation data for the sheltered homeless during the 2013 PIT count.

d. **Methodology for Unsheltered Count.** HUD will award up to 2 points to CoCs based on the CoCs ability to collect and report accurate and quality data on the unsheltered homeless by using methods to reduce the occurrence of counting the unsheltered homeless more than once during the 2013 PIT count.

8. **Bonus Points.** HUD will award up to 6 bonus points to CoCs as follows:
   a. **Administration.** HUD will award up to 2 point to CoCs where 100 percent of the project applications request 7 percent or less in project administration costs.
   b. **SSO Projects.** HUD will award up to 2 bonus points to CoCs where no SSO projects (excluding those that were awarded in the FY 2012 CoC Program Competition for coordinated assessment) are prioritized in Tier 1.
   c. **Accuracy of Submission.** HUD will award up to 2 bonus points to CoCs that accurately and completely include all submitted project applications on the Form HUD-2991.

9. **CoCs That Have Claimed the Same Geographic Area (Competing CoCs).** (24 CFR 578.35(d)). Subject to the appeal process in 24 CFR 578.35(d), if one or more CoC claims the same geographic area, HUD will award funds to the Collaborative Applicant whose application has the highest overall score. Projects from the lower rated CoC will not be awarded funds.

B. **CoC and Project Review and Selection Process**
1. **Review, Rating, and Ranking.** Two types of reviews will be conducted—selection criteria rating for the overall FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Application, and threshold review for project applicants and project applications. For new projects created through reallocation, the review process will consider applicant and sponsor eligibility and capacity, project eligibility, and project quality as part of the threshold review. The renewal project threshold review will consider applicant and sponsor capacity and eligibility. The renewal project threshold reviews are explained in Section V.E.2 of this NOFA, which covers eligible applicants and projects.

HUD may employ rating panels to review and rate all or part of FY 2013/FY 2014 CoC Applications according to the rating criteria in Section VII.A. See the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA for more information on rating panels.

a. **Threshold Review: Applicant and subrecipient eligibility, capacity, and quality.** HUD will review project applications to determine whether applicants and subrecipients meet the eligibility and capacity thresholds, and whether the projects meet the eligibility and project quality thresholds detailed in Section V.E.2. If HUD determines these standards are not met, the project will be rejected from the competition. If a new project receives sufficient points to pass the project quality threshold review described in Sections V.E.2.e.(1),(2), or (3), as applicable, but does not meet one or more of the criteria within the rating factors, then HUD will place conditions on the grant award and the applicant must demonstrate that the criteria will be met before HUD will sign a grant agreement with the applicant for the project. If an applicant is unable to demonstrate that the project quality threshold criteria are met within the time frame specified by HUD, then HUD reserves the right not to award funds to the applicant and add those funds to the funds available for the next competition.

b. **Conditional Selection and Adjustments to Funding.** Once projects are determined to have passed threshold review, HUD will use the following order of selection priorities to select eligible projects for funding in the CoC Program Competition. CoCs that receive a higher score have a better chance of being awarded projects ranked in Tier 2, depending on the availability of carryover or recaptured funds to be used in the CoC Program Competition.

Using the selection priorities, HUD will select projects from the CoC’s Priority Listings until no additional funds are available. HUD will select lower ranked projects from the CoC Priority Listings above higher ranked projects, consistent with these selection priorities.

Within the rank order established by the CoC on the Priority Listings, HUD will first select projects from Tier 1 in the following order by CoC score:

1. renewal permanent housing projects, RRH and PSH;
2. new PSH projects created through reallocation for 100 percent chronically homeless;
3. new rapid re-housing projects created through reallocation for homeless
households with children;
(4) renewal transitional housing;
(5) CoC planning costs;
(6) UFA costs;
(7) SSO projects for centralized or coordinated assessment system;
(8) renewal HMIS;
(9) all other renewal supportive services only projects, and
(10) any project application submitted by the CoC that was not included in the HUD-approved GIW.

