MEMORANDUM

To: Alameda County Projects and Stakeholders
From: EveryOne Home and HCD
Date: December 22, 2016
Re: HUD 2016 CoC NOFA Funding Awards

HUD announced funding awards for the 2016 Continuum of Care competition on December 20, 2016. Our continuum was awarded a total of $33,998,867 for its combined Tier 1, Tier 2, Coordinated Entry, and CoC planning projects. A link to HUD’s press release and list of all funded projects is here. To view, select California where Alameda County’s list starts on page 4.

All renewal projects in both Tiers were funded along with the new Coordinated Entry Project that uses reallocated funds. This means thousands of people will remain in affordable, safe homes and hundreds more will be assisted to end their homelessness. The attached list provides a comparison of what was requested versus what was awarded in the rank order from our local process as submitted to HUD. Highlights include:

- **All renewals funded.** All renewals, including three projects in Tier 2 totaling $934,041, were funded in this round. Renewing rental assistance projects were increased by a combined total of $5.4 million from the Annual Renewal Demand due to 2016 Fair Market Rents being higher this year.
- **The Coordinated Entry Project was awarded.** The CES project submitted by HCD was awarded at the full amount of $1,038,171. Combined with Whole Person Care and Boomerang funding, this grant will help ensure our Coordinated Entry System Design can get implemented throughout the County.
- **The bonus project was not funded.** Berkeley Way, a permanent supportive housing project scheduled to start construction in 2018, was not funded this round. Because operations are still several years away, the project would be eligible to submit again in future rounds.
- **CoC Planning funds were also renewed.** This resource will allow our CoC to expand the capacity of both HMIS and the CoC Lead Agency, EveryOne Home. While the 2015 award is still not fully under contract, this ensures the Continuum will have this funding through 2018.

Congratulations to all grantees and to our community for its flexibility, commitment to excellence and strategic approaches to our collaborative application. We will need to bring all that to our 2017 effort as well. The next four years will be very challenging politically, and maintaining a high caliber of services for those most vulnerable in our community will take creativity, and willingness to think and act boldly.

Please feel free to distribute this to any sub-grantees or colleagues who were also part of the CoC NOFA process. If you have questions about your specific funding award amount, please direct them to Riley at riley.wilkerson@acgov.org. Other questions may be directed to EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org.

A community debrief of the NOFA process will be convened early in 2017. Please stay tuned for invitations and announcements from EveryOne Home.

Thank you, everyone, for your hard and thoughtful work in a very challenging NOFA process. Happy Holidays!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Prog. Type*</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laguna Commons</td>
<td>Alameda County BHCS</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$131,224</td>
<td>$167,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welcome Home SL</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$541,428</td>
<td>$665,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HOAP</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$215,808</td>
<td>$282,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>InHOUSE</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$2,254,150</td>
<td>$2,958,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spirit of Hope 1</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$51,685</td>
<td>$51,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>Satellite Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$39,462</td>
<td>$39,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$216,446</td>
<td>$216,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI) SHP</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$474,829</td>
<td>$474,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>COACH Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$514,102</td>
<td>$674,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$138,872</td>
<td>$182,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$142,771</td>
<td>$187,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$583,980</td>
<td>$765,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – SRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$1,223,324</td>
<td>$1,605,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services</td>
<td>LifeLong Medical Care</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$549,672</td>
<td>$549,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment (RISE) Project</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$160,183</td>
<td>$160,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$5,012,291</td>
<td>$6,577,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Russell Street Residence</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$297,138</td>
<td>$297,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$678,635</td>
<td>$822,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Homes for Wellness</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$701,756</td>
<td>$890,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care – HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$959,900</td>
<td>$1,264,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek SHP</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$85,788</td>
<td>$85,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>North County Family Rapid Rehousing Housing</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$674,327</td>
<td>$804,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Housing Fast Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$1,864,465</td>
<td>$1,864,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Prog. Type*</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>Amount Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – HOPE Hsng</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$356,245</td>
<td>$470,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Turning Point FY11</td>
<td>Fred Finch Youth Center</td>
<td>TAY-TH</td>
<td>$633,869</td>
<td>$633,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bessie Coleman Court</td>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$195,508</td>
<td>$247,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>APC Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$1,111,092</td>
<td>$1,111,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>Yvette A. Flunder Foundation</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$216,487</td>
<td>$216,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Bonita House, Inc.</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$35,323</td>
<td>$35,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$80,867</td>
<td>$80,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$314,024</td>
<td>$393,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek S+C</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$164,104</td>
<td>$215,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NCWC – North County Women’s Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$390,535</td>
<td>$390,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TAY-TH</td>
<td>$713,095</td>
<td>$713,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$70,289</td>
<td>$70,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$604,658</td>
<td>$604,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Carmen Avenue Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD / Allied Housing</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$36,166</td>
<td>$36,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>North County Homeless Youth RRH</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$1,072,206</td>
<td>$1,306,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tri-City / FESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$42,973</td>
<td>$42,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$348,184</td>
<td>$456,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$264,765</td>
<td>$264,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$971,983</td>
<td>$971,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Banyan House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$81,320</td>
<td>$81,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Southern Alameda County Housing / Jobs Linkages Program</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$1,201,674</td>
<td>$1,463,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Coordinated Entry System Application</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>CES-R</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$77,099</td>
<td>$77,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Families in Transitional Scattered Sites</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$249,815</td>
<td>$249,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Berkeley Way</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PSH-B</td>
<td>$1,408,730</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CoC Planning Project FY 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$845,238</td>
<td>$845,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Renewals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,744,517</td>
<td>$32,115,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bonus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,408,730</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reallocated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,036,65</td>
<td>$33,998,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Prog. Type*</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>Amount Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laguna Commons</td>
<td>Alameda County BHCS</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$131,224</td>
<td>$167,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welcome Home SL</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$541,428</td>
<td>$665,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HOAP</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$215,808</td>
<td>$282,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>InHOUSE</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
<td>$391,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$2,254,150</td>
<td>$2,958,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spirit of Hope 1</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$51,685</td>
<td>$51,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peter Babcock House</td>
<td>Satellite Affordable Housing Associates</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$39,462</td>
<td>$39,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alameda Point Permanent</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$216,446</td>
<td>$216,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI) SHP</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$474,829</td>
<td>$474,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>COACH Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$514,102</td>
<td>$674,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pathways Project</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$138,872</td>
<td>$182,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Supportive Housing Network</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$142,771</td>
<td>$187,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – SRO</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$583,980</td>
<td>$765,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – SRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$1,223,324</td>
<td>$1,605,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Health, Housing and Integrated Services</td>
<td>LifeLong Medical Care</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$549,672</td>
<td>$549,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment (RISE) Project</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$160,183</td>
<td>$160,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – TRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$5,012,291</td>
<td>$6,577,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Russell Street Residence</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$297,138</td>
<td>$297,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Welcome Home</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$678,635</td>
<td>$822,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Homes for Wellness</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$701,756</td>
<td>$890,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care – HOST</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$959,900</td>
<td>$1,264,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek SHP</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$85,788</td>
<td>$85,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>North County Family Rapid Rehousing Housing</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$674,327</td>
<td>$804,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Housing Fast Support Network</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$1,864,465</td>
<td>$1,864,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Prog. Type*</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>Amount Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program – HOPE Hsng</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$356,245</td>
<td>$470,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Turning Point FY11</td>
<td>Fred Finch Youth Center</td>
<td>TAY-TH</td>
<td>$633,869</td>
<td>$633,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bessie Coleman Court</td>
<td>Building Futures with Women and Children</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$195,508</td>
<td>$247,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>APC Multi Service Center</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$1,111,092</td>
<td>$1,111,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Walker House</td>
<td>Yvette A. Flunder Foundation</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$216,487</td>
<td>$216,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Channing Way Apartments</td>
<td>Bonita House, Inc.</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$35,323</td>
<td>$35,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Regent Street</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$80,867</td>
<td>$80,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization</td>
<td>Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$470,509</td>
<td>$470,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lorenzo Creek S+C</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$164,104</td>
<td>$215,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NCWC – North County Women’s Center</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$390,535</td>
<td>$390,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>TAY-TH</td>
<td>$713,095</td>
<td>$713,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bridget Transitional House</td>
<td>Women’s Daytime Drop-In Center</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$70,289</td>
<td>$70,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>STAY Well Housing</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$604,658</td>
<td>$604,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Carmen Avenue Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD / Allied Housing</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$36,166</td>
<td>$36,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>North County Homeless Youth RRH</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$1,072,206</td>
<td>$1,306,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tri-City / FESCO Bridgeway Apartments</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$42,973</td>
<td>$42,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$348,184</td>
<td>$456,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$264,765</td>
<td>$264,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>AC Impact</td>
<td>Abode Services</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$971,983</td>
<td>$971,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Banyan House Transitional Housing</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$81,320</td>
<td>$81,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Southern Alameda County Housing / Jobs Linkages Program</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>$1,201,674</td>
<td>$1,463,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Coordinated Entry System Application</td>
<td>Alameda County HCD</td>
<td>CES-R</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Concord House</td>
<td>Resources for Community Development</td>
<td>PSH</td>
<td>$77,099</td>
<td>$77,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Families in Transitional Scattered Sites</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>Gen-TH</td>
<td>$249,815</td>
<td>$249,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Berkeley Way</td>
<td>Berkeley Food and Housing Project</td>
<td>PSH-B</td>
<td>$1,408,730</td>
<td>$1,408,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoC Planning Project FY 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$845,238</td>
<td>$845,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,744,517</td>
<td>$32,115,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,408,730</td>
<td>$1,408,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reallocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
<td>$1,038,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,036,65</td>
<td>$33,998,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document summarizes the scores your CoC received in the FY 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition application. It provides three sets of information:

- The CoC’s score on several high priority questions;
- A summary of the CoC’s scores on the four sections of the application; and
- A summary of the average CoC score, including the highest and lowest scores.

The scores are organized in the same manner as the CoC application. In a separate document, we are publishing a crosswalk showing how the questions in the CoC application were related to the questions in the NOFA.

**High Priority CoC Application Questions**

Below is a selection of high priority CoC Application questions that includes the total points available for each of the questions listed and the points received by the CoC for the question. The chart below indicates the maximum amount of points available for each scoring category and the actual score your CoC received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1F. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review, Ranking, and Selection</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This question assessed whether a CoC used objective criteria and past performance to review and rank projects. To receive full points, CoCs would have had to use performance-based criteria to at least partially evaluate and rank projects. Examples of performance criteria include reducing the length of time people experienced homelessness and the degree to which people exited programs for permanent housing destinations.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F-2. In the sections below, check the appropriate box(s) for each section to indicate how project applications were reviewed and ranked for the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition. (Written documentation of the CoC’s publicly announced Rating and Review procedure must be attached.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F-2a. Describe how the CoC considered the severity of needs and vulnerabilities of participants that are, or will be, served by the</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High Priority CoC Application Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project applications when determining project application priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Bed Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2C-2.</strong> Per the 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC), indicate the number of beds in the 2016 HIC and in HMIS for each project type within the CoC. If a particular project type does not exist in the CoC then enter “0” for all cells in that project type.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This question captured the change in PIT counts of Sheltered and Unsheltered Homeless Persons</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-1a. Using the table provided, indicate the number of persons who were homeless at the Point-in-Time (PIT) based on the 2015 and 2016 PIT counts (or the two most recent years’ PIT counts were conducted) as recorded in the Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-3. Performance Measure: Length of Time Homeless. Describe the CoCs efforts to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless. Specifically, describe how the CoC has reduced the average length of time homeless, including how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and families with the longest lengths of time homeless.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-4a. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations: Fill in the chart to indicate the extent to which projects exit program participants into permanent housing (subsidized or non-sub-subsized) or the retention of program participants in CoC Program-funded permanent supportive housing.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-4b. Exit to or Retention of Permanent Housing. In the chart provided, CoCs must indicate the number of persons who exited from any CoC-funded permanent housing project except Rapid Rehousing (RRH) to permanent housing destinations or retained their permanent housing between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A-5. Performance Measure: Returns to Homelessness: Describe the CoCs efforts to reduce</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## High Priority CoC Application Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the rate of individuals and families who return to homelessness. Specifically, describe strategies your CoC has implemented to identify and minimize the returns to homelessness, and demonstrate the use of HMIS or a comparable database to monitor and record returns to homelessness.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.8. Enter the date the CoC submitted the system performance measure data into HDX. The System Performance Report generated by HDX must be attached.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

| 3B-1.2. Compare the total number of PSH beds (CoC program and non-CoC program funded) that were identified as dedicated for use by chronically homeless persons on the 2016 Housing Inventory Count, as compared to those identified on the 2015 Housing Inventory count. | 10                      | 6                  |
| 3B-2.3. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve families from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.                                                                                                                           | 5                       | 0                  |
| 3B-3.1 Compare the total number of homeless Veterans in the CoC as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015.) | 8                       | 8                  |