Within the rank order established by the CoC on the Priority Listings, HUD will then select projects from Tier 2 with any remaining available funds in the following order by CoC score:

(1) renewal permanent housing projects, RRH and PSH;
(2) new PSH projects created through reallocation for 100 percent chronically homeless;
(3) new rapid re-housing projects created through reallocation for homeless households with children;
(4) renewal transitional housing;
(5) CoC planning costs;
(6) UFA costs;
(7) supportive services only projects for centralized or coordinated assessment;
(8) renewal HMIS; and
(9) all other renewal supportive services only projects, and
(10) any project application submitted by the CoC that was not included in the HUD-approved GIW.

HUD will select projects in order of the selection priorities, and within each selection priority by CoC score, and for each CoC in order of the Priority Listings, until there are no more available funds. For each selection priority, HUD will select all of the projects for a higher scoring CoC, in order of the CoC’s Priority Listings, before selecting projects from the next highest scoring CoC, in order of that CoC’s Priority Listings; HUD will move down through the CoCs by CoC score before continuing to the next selection priority, or until there are no more available funds.

2. Adjustments to Funding. HUD may adjust the selection of competitive projects as follows:

a. The FMRs used in calculating award amounts will be those in effect at the time the of application submission deadline.

b. Geographic Diversity. HUD has determined that geographic diversity is an appropriate consideration in selecting homeless assistance projects in the competition. HUD believes that geographic diversity can be achieved best by awarding grants to as many CoCs as possible. To this end, in instances where any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin
Islands, and American Samoa do not have at least one funded CoC, HUD reserves the right to fund eligible project(s) with the highest total score in the CoC.

c. Funding Diversity. HUD reserves the right to reduce the amount of a grant, if necessary, to ensure that no more than 10 percent of assistance made available under this NOFA will be awarded for projects located within any one unit of general local government or within the geographic area covered by any one CoC.

d. If HUD exercises a right it has reserved under this NOFA, that right will be exercised uniformly across all applications received in response to this NOFA.

e. Tie-breaking Rules. HUD will break ties among CoCs with the same total score by comparing scores received by the CoCs for each of the following scoring factors, in the order shown: Overall CoC score; CoC Strategic Planning and Performance; CoC Coordination of Housing and Services; CoC Housing, Services, and Structure; Recipient Performance; HMIS; PIT count; and Leveraging. The final tie-breaking factor is the priority number of the competing projects on the applicable CoC Priority Lists.

3. Corrections to Deficient Applications. HUD will exercise the authority for curing deficiencies as stated in the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA, if needed, on a consistent and uniform basis for all CoCs and applicants. Additionally, HUD reserves the right to respond to unanticipated system defects, ambiguities, and technical difficulties in application submissions in e-snaps through a flexible implementation of its authority to cure application deficiencies through written inquiries seeking clarification and additional information (also known as callbacks). Upon proper publication in the Federal Register, HUD reserves the right to extend the competition deadline for good cause.

VIII. Award Administration Information

A. Award Notices

1. Action on Conditionally Selected Applications. HUD will notify conditionally selected applicants in writing. HUD may subsequently request conditionally selected applicants to submit additional project information—which may include documentation to show the project is financially feasible; documentation of firm commitments for match; documentation showing site control; information necessary for HUD to perform an environmental review, where HUD determines to do so in accordance with 24 CFR 58.11(d); a copy of the organization’s Code of Conduct; and such other documentation as specified by HUD in writing—to the application, that confirms or clarifies information provided in the application. HUD will notify applicants of the deadline for submission of such information. If an applicant is unable to meet any conditions for fund award within the specified time frame, HUD reserves the right not to award funds to the applicant and add them to funds available for the next competition.

2. Applicant Debriefing. See the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA for applicant debriefing procedures.
3. **Appeals Process.** Applicants may appeal the results only as provided in 24 CFR 578.35.

B. **Administrative and National Policy Requirements**

1. **Administrative and Other Program Requirements**

   a. Federal agencies are required to measure the performance of their programs. HUD captures this information not only from monitoring visits and APRs, but also on the data gathered in annual competitions. HUD’s homeless assistance programs are being measured in FY 2013 and FY 2014 by the objective to “end chronic homelessness and to move the homeless to permanent housing.” HUD has chosen six indicators which directly relate to the CoC Program. These six indicators, as described below, will be collected in the FY 2013/FY2014 CoC Application:

   (1) The creation of new PSH beds for the chronically homeless.
   (2) The decrease in the number of the chronically homeless in the CoC’s geography.
   (3) The increase of employment of the homeless residing in or exiting HUD homeless assistance projects.
   (4) The increase of the use of mainstream resources for the homeless residing or exiting from HUD homeless assistance projects.
   (5) The percentage of turnover in CoC Program-funded PSH not dedicated to the chronically homeless that will be prioritized to serve the chronically homeless.
   (6) The percentage of households with children that are served in rapid re-housing that came from unsheltered locations.

   b. **Procurement of Recovered Materials.** See Section III C.4.1 of the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA and the interim rule at 24 CFR 578.99(b) for further information.

   c. Reference the General Section of HUD’s FY 2013 NOFA for other administrative requirements.

2. **Timeliness Standards.** The FY 2013 HUD Appropriations Act requires HUD to obligate FY 2013 CoC Program funds by September 30, 2015. Obligated funds remain available for expenditure until September 30, 2020. However, HUD reserves the right to require an earlier expenditure deadline under a grant agreement. After Congress enacts an appropriation funding the Department for the balance of FY 2014, HUD will provide information about the obligation requirements for FY 2014 funds. The applicant is expected to initiate the approved projects promptly in accordance with the requirements of this section of this NOFA. Grant terms, and associated grant operations, may not extend beyond the availability of funds. Applicants must plan accordingly and only submit applications that can start operations in a timely manner with enough time to complete within the awarded grant term. In addition, HUD will take action if the grantee fails to satisfy the following timeliness standards found in 24 CFR 578.85.
3. Reporting

   a. In accordance with program regulations at 24 CFR 578.103, applicants must maintain records and within the timeframe required, make any reports, including those pertaining to race, ethnicity, gender, and disability status that HUD may require. CoC applicants may report this data as part of their APR submission to HUD. Also, recipients who expend $500,000 or more in a year in federal awards are reminded they must have a single or program-specific audit for that year in accordance with the provisions of OMB Circular No. A-133.

   b. Section 3 Reporting Regulations. Pursuant to 24 CFR 135.3(a)(2), the Section 3 requirements apply to housing and community development assistance that is used for housing rehabilitation, housing construction and other public constructions. Recipients performing any of these activities are subject to Section 3 and must submit Form HUD-60002 to the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) at the time they submit their APR to the Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs. This form may be completed electronically at www.hud.gov/section3. For more information on Section 3, see Section III.C.3.d. of the FY 2013 General Section Technical Correction.


IX. Agency Contacts

A. For Further Information. Individuals who are hearing or speech-impaired should use the Information Relay Services at 1-800-877-8339 (these are toll-free numbers). Recipients and individuals can use the locator at www.onecpd.info to find contact information for the Collaborative Applicant and for the HUD CPD Field Office serving the CoC’s territory.

B. For Technical Assistance. HUD will make appropriate resources available for technical assistance related to e-snaps. Specifically, HUD will make available e-snaps AAQ at www.onecpd.info/ask-a-question. To address technical or other questions, HUD CPD Field Office staff will also be available to help citizens identify organizations in the community that are involved in developing the CoC system. HUD staff and HUD contractors are prohibited from providing CoCs and project applicants with guidance that will result in a competitive advantage for any CoC or project applicant.

Following conditional selection of applications, HUD staff will be available to assist selected applicants in clarifying or confirming information that is a prerequisite to the offer of a grant agreement by HUD. However, between the application deadline and the announcement of conditional selections, HUD is prohibited from and will not accept any information that
would improve the substantive quality of a CoC’s application pertinent to HUD’s funding decision.

C. **Satellite Broadcast**, HUD will hold one or more informative broadcast(s) via satellite for potential applicants to provide guidance on the program and preparation of the application. HUD strongly recommends that applicants view these broadcasts, which will provide critical information on the application process. For more information about the date and time of the broadcast, individuals should consult the HUD website at [www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm](http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm).

D. **Other Information**

A. **Paperwork Reduction Act.** The information collection requirements contained in this document have been submitted for approval by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501-3520) and the OMB approval number is 2506-0112. In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, HUD may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection displays a currently valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for the collection of information and grant administration is estimated to average 250 hours per annum per respondent for the application and grant administration. This includes the time for collecting, reviewing, and reporting the data for the application, semi-annual reports and final report. The information will be used for grantee selection and monitoring the administration of funds.

B. **Environmental Impact.** A Finding of No Significant Impact with respect to the environment has been made for this notice, in accordance with HUD regulations at 24 CFR part 50 that implement section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)). The Finding of No Significant Impact is made available with the posting of this NOFA on HUD’s “Funds Available” page at [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/administration/grants/fundsavail) under the FY 2013 program link.

Dated: November 21, 2013

Mark Johnston
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Special Needs

[FR-5700-N-31B]
To Whom It May Concern:

ORGANIZATION NAME is in support of the PROJECT NAME sponsored by PROJECT APPLICANT NAME on behalf of the countywide efforts to reduce and end homelessness. PROJECT NAME will (Project applicant can insert a brief, 2 sentence program description).

To that end, ORGANIZATION NAME agrees to commit resources to PROJECT NAME and to PROJECT APPLICANT NAME as the grantee. The specific resources being contributed include:

(List specific resources with some description so that the value to project is clear. The bullets below are just examples. Leveraged services are not limited to being HUD funded activities so things like training, coordination, and other support service can be included.)

- Outreach valued at $ (AMOUNT).
- Case management valued at $ (AMOUNT).
- Leasing services valued at $ (AMOUNT).
- Local coordination, supervision, and management valued at $ (AMOUNT).
- Payee services valued at $ (AMOUNT).
- Benefits advocacy valued at $ (AMOUNT).
- (Fill in blank with specific list of services by name) _________________ services valued at $ (AMOUNT).

These resources will be available to the project when the project is under contract with HUD and available for one year.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]

NAME
TITLE
Alameda County Local Application Process
For the 2013 HUD Continuum of Care NOFA
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Question received on 12/27/2013 (via email):

1. How will local government investments into owned SHP properties be rated in this process?

Answer: The Committee elected not to give points for local government investments into owned SHP properties. The Committee will consider each project case by case based on where it falls in the rating and ranking. As stated in the application instructions, the Committee can adjust the order of ranking as necessary to strengthen the package and protect vital elements of our system of care. The impact of defunding residential buildings is a factor to be considered. Staff can be directed by the Committee to request additional information about physical plant and local funding to assist in their deliberation.

2. In relationship to Outcomes Measure 2b, ‘exiting with income for those entering with no income’, how will projects with very low exiting numbers be scored?

Answer: It is true that each person’s outcome carries greater weight in smaller projects, and that is the case whether the outcomes are poor or excellent. Eliminating results with fewer than 5 exits, could help projects with a few bad exits, but it could also hurt a project that had all good exits. Therefore, the Committee has elected to maintain the approach used in last year’s NOFA process--all projects, except those exiting zero people, will be scored on all outcomes measures.

Questions received on 12/23/13 through 12/27/13 (via email):

1. The NOFA instructions indicate we should use version 5 of the Data Completeness Forms, what about version 6?

Answer: Instructions say that you should use Data Completeness Report Card 0252 (EE v5). Version 5 was recently replaced by (EE) v6. Please use that. In the prompts, select the specific project under the ‘select provider’ prompt, and do not include services. Example is provided below:
Prompts should include the following:

Select Provider: select the specific project

Include Services....: NO

If you have already submitted your application and included services in the Data Report Card Report, it could have lowered your score. If that is the case, you may resubmit your application with the correct version of the report and your revised score.

Questions received on 12/16/13 through 12/23/13 (via email):

1. Is question C in the Housing Assistance Summary of the Project Detail question of the new project application "not applicable" to a Rapid Rehousing for Families project?

Answer: Correct, it is not applicable to Rapid Rehousing for families projects.

2. On the Timing section of the new project application, question E proposed term of this grant instructs a reference to the HUD NOFA page 16. Where are term options on Page 16 of the NOFA?

   Answer: The reference to page 16 was not correct. The discussion of grant terms starts at the bottom of page 20 and continues on page 21 of the 2013 NOFA

3. What is the time frame that can be used for data from the APR?

   Answer: We have asked that all projects run the APR for the same time period, 10/1/12 through 9/30/13.
4. For new projects that are the second type described (those converting current TH and SSO to PH) what is the deadline for notifying HCD/EveryOne Home of intent to convert?