### 4B. Additional Policies

| 4B-1. Based on the CoCs FY 2016 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH), Transitional Housing (TH), and SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) projects in the CoC are low barrier? | 6                       | 6                  |
| 4B-2. What percentage of CoC Program-funded Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid RE-Housing (RRH), SSO (non-coordinated entry) and Transitional Housing (TH) FY 2016 projects have adopted a Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements? | 6                       | 6                  |
### High Priority CoC Application Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoC Application Questions</th>
<th>Maximum Score Available</th>
<th>CoC Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4B-4. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve all populations from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CoC Scoring Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Category</th>
<th>Maximum Score (Points)</th>
<th>Your CoC Score (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: CoC Structure and Governance</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Data Collection and Quality</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3: CoC Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4: Cross-Cutting Policies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CoC Application Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>159.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Scores for all CoCs

- Highest Score for any CoC: 187.75
- Lowest Score for any CoC: 79
- Median Score for all CoCs: 154.5
- Weighted Mean Score for all CoCs: 160.7

*The weighted mean score is the mean CoC score weighted by Annual Renewal Demand. CoCs that scored higher than the weighted mean score were more likely to gain funding relative to their Annual Renewal Demand, while CoCs that scored lower than the weighted mean were more likely to lose money relative to their Annual Renewal Demand.*
### HUD CoC NOFA Local Application
### Rationale for Changes to 2016 Process

|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| **Primary Activity Type** | 16             | 5              | - In prior rounds, only PSH projects could score full points, while all other project types could only score few or zero points.  
- Is not a performance – based metric  
- PSH and RRH lost out on 11 automatic points, and no longer had a large advantage over all other project types.  
- This did seem to be a significant reason for scoring and ranking shifts. |
| **HUD Priorities**      | 8              | 10             | - Was called Target Populations in 2016, and was a sub-question in a larger section of HUD priorities.  
- Is reflective of HUD emphasis on target populations.  
- Was not responsible for any major swings in scores for any projects. |
| **Using Housing 1st Approach** | 6             | 10             | - Was part of the HUD Priorities section in 2016. Community is committed to operating on a Housing 1st / Low Barrier model. More backup documentation was also required this year, which added weight to the score. This question requires narrative response, and is scored by the NOFA Committee. This year backup documentation was considered in evaluation of the narrative response and projects lost points if the narrative and backup documentation did not match. |
| **Cost Effectiveness**  | N/A            | 5              | - HUD explicitly mentions this metric as a priority (2016 HUD CoC NOFA, pg. 8, section 2a). As a result, it was added in 2016.  
- Demonstrates effective use of HUD funds. |
| **Outcome Performance** | 38             | 32             | - Since there are no consistently low performing projects in the package, weight on these metrics could be shifted to focus on other areas such as grant management, fiscal management, cost effectiveness, and Utilization.  
- Some projects saw individual score swings because of their performance. Lowering the total point value of performance did not cause shifts in ranking. |
| **Spending**            | 12             | 5              | - The community acknowledged that while underspending was an issue, the underlying causes have been identified.  
- The issue overall needs to be addressed by a system-wide strategy at the funder level.  
- The shift in weight actually helped those projects who were penalized more harshly for underspending in 2015. |
| **Reports and Invoicing** | N/A           | 8              | - Explicitly mentions this metric in the NOFA (p. 26, section 2.d.(1) ) as a threshold requirement for all renewal projects. |
### HUD CoC NOFA Local Application

#### Rationale for Changes to 2016 Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2015 Score</th>
<th>2016 Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proof of Eligibility          | N/A        | 5          | • Meant to weight projects compliance with low barrier.  
• Narrative showed proof of good grant management as evidenced by claims in the Policy and Procedure Documentation.                          |
| Utilization                   | N/A        | 5          | • Is explicitly mentioned in the NOFA as a factor that should be scored.  
• Very few projects earned full points on this metric.                                                                                                                                               |
| HMIS Data Completeness Report Card | 2           | 2          | • No change to score                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Fiscal Management             | N/A        | 4          | • Was scored in 2015 as part of quality assurance, though audits were submitted during that funding round. More projects than anticipated had findings in their audits, and the NOFA committee felt weight should be put on this item.  
• It was not a major factor in scoring shifts.                                                                                                                                                       |
| Quality Assurance             | 12         | 7          | • Fiscal management and quality assurance were score as a single factor in 2015 and as two distinct factors in 2016.  
• Changing this scoring allowed for points to be put into items such as Proof of Eligibility.  
• Projects in all parts of the package (top, middle, bottom) scored low on this metric. It was not a driver in where a project landed in the package.                                               |
| Leverage                      | 3          | N/A        | Was no longer required in 2016. HUD no longer scores it either.                                                                                                                                         |
| Completeness                  | 3          | N/A        | Was not scored in 2016. There were not generally issues of incomplete applications being submitted, and any missing items would be reflected in scoring through other elements of the application.                     |
| Total Points Possible         | 100        | 100        | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
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OVERVIEW OF THE 2016 PROCESS
Overview of the 2016 Process: Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles were established by the Community in the 2013 funding round, and reaffirmed and updated by the HUD CoC Committee in 2016.

- Maximize the resources available to community
- Package submitted will align with HUD priorities in order to meet local needs
- Prioritize ensuring existing residential capacity and housing stability is maintained systemwide
- Keep the renewal process as simple as possible
- Continue to emphasize project performance and the submission of projects that will meet HUD’s thresholds
- Support individual projects seeking to reallocate or reclassify where relevant
- Facilitate a clear, fair and transparent local process
## Overview of the 2016 Process:
### Committee and Staff Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EveryOne Home</th>
<th>HCD</th>
<th>HUD CoC Committee</th>
<th>NOFA Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide analysis of HUD Communications</td>
<td>Assist with analysis of HUD communications</td>
<td>Attend input sessions and Bidder’s Conferences</td>
<td>Attend input sessions and Bidder’s Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage logistics and support of the HUD CoC and HUD NOFA Committees</td>
<td>Work in partnership with EH staff to complete the Consolidated Application</td>
<td>Convert feedback from input sessions into community priorities</td>
<td>Convert strategies determined by HUD CoC into viable scoring criteria and applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate local process, including scheduling and convening of community meetings</td>
<td>Submit complete application to HUD at or prior to due date through e-snaps.</td>
<td>Work with EH staff to refine community strategies and priorities</td>
<td>Score narrative sections and backup documentation of local applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the NOFA Committee to develop the local application.</td>
<td>Work on the GIW and communications with projects about e-snaps apps.</td>
<td>Give guidance to the NOFA Committee based on recommended strategies.</td>
<td>Rate and rank local applications and determine final rank list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring objective elements of local application and working w/ HCD on Consolidated App.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Communication (FAQs, posting application items on website)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the 2016 Process: Strategic Direction

Strategic direction for the 2016 process was determined by the HUD CoC Committee after taking the following steps:

- Reviewing the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) issued 6/28/16: https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf
- Reviewing Alameda County’s scores and HUD’s feedback on the 2015 applications
- Soliciting community input at two open meetings (6/21/16 and 7/7/16) attended by 45 stakeholders in total
- Conducting an anonymous online survey, which was completed by 36 respondents
Overview of the 2016 Process:
Strategic Direction from HUD CoC

Specific 2016 Strategic Recommendations from the HUD CoC Committee as informed by community input process:

1. Support Strategic Reallocation
2. Invite a proposal for Coordinated Entry
3. Ensure local scoring values general TH projects which are in line with continuum principles and which improve continuum performance, allowing them to rank competitively.
4. Rank both new and renewing projects together, and protect existing residential capacity in scoring and ranking (allow new projects into Tier 1).
Overview of the 2016 Process: Strategic Direction - NOFA Committee Implementation

In an effort to meet the direction from the HUD CoC Committee, and submit a competitive CoC application, the HUD NOFA Committee implemented the following in the 2016 local process:

1. invited voluntary reallocation or negotiated reallocation w/ local funders, established minimum score for inclusion, and;
2. did not invite applications from any SSO project not tied to CES.
3. Invited a proposal for a Coordinated Entry System.
4. Shifted weight of scoring for Primary Activity Type to enable TH projects which met continuum principles and improved system performance to be competitive.
5. Added new criteria for scoring grant management performance.
6. Allowed for new and bonus projects to be ranked in Tier 1 with renewals
Overview of 2016 Process: Changes to the Local Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backup Documentation (particularly for the Housing First Principle narrative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports and Invoicing (8 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization (5 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omitted Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview of 2016 Process: Changes to the Local Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2015 Value</th>
<th>2016 Value</th>
<th>Total difference (+ / - )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Type</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD Priorities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing First</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Management</td>
<td>Had been in QA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local and National Results
Local and National Results:
Outcomes and Analysis Results of Local Process

The local process completed with a total of 49 projects.
   44 projects fully in Tier 1
   One project straddled the line of Tier 1 and Tier 2
   Four projects fully in Tier 2, including the bonus and CES projects.

Total 2016 funding request = $29,583,325

Total 2016 Funding Award = $33,998,867 (total includes the CoC Planning Grant)

All renewal projects (including the CoC Planning Project) and the CES application were funded either in full, for more than the amount requested.

The bonus project was not awarded.

One SSO Project not tied to CES was not submitted with the 2016 package.
## Local and National Results: Rationale for Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rationale for Change / Impact of Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Type</td>
<td>• HUD lowered the value of this metric in its scoring and reduced the difference between PH and TH maximum scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD Priorities</td>
<td>• Gave points for severity of need including projects taking people from the streets or vets or persons fleeing violence and trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance</td>
<td>• Reduced the overall points for this to include other things HUD listed as criteria it wanted used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Spending                                    | • A community strategy needs to be developed to address effectively  
• Change helped projects which were struggling with spending issues                                      |
| Adding Cost Effectiveness, Utilization, Reports and Invoicing, Eligibility | • All objective criteria HUD explicitly stated it wanted communities to use in evaluating projects                                                                          |
| Completeness                                | • Has not generally been an issue  
• Points reassigned to reflect other priorities and metric omitted                                                                                                    |
| Leverage                                    | • HUD had eliminated scoring Leverage and it is not a performance based metric. Omitted.                                                                                |
Local and National Results: Impact of Changes

- Primary Activity Type
  - PSH and RRH projects had an 11 point reduction in points they earned automatically for type.
  - Functioned to level scoring between project types, allowing TH projects to score competitively.
  - All but one project which dropped 10 or more rank places were PSH or RRH, and no longer received these points.

- Using a Housing First Approach
  - No project earned full points on this metric in 2016.
  - Backup documentation on this issue was required for the first time in 2016.
  - Even with a strong narrative, if backup documentation did not support claims, projects lost points on this metric.
  - Projects varied widely in scores, but high scoring projects still scored low in this metric and vice versa. Overall, it had a small impact on scoring.
Local and National Results: Impact of Changes

- Cost Effectiveness
  - Specifically mentioned by HUD as a priority; “CoCs should use objective, performance based scoring criteria and selection [and] should consider how much each project spends to serve and house an individual or family as compared to other projects serving similar populations.” (2016 HUD CoC NOFA, II.A.2.a, p. 8)
  - Measure is meant to show the effective use of HUD funds.
  - Only two projects scored 2-3 points on this metric. It had only a small impact on a couple of projects.
Local and National Results:  
Impact of Changes

Reports and Invoicing

- “HUD reserves the right to deny the funding request for a new project, if the existing recipient...does not routinely draw down funds from eLOCCS at least once per quarter. Additionally, HUD reserves the right to withdraw funds if no APR is submitted on the prior grant.” (2016 HUD CoC NOFA, V.C.G2.C.5c p. 26)
- NOFA identifies this metric as a HUD threshold requirement for all renewing projects.
- The metric did impact scores of projects, particularly those which earned full points. Of the bottom 10 projects, four earned 0 points.
Local and National Results: Impact of Changes

- **Utilization**
  - “To receive maximum points, the CoC must have monitored the renewing project applicants and projects for utilization rates,” (VII.A.2d pg. 36)
  - Ensures that projects are meeting both client and system needs.
  - Of the eight lowest performing projects, seven scored full points on this metric. It did not account for a large shift or swing in scoring overall.

- **Quality Assurance:**
  - Of projects in the lowest 10 rank spots, three scored less than six (6) points (total points available = 7)
  - Projects at a variety of rank spaces (top, middle, and low) scored medium to low points on this metric.
  - This metric was not a driver in a project scoring low in the final rank order.
HUD hosted a debrief of the overall national process on February 7, 2017. The SNAPS office commented on national trends and amounts, which are mentioned for the remainder of this section:

- The total amount awarded nationally = $1.95 billion.
- $124 million went to new PSH and RRH through reallocation and bonus processes.
- TH projects were awarded $107 million, approx. $66 million less than allocated in 2015. 90% of that reduction was done at the CoC level.
- Tier 1 = 93% of CoC ARDs
- 5.8% of funds were for reallocated projects.
- Despite advocacy already underway from other communities, reallocation is not going away. HUD has encouraged CoCs to continue reallocating even high performers.
CoCs that did well reallocated lower performing projects, used performance criteria, used housing first principles, reduced homelessness, increased PH units.