**Answer:** Projects are strongly encouraged to notify HCD/EveryOne Home by noon on December 27th to begin discussions. Please note, if you submit a local application creating a new project out of one you intend to convert without having notified HCD/EveryOne Home by January 3rd of your plans, the proposal is at risk of not being included in the package.

5. **Question:** I can’t find some of the outcomes measures in the reports the application is telling me to use. Can you please provide some guidance?

**Answer:** Some of the instructions in the first column of the Outcomes Measure charts (pp.10-12), which name the reports and which measure they correspond to (A, B, C, D) are incorrect. Please use the following guidance:

For **Permanent Supportive Housing, SSOs tied to PH:**

- A: question 27 of the APR
- B: HMIS Outcomes Report
- C: 26a2 and 26b2 of the APR
- D: the Returns to Homelessness Report (provided to projects by EveryOne Home staff)

For **all other project types:**

- A: HMIS Outcomes Report
- B: HMIS Outcomes Report
- C: 26a2 and 26b2 of the APR
- D: Returns to Homelessness Report (provided to projects by EveryOne Home staff)

6. **Do projects submitted as conversions from TH to PSH have a chance of ending up in Tier 1 or will all new projects get placed in Tier 2?**

**Answer:** Yes, new projects that are conversions of an existing project into permanent housing have a chance of ranking in Tier 1 depending on the proposal’s score and the scores of other new projects and renewals. New projects will be ranked below renewals that meet the threshold score of 60%
and are included in Tier 1, but they are not automatically relegated to Tier 2. For further information, please see instructions on page 2 of the new project application.

7. Once I complete the e-snaps application for a renewal, should I hit the submit button?

Answer: Yes, hit the submit button.

8. Who is on the NOFA committee, and what are their affiliations? Are any additional people involved in NOFA process?

Answer: The NOFA committee is comprised of individuals who represent non-conflicted organizations or county departments. This means that they are employed by agencies/departments which do not receive any funding from HUD, and who are not current or perspective CoC funding applicants. A downloadable PDF with the full list of committee members and their affiliations can be found on the EveryOne Home website at the following link: http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html. The NOFA committee is supported by several EveryOne Home staff – namely: Executive Director Elaine de Coligny, Program Specialist Jackie Ballard, and Administrative Assistant Alexis Lozano. EveryOne Home staff facilitate the work of the NOFA Committee; they do not rate or rank the local applications. Additionally, Riley Wilkerson, lead staff for HCD’s role as collaborative applicant, handles the Grant Inventory Worksheet, manages the E-snaps submissions of project applications, supports projects technical questions to the local HUD office, and is available to the Committee for technical questions. Because HCD is also an applicant for HMIS and specific projects, he does not participate in Committee meetings or any discussion of the local application scoring criteria development or ranking of projects.

9. What is the criteria and methodology by which each project will be scored? Will there be a final arbiter in the decision making process, e.g., can a project be arbitrarily changed and/or changed, with cause, by anyone?

Answer: The criteria for scoring each project is articulated in the project applications which were released at the 12/10/13 community meeting and can be downloaded from the EveryOne Home website at the following link: http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html. Those applications include a scoring matrix that enables renewing projects to determine the majority of their points via self scoring. There are two narratives that are scored, worth 6 and 8 points respectively, and 3 points for application completeness that will be scored at the discretion of the reviewers. Each renewal application will be scored by 3 reviewers, the scores will be averaged, and the review committee will meet to discuss scores and the ranking order before they are finalized and published to the applicants.
The Continuum of Care Interim Regulations published in July of 2012 explicitly charged each local Continuum of Care with the responsibility of rating and ranking projects for inclusion in the CoC’s annual funding request to HUD. The CoC must establish a “non-conflicted” group to execute this responsibility. As indicated at the 12/10/13 community meeting, the NOFA Committee, established by the EveryOne Home Board, is the final arbiter for the local rating and ranking process. (Follow this link: [http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html](http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_nofa13.html) to review the Power Point presentation describing the local process.)

Projects will be evaluated as submitted. They will not be changed by the NOFA Committee. Reviewers, who are members of the NOFA Committee, will rate and rank project applications, and the Committee as a whole will decide what projects are included in the package. They will negotiate with the project whose initial ranking places it partially in both Tiers to reduce the budget so that it fits completely in Tier 1, and with new projects on their total budgets based on the final reallocation amount available for new permanent housing.