CoCs that did poorly had increases in homelessness, and no increases to units for PSH dedicated to chronically homeless or less RRH units.
Local and National Results: HUD Process

- Overall a bigger reduction in homelessness nationwide by about 15K people.
- HUD has indicated that TH is not being phased out completely. The specific TH types mentioned: TAY, DV, and Recovery Programs. Housing 1st will be a big part of TH projects continuing to be funded.
Local and National Results:

HUD Process

Lowest CoC Score = 79 points
Highest CoC Score = 187.75
Weighted Mean = 160.7
Alameda County Score = 159.25

Grants for Residential Programs are serving 14.8% more households per dollar than in 2014.

22.5% more households were served with residential programs over the last two years.
Local and National Results: HUD Process

The chart below shows scoring on questions pertaining to the Continuum of Care Project Review, Rating and Ranking, and Selection. The two relevant questions between 2015 and 2016 are identical in the Consolidated Application. For additional context, please see the HUD Scoring Crosswalk documents for both years, available on the EveryOne Home website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Application Questions</th>
<th>2015 Score</th>
<th>2016 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care Project Review, Ranking and Selection</td>
<td>1F-2, 1F-2a</td>
<td>5 of 10</td>
<td>10 of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 of 3</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local and National Results:
Key Conclusions / Observations

- Nine projects saw an increase in rank by 10 spaces or more. Of those, nine were in Tier 2 in 2015 and moved to Tier 1 in 2016.

- Nine projects saw a drop in rank of 10 places or more. Of those projects, only 2.5 were in Tier 2 in 2016 (one project straddled the line). All projects were funded.

- Primary Activity Type decreasing by 11 points was a factor for all projects that dropped 10 or more points in rank between 2015 / 2016.

- Of the projects that dropped more than 10 rank places between 2015 / 2016, seven of eight had zero points in at least one or more performance outcome category questions.

- 49 projects scored between 64 and 97.2 points. While projects dropped in ranking, their score may not have changed substantially between the years.
Local and National Results: Key Conclusions

- HUD released CoC Application scores on 2/8/17. Alameda County got the same overall score as 2015 (159.25 points)
  - Lost points in system performance in 2016
  - Gained full points for our local rating and ranking criteria and process
- Despite the local competition being particularly challenging in 2016, Alameda held ground in the national competition by submitting an extremely competitive package. In the changes made to our local process, Alameda County earned full points on this metric (Structure of Governance).
- While Alameda County’s strategy with our local process was successful, the majority of lost points were in the System Performance category. The HUD CoC Committee, and Community will need to focus on our performance as a system, which will be a topic of discussion in coming months as planning for the 2017 process begins.
Local Feedback on the 2016 Process
Local Feedback on the 2016 Process Themes

In September, EveryOne Home released a survey for the community to provide feedback on the 2016 local process. Major themes from that feedback are in the box below, with in depth descriptions in the following slides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Versions and Releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Ranking and Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>FAQ Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CoC’s Local Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Feedback on the 2016 Process: Timing and Other CoC Processes

Timing:

- Community members felt that there was not enough lead up time or actual time for the NOFA process.
- Unfortunately, HUD’s schedule for release of the NOFA is not always known, and once released, the timeline is theirs as is the application deadline. Alameda County will be shifting to a year round monitoring process which will alleviate some of the pressure in the timeline.
- In its 2016 process debrief webinar, HUD did indicate that they are hoping to provide communities more time with the NOFA (between 90-120 days).

Other CoC Processes:

- Feedback indicated an interest in the HUD CoC Committee reviewing the rating and ranking procedures of neighboring CoC’s which may have an easier and more accessible process.
- The HUD CoC Committee agrees with that recommendation and will ask the NOFA Committee and staff to implement it.
Local Feedback on the 2016 Process:
Versions and Releases and Attachments

Versions and Releases:
- Survey Respondents expressed frustration with an updated version of the local application being released so late in the process.
- EveryOne Home and the NOFA Committee will work to have a single application with no updates or additions in the upcoming round.

Attachments:
- Community Members felt frustration at the large volume of attachments now required for the NOFA process.
- The NOFA Committee felt that this was an accurate way to capture community commitments to the Housing First principles, and to fulfill scoring on metrics HUD specifically mentions as priorities, such as eLOCCS draws, reports, and audits.
- The monitoring capacity added with the CoC grant may allow these documents to be reviewed through monitoring rather than submitted at NOFA time.
Local Feedback on the 2016 Process: Ranking and Appeals

Rating and Ranking

Feedback from several sources indicated a displeasure and concern about the shifts in projects’ ranks and scores for the 2016 process.

As a community, Alameda County made a decision to tie scores to rank - this does not need to be the case and changing this dynamic can be explored again. Additional comment on this issue can be found at various points in this presentation.

Appeals

Feedback requested that the appeals process be published as part of the application process and allow for Tier 1 projects to appeal their scores.

The appeals process will be published with the application. The NOFA Committee determined that any project scoring in Tier 1 would not be appealable, since funding was guaranteed. All projects, regardless of rank, would be allowed to view their individual scores and committee comments upon request.
Local Feedback on the 2016 Process: Transparency and FAQs

- **Transparency:**
  - It was articulated in the survey that some community members had concerns about the level of transparency in the NOFA process.
  - Unfortunately, community members cannot participate in the NOFA process at all levels due to conflicts of interest. EveryOne Home has taken steps to further clarify the roles between the HUD CoC and HUD NOFA committees, and ensuring members of those committees are part of community discussions at every step.

- **FAQs**
  - There was a general sentiment of wanting for a longer FAQ process, preferably one that covered the entire process, with more frequent updates than those once per week.
  - EveryOne Home staff, and the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees will explore the capacity required to facilitate a more robust FAQ period and implement in the 2017 round if this is feasible.
Looking Ahead:
2017 Process and Beyond

- The community will move to a year round monitoring schedule, allowing for review of performance and back up documentation ahead of time.

- The EveryOne Home Project Monitor position will begin in 2017 (once under contract with HUD for the CoC Planning Grant awarded in 2015).

- In its debrief webinar, HUD indicated the Registration Notice will be released soon (late February or early March). HUD is attempting to get back onto a consistent timeline:
  - NOFA released in May
  - Process closes in August
  - Project awards released in December
  - Process will be longer than last year - between 90 - 120 days

- The HUD CoC Committee will be seating the 2017 NOFA Committee. If you are interested, please download an application online at: [http://tinyurl.com/zgwr3my](http://tinyurl.com/zgwr3my) and submit it via email to info@everyonehome.org
EveryOne Home, Alameda County’s Continuum of Care Lead Agency, is inviting local applications for renewing CoC projects and new permanent housing bonus projects and new projects created using reallocated funds from the CoC’s existing Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all projects applications to be rated and ranked by the local Continuum of Care (CoC) in order to be included in the collaborative application. Without a local application, projects cannot be scored or ranked and cannot be included in the final application package.

Local application due date: 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday August 9th via email to info@everyonehome.org

The results of the local rating and ranking process will be announced on August 30, 2016.

Project types that must submit the attached application:

- **Renewing** Transitional Housing (TH) (both youth-serving and general-use),
- **Renewing** Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH),
- **Renewing** Rapid Rehousing (RRH),
- **New** PSH and,
- **New** RRH

In previous rounds, renewing and new projects submitted different applications. In 2016, new and renewing applications are being combined into a single project application with some questions needing to be answered differently by new or renewing applicants. For example, renewing applicants will be asked for “existing housing capacity” and new projects for “proposed housing capacity”. In cases where questions or point calculations differ between existing (renewal) and proposed (new) projects, the questions or instructions for proposed projects will be highlighted as they are here.

The CoC is not renewing Support Services Only grants not tied to permanent housing. It is inviting proposals for a new Support Services Only project for Coordinated Entry (CES). *Please note new and renewing Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) projects and new Support Services Only for Coordinated Entry (SSO for CES) projects must submit different application forms available at the bidders’ conference and on the EveryOne Home website: [www.everyonehome.org](http://www.everyonehome.org).*

**Available Funds:** Alameda County’s currently approved Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = $28,293,885.¹ The CoC can submit renewing and reallocated projects for up to that amount plus an additional $1,414,694 for new permanent housing projects.

---

¹ The ARD is still under negotiation with HUD regarding the Fair Market Rents (FMRs) used to calculate grant amounts. If Alameda County is successful in having the grants awarded at the higher FMR amount, the ARD will go up by over $4 million. Other calculations will increase as well. To be safe the CoC is budgeting using the lower/approved ARD and will adjust upward if need be.
The total funds requested from Alameda County cannot exceed the combined amounts of the ARD and the bonus funds, which currently = $29,708,579. The amount will be finalized by HUD on or after August 5, 2016.

**Eligible Applicants:**

Applicants for renewing grants must be listed as the current grant recipient on the CoC’s 2016 Grant Inventory Worksheet approved by HUD. Eligible projects for renewal must have an existing contract or expect to be under contract by 12/31/16 for funds awarded in a previous application round.

Eligible applicants for new projects to be funded by reallocated or bonus funds are nonprofit organizations, states, local governments, instrumentalities of state and local governments, and public housing agencies without limitation or exclusion (NOFA pg. 20) Applicants do not need to be current grantees in order to apply for reallocated or bonus funds. For profit entities are not eligible to apply.

**Projects that are not planning on renewing their CoC funding:**

Projects who find mainstream funders to cover project costs with resources that are a better fit, or projects that determine they are unlikely to receive the minimum score on their local application may elect not to submit an eligible project for renewal. Projects eligible to be renewed, but electing not to be included in the 2016 HUD application are being asked to indicate so by completing and submitting items a-d of the General Section of the application.

The funds for projects not electing to renew will be added to the pool of available funds for reallocation to new projects. The decision not to renew is permanent. Once eliminated from the package, the same project cannot reapply in subsequent years. Only new projects created by reallocated funds or bonus funds can get added to our package in future application rounds.

**Projects renewing for the first time that are not yet under contract, or which were not in operation for a full twelve months since 10/1/2014:**

Renewing projects without a year of operation and expenditures need only complete and submit items a-e of the General Section. They will receive the score awarded when they applied as a new project and be ranked according to that score.

**Voluntary reductions of grants:**

Projects that have consistently under spent may wish to consider reducing their renewal amounts. Question i. 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.

**Reallocated and bonus funds available for new projects:**

Because no SSO projects not tied to Coordinated Entry or Permanent Housing will be submitted in 2016, Alameda County CoC will have a minimum $1,038,171 available to be reallocated to fund new projects. Additional funds may come available because projects reduce their renewal amount or elect not to submit. The CoC welcomes voluntary reallocation of HUD funds. Projects that can be funded using reallocated dollars include:
a. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) with all beds dedicated to chronically homeless individuals and families
b. New rapid rehousing (RRH) that will serve individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, and include persons fleeing domestic violence
c. New Supportive Services Only project for a centralized or coordinated entry system (CES)
d. New dedicated HMIS project that must be carried out by the HMIS Lead

The Continuum is inviting proposals of up to $1,000,000 for centralized or coordinated entry. Those projects will complete a different application, as will those for a new HMIS project. Those application types will not be covered by these instructions. If no qualified CES proposals are submitted, funds will be reallocated to fund new project types a, b, and d.

The Continuum is also eligible to apply for an estimated $1,414,694 million for permanent housing bonus projects. Bonus funds may only be used for project types a. and b. above.

Because any new permanent housing project can be funded using either bonus or reallocated funds, new permanent housing applications that are either PSH or RRH are strongly encouraged.

**Submission Requirements:**

All project types must submit their application via email to EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org, by 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday August 9, 2016. In addition to the completed local application form, applicants must include copies of the required back up documentation as a PDF. The file name for the attachment document should reflect the applicant and project names.

The items below are separated into categories, but can be submitted as a single PDF. All items below are required to be attached in order for applicants to receive full points on a given section of the application. There is a checklist included with the application which can be utilized to ensure that all relevant items are enclosed.

The required documents and instructions for their uses are described in greater detail in the sections below, and include:

1. **HMIS Reports:** Reports should be run for the federal fiscal year October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015, not the calendar year. If the project has been operational for at least 12 months, but started after October 1, 2014 use the first 12 months of operation for the report date range (eg. Project started December 1, 2014 run a report for December 1, 2014 – November 30, 2014).
   a. The project’s InHouse Demographics Report for October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015.
   e. Applicants proposing new projects can submit up to 3 APRs and data report cards from programs comparable as to what is being proposed. Reports should be from October 1, 2014 – September 30 2015

2. **Project management documents:**
   e. Existing or Proposed program participant agreement; lease, and/or “House Rules”
   f. Existing or Proposed eligibility criteria and/or a housing application
   g. Existing or Proposed policy on basis for eviction or involuntary program termination
   h. Existing or Proposed grievance policy
i. Evidence of site control--this is required for any existing projects for which HUD is paying leasing, operating or rehabilitation cost on a building, both residential and service delivery sites. Without evidence of site control for renewal projects for whom the above is true, the project cannot be included in the package.