10. **Will the process through which the committee came to its decisions, including the scoring notes and related documentation justified by each individual who participates in the local scoring process, be made public?**

**Answer:** The ranking of all projects submitted will be made public on January 17th through direct communication to the applicants and posting on the EveryOne Home website. Each applicant will receive its own score. Applicants that wish to review score sheets and reviewers comments can make an appointment to come to the EveryOne Home office to do so. Reviewers’ names will be redacted from the notes.

11. **How should projects answer the question in E-snaps as to whether or not they participate in a Coordinated Assessment?**

**Answer:** Projects should answer “No.” Our community is still developing our coordinated intake and assessment, which EveryOne Home and HCD will address in the CoC narrative portion of our collaborative application.

12. **If my project had less than 5% funds left unexpended last year, what do I need to address in question b. under Spending?**
Answer: Question b. need only be addressed if a project had more than 5% of its funding unexpended. If less than that percentage was left over, please state that information. While no additional information is required, it is strongly encouraged that you to provide a very brief explanation to ensure that your project receives the full four points.

13. I am attempting to answer a narrative question with no word or character length restrictions and the text box will not expand any further. I’m not finished with my answer – what should I do?

Answer: If you feel you have more to write and a text box will not continue to expand, please do the following:
- Complete as much of your answer as your application will allow in the space designated for it.
- If the text box will not continue expanding, please make a note at the end of your answer, underlined in bold, directing your application’s reviewers to a supplemental attachment.
- Continue your answer in another document, which can be submitted with your local application, also in PDF form. Please also list the name of your project at the top of any supplemental application materials.

Questions received at bidder’s conference on 12/10/13 through Sunday, 12/15/13:

1. HUD has said that if a project has any portion of its budget fall below the Tier 2 funding line the whole project will be considered part of Tier 2. Will the NOFA Committee do the same thing? (from bidders conference)

Answer: No, as stated on page two of the new and renewal application instructions, the NOFA committee reserves the flexibility to make adjustments to the final project priority list in order to create the strongest package that meets the needs of our community. The amount of the grant is one of the factors that will be taken into consideration and extends to adjusting the amount of a project budget if it falls in both tiers. Should the situation arise, the NOFA Committee will contact the project in question and determine what a workable change in the budget will be for both the project and the package.

2. How is HUD defining “youth” as a priority population? (from bidders conference)

Answer: Page 7 of the NOFA describes “unaccompanied youth” as a priority population and defines the age range as between ages 16-24 on page 39. A project can serve youth in the entire age range or focus on youth ages 16-17 or 18-24 and still get the full point for this question.

3. Why are you measuring Outcome Measure D, “Returns to Homelessness”, for a year after exit to permanent housing? For those projects in which people are permanently housed already, should you measure the program exit into homelessness? (from bidders conference)
Answer: This is a new measure being applied to projects this year. It is being measured using the report created for returns to homelessness system-wide, which we have been measuring and reporting on for three years in the system-wide Outcomes Progress Report. The NOFA Committee feels that using the same measure for all projects this year is the most consistent and fair, and will therefore measure the outcome as described in the application. Community comments will be taken under advisement for future NOFA rounds.

Questions Received via e-mail, through 12/15/13:

4. For Outcome Measure B, “Entering with No Income, % who Obtain Some Income”, how would projects which had no one exit the project who came in with no income be scored? (Asked at bidders conference and in an email dated 12/13/13)

Answer: Applications are scored as a percentage of total possible points. For most applicants that will be a percentage of 100 points. In cases where there is no data for a given measure—such as exiting with income after entering with none or the spending measure when a grant has not completed its first term, the points from that question will be eliminated from the total possible points and the percentage will be based on a lower total. For example, projects that do not have data for Outcome Measure B will be scored on an 88 point scale versus a 100 point scale.

5. Where did the 56% benchmark for Outcome Measure C, “Access to Mainstream Benefits”, come from? (via email 12/10/13)

Answer: On page 38 of the NOFA, HUD indicates that it will grant full points on this measure for communities that have 56% of their participants obtaining or maintaining mainstream benefits. This includes both stayers and leavers with one or more source of non-cash benefits. The data for stayers will come from either the intake form or the annual update. The data for leavers will come from the exit form. Non-cash benefits were chosen to measure this outcome because the APR income cash chart does not distinguish between earned and mainstream benefits, and this measure is currently not captured in the HMIS Outcomes Report.