3. Grant and Fiscal Management documents

j. Proof of submission of the last three APRs, including due date and date of submission
k. Proof of LOCCS draws, including date of draw request, for the last two complete grant cycles.

l. Applicants proposing new projects can include APRs and LOCCS draws for comparable projects.
m. Most recent annual audit with Management Letter—must be from a fiscal year ending December 31, 2014 or later. Agencies not required to have an annual independent audit, must submit financial statements from the most recently ended fiscal year prepared according to Circular A-133 generally accepted accounting principles.

n. Proof of 501c3 standing if applicable. Failure to provide standing (if applicable) can result in exclusion from the package.

Applicants responding to this RFP should be very familiar with the HUD NOFA issued June 28, 2016, and with the detailed guidance for completing new and renewing applications. Applicants are expected to know the eligible types of assistance, eligible populations, required match and other requirements from HUD. See: https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf for more information.

Projects must also complete a project application in e-snaps by close of business Thursday, August 18th, 2016. Any questions concerning e-snaps or that application process should be submitted to Riley Wilkerson at Riley.Wilkerson@acgov.org, at Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development, who functions as the CoC Collaborative Applicant.

**HUD Tiers, Project Scoring and Ranking:**

As it has since the 2012 NOFA round, HUD requires CoCs to rank their projects in two tiers. Tier 1 projects are assured of funding, provided they meet HUD’s threshold. Tier 2 projects are at risk of not getting funded and must compete against all other Tier 2 projects nationally. HUD has also indicated that it is likely to have enough funds to cover every Continuum’s ARD amount. In the 2016 round, HUD has indicated that Tier 1 is 93% of the package. This is substantially larger than in the 2015 round, and far fewer projects are expected to fall into Tier 2. Based on the currently approved ARD, the CoC’s tiers break out as follows:

| Tier 1 = | $26,313,313 |
| Tier 2 ARD = | $1,980,572 |
| Bonus Amt. = | $1,414,694 |
| Total Tier 2 = | $3,395,266 |
| Total Submission allowed = | $29,708,579 |

HUD will fund Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards to all Tier 1 projects nationally. This year, HUD will again rank all Tier 2 projects against all other Tier 2 projects nationwide. Projects will be scored on a 100-point scale based on the following from page 14 of the NOFA:

a. Up to 50 points in direct proportion to the score received on the CoC Application rounded to the nearest whole point. Based on Last year’s CoC score of 164 our Tier 2 projects would have received 41 points out of 50.

b. Up to 35 points based on where the project is ranked locally and the ratio of the cumulative funds requested by projects ranked above it. See the NOFA for a detailed description of the formula.
c. Up to 5 points for project type which could be submitted from our continuum
   i. 5 points for new and renewing PSH and RRH, HMIS, SSO for Centralized Entry System, and renewing TH for homeless youth
   ii. 3 points for renewing TH not for unaccompanied youth
   iii. 1 point for renewing SSO that is not for Coordinated Assessment

d. Up to 10 points for commitment to applying the Housing First model.

Tier 2s from Continuums with high scores on their CoC Application and with project types worth 5 points or more have the best chance of sustaining or increasing their ARD in this competition.

Locally, project applications will be scored on a 100 point scale in five categories:

1. Project Type = Up to 5 points
2. How Project Helps Address Local and HUD Priorities = Up to 25 points
3. Outcome Performance = 32 points
4. Grant Management = 25 points
5. Organization Capacity = 13 points

The scoring tool at the back of the application details how projects earn points in each category. Unlike past funding rounds, when renewals were automatically ranked above new projects, both new and renewing projects will be ranked together based on their application scores. In cases where questions or point calculations differ between existing (renewal) and proposed (new) projects, the questions or instructions for proposed projects will be highlighted as they are here. The application form and the scoring tool are tightly linked. As you prepare the application the scoring chart at the end of this local application can be detached and used alongside many of the sections in order to self-score.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be assured inclusion in the application package. Projects scoring below that are subject to reallocation. Applicants are strongly encouraged to review the local application, 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, adjust the final ranking in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, include projects that score below 60 points, and/or 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;
- the projected impact of the loss of any residential buildings on homeless people;
- the expiration date and amount of the grant

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 info@everyonehome.org to submit as described on page 1.

For questions regarding the completion of the local application, please contact EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org. All questions received August 1, 2016 will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.

All projects applications received by the deadline will be reviewed and applicants will be notified by August 30, 2016 of their score, their ranking and whether they are being included in the Consolidated Application.
ALAMEDA COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE LOCAL HOUSING PROJECTS APPLICATION  
(Updated 7/21/16)

GENERAL SECTION

a. Project Name: ____________________________

b. Applicant Name: ____________________________

c. □ This project is not submitting a request for HUD CoC funding in 2016.

d. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application or withdraw it from consideration: ____________________________

If item c. was checked above, STOP. You are finished. Make a PDF of this page, and send it to EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org.

e. □ New □ Renewing (If renewing, please complete this section.)

Has this project been in operation since 10/1/2014? □ Yes □ No.

   If yes, then all reports submitted in this application should reflect a time period of 10/1/14 - 9/30/15.

   If no, did this project start operations after 10/1/2014? □ Yes □ No

   If yes, does this project have at least one year of program data? □ Yes □ No

   If yes, all reports attached to this application should be run from the start date to 12 months later.

   Indicate program start date: ____________________________

If no, and the program has less than one program year of data or is not yet under contract, but will be by 12/31/16, STOP. Your application is complete. Make a PDF of this page, and send it to EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org. You will still need to complete all required elements of e-snaps. You will receive the score your application earned when it was first submitted.

Checklist of required documentation for all projects submitting an application:

   HMIS Reports:
   □ Demographics Report (10/1/14 - 9/30/15)
   □ APR from HMIS (10/1/14 – 9/30/15)
   □ Data Completeness Report Card (10/1/14 – 9/30/15)
   □ System Performance Management (10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015)
   □ Applicants proposing new projects can submit up to 3 APRs and data report cards from programs comparable to what is being proposed. (10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015)
### Project Management:
- [ ] Existing or proposed program participant agreement; lease and/or “House Rules”
- [ ] Existing or proposed eligibility criteria and/or a housing application
- [ ] Existing or proposed policy on basis for eviction or involuntarily program termination
- [ ] Existing or proposed grievance policy
- [ ] Evidence of site control / [ ] N/A

### Quality Assurance / Grant Management:
- [ ] Proof of submission of the last three APRs, including due date and date of submission
- [ ] Proof of LOCCS draws, including date of draw request, for the last two complete grant cycles. ([click here for instructions](#))
- [ ] Most recent annual independent audit with Management Letter or financial statement if audit not required —must be from a fiscal year ending December 31, 2014 or later
- [ ] Proof of 501c3 non-profit status / [ ] N/A
- [ ] Applicants proposing new projects can submit proof of timely APRs and LOCCS draws on comparable HUD grants or other similar documentation for other federal grants.

f. For both renewing and newly proposed projects, please provide the **General Description** of your project.