6. What are the factors that will be used to determine a highly rated answer versus a lower rated answer to the narrative question(s), “Utilizing a Housing First Approach”, in the General Section of the renewal application? (via email 12/12/13)

Answer: Answers that get full points for this question will demonstrate an understanding of Housing First Principles and clearly describe how they are implemented in the project. The factors considered and the weight they are given will vary depending on the project type. For example, SSO projects not tied to permanent housing and transitional housing projects would want to address how the project focuses on getting participants permanently housed as soon as possible, versus using the maximum time allowable for the program—24 months in the case of TH. Whereas SSO tied to permanent housing and permanent housing projects would discuss how housing stability is prioritized and maintained. In general, as noted on page 5 of the local application, entry requirements should be “no-barrier” or “low barrier”; obtaining or maintaining permanent housing should be prioritized and emphasized with participants; people should not be offered housing as a reward for clinical successes or lose it for clinical setbacks, such as relapse. All projects should address entry requirements—those with sobriety or income requirements would not get full points. All projects should also address how program agreements/lease violations are handled. Projects that use drug testing, and exit people for loss of
sobriety, would not get full points, nor would projects that exit tenants for non-participation in services.
For more information on the Housing First Approach the following resources may be helpful:

a. HUD SNAPS Weekly Focus—Adopting a Housing First Approach:

b. Organizational Change: Adopting a Housing First Approach:
http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/organizational-change-adopting-a-housing-first-approach


d. http://100khomes.org/read-the-manifesto/housing-first

7. In the Quality Assurance section on page 15 of the renewal application, a number of sub-questions are asked that make up the 8 possible points for that narrative. Please clarify the relative worth of each sub question. (via email 12/12/13)

Answer: The sub-questions are intended as prompts for what to cover in the narrative. They do not have a set relative worth, as they will apply differently to each project. For example, there may be areas of quality assurance where the project has a long way to go, but has worked really hard and improved, and remains focused on this effort. That could carry similar value to a project which is doing really well on the same factor. and has the infrastructure in place to maintain its performance. Narratives that are comprehensive and specific will score better than answers that offer general assertions about a project’s commitment to quality assurance, data accuracy, consumer satisfaction, etc.

Questions for E-snaps:

1. How do we answer question 19 in 1E? (via email 12/13/13)

Answer: The answer is "Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review."
Alameda County 2013 NOFA Committee

Jill Dunner, Consumer
Damon Francis, Alameda County Public Health Department
Grace Kong, City of Hayward
Duane Poe, Black Bay Area United Fund
Angela Robinson-Pinon, Alameda County Planning Department
Marnell Tinson, Consumer
Moe Wright, BBI Construction
Guiding Principles

for Alameda County 2012 HUD CoC NOFA Process

These principles were developed with community input solicited at a Community Meeting, on an open community conference call, and via written survey feedback. The NOFA Committee adopted these on 10.22.2012.

a. Reorient our Countywide system to ensure that we are permanently housing those who lose their housing as rapidly and cost effectively as possible, reducing lengths of time homeless and returns to homelessness while increasing exits to permanent housing. Build in the nimbleness and flexibility to get the right resources to the right people at the right time.

b. In reorienting the system proceed thoughtfully to deploy proven strategies and target resources to best practices, maximizing dollars at the front line, and using data and outcome performance available to all stakeholders along with consumers’ and providers’ lived experiences to drive those choices.

c. Each program in the Continuum of Care is accountable to contributing to our achievement of local and HEARTH outcomes.

d. Build on our strengths. Support capacity building and provider development while operating with mutual accountability between all stakeholders, including EveryOne Home.

e. Work collaboratively across providers, systems, and jurisdictional boundaries; leverage mainstream resources the maximum extent possible. Be mindful of local realities.

f. Implement programs and services with a Housing First, “no wrong door” framework; no one is viewed as “unhouseable.” Meet consumers where they are.

g. Build a system that touches everyone, not excluding certain groups or people.

h. Be creative. Be patient. Hang in with the process.