For new projects, identify sub-grantees, their role in the project, and the history of collaboration between proposed partners.

```

```

g. Does this project include one or more buildings (housing or service site) that is owned or long-term leased by the grantee or a sub recipient? If so, please describe the options for the building(s) if this project were not renewed. Applicants must include proof of site control in the form of a lease, title, or other documentation.

```

```

h. Is this project classified as Rental Assistance?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

i. Amount of application: [ ] $___

Does this amount match what is listed in the GIW?  
- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No  
- [ ] N/A this is a new project

If no what is the amount by which the request is being reduced? [ ] $___

j. End date of current HUD grant: ______

k. If renewing for a lower amount, please describe how the project will continue to be able to meet its program outcomes and performance targets:
I. 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. New projects should use the space below to outline how the proposed project will assist homeless persons with those elements above:

1. PRIMARY ACTIVITY TYPE (5 points):

- PSH  
- RRH  
- General TH  
- Transition Aged Youth Serving TH

Renewing and new HMIS projects and SSO tied to CES must complete different application forms, available on the EveryOne Home website.

2. HUD PRIORITIES (25 points):

a. Target Populations and Severity of Need (up to 10 points)

i. 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?

- Existing project that serves 100%, all units in project are dedicated to the chronically homeless
- Proposed PSH project for 100% chronically homeless households from Home Stretch registry
- Not all units are dedicated, but by policy and practice a portion of turnover units are prioritized to chronically homeless: 100% 85%

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 10/1/2014 - 9/30/2015)

- N/A, this is not a PSH project and/or this is not a specific target population for this project.

ii. Rapidly Rehousing Families:

- Existing Rapid Rehousing for Families? Yes No
- Is this project proposing RRH for families and/or individuals? Yes No
iii. **Youth (individuals and families with TAY as head of household):**

☐ 50% or more of heads of household are TAY

If yes, what percentage of clients were TAY? Must be verified by attached Demographics Report from 10/1/2014 -9/30/2015

iv. **Veterans**

☐ 50% or more of heads of household are Veterans

What percentage of clients were Veterans? Must be verified by attached Demographics Report from 10/1/2014 -9/30/2015

v. **Those coming directly from the streets:**

☐ 50% or more of those served entered the program directly from the streets

What percentage of clients entered directly from the streets? Must be verified by attached Demographics Report from 10/1/2014 -9/30/2015

vi. **Domestic Violence or human trafficking:**

☐ 50% or more of heads of household are fleeing Domestic Violence or human trafficking

What percentage of clients were survivors of domestic violence? Must be verified by attached Demographics Report from 10/1/2014 -9/30/2015

b. **Utilizing a Housing First Approach (up to 10 points)**

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.” For both new and proposed projects, please describe how the project employs or will employ a Housing First approach. These principles can be applied to TH projects as well as PH and all projects can earn points for this narrative. To receive full points, applicants will have attached the full list of backup documentation as described on page one and cite, in the narrative below, from those documents which support their claims to being in compliance with the Housing First philosophy. For proposed projects, please include backup documentation as indicated for a comparable project.

*All projects are required to submit the materials indicated under Project Management Materials on page one as backup documentation to score full points on this section*
c. Cost Effectiveness (up to 5 points)

Actual Cost per year of housing retention or cost per permanent housing exit for existing projects.  
*Projects should note that for scoring, they will only be compared to the average of their sector (TH will only be compared to the average for TH, etc.,)*

Number of households who exited to permanent housing in 2015

or

Number of households who retained permanent housing in 2015

Total project budget (HUD dollars + match) = $ / Total # of households from i. or ii. above = cost per outcome

Cost per year of housing retention or cost per permanent housing exit for proposed new projects based on proposed project budget

*Projects should note that for scoring, they will only be compared to the average of their sector (TH will only be compared to the average for TH, etc.,)*

Proposed number of households who will exit to Permanent Housing

or

Proposed number of households who will retain Permanent Housing

Total project budget = $ / Total # of proposed households from i. or ii. above = projected cost per outcome

3. PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (32 Points):

The following section is related to project performance on local and HUD required outcomes. Please read the instructions carefully. Renewal projects should complete Tables 1, 2, or 3, depending on project type. New projects should complete tables 4 or 5 depending on project type. Proposed projects may submit up to three (3) APRs from comparable projects. If your project started on or before 10/1/2014, you must attach a copy of your APR for 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015. If your project has a start date later than 10/1/2014 and has one full year of program data, please run your APR from your start date to 12 months later.

INSTRUCTIONS

Outcome A: Housing (up to 10 points)

**PSH:** Permanent Supportive Housing Projects must produce the Housing Retention information from 10/1/2014 -9/30/2015 (see notes above for projects with a different start date) **APR, Question 27.** Using the formula below and the sample table identifying each cell value, calculate the 12 month retention rate.
### 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>D</td>
<td>K</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>

Housing Retention > 12 months: \((P - H - I - J - K + G) - A - B - C - D \) / \((P - H - I - J - K + G)\) = % of persons retaining permanent housing for 12 months or more.
RRH, general TH, and youth-serving Transitional Housing: Rapid Re-housing, general Transitional Housing, and youth-serving Transitional Housing must produce the Obtaining Permanent Housing information from the APR, Question 29a1 and 29a2, and Question seven (7). If your project started on or before 10/1/2014, you must attach a copy of your APR for 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015. If your project has a start date later than 10/1/2014 and one full year or program data, please run your APR from your start date to 12 months later. Using the formula below and the sample tables identifying each cell value, calculate obtaining permanent housing rate.

29a1. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed More than 90 Days)
Number of Leavers in Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Destinations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Children</th>
<th>With Children and Adults</th>
<th>With Only Children</th>
<th>Unknown HH Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, no Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, with Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, no Ongoing subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with VASH Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with other Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Friends, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29a2. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed 90 Days or Less)
Number of Leavers in Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Destinations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Children</th>
<th>With Children and Adults</th>
<th>With Only Children</th>
<th>Unknown HH Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, no Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, with Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, no Ongoing subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with VASH Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with other Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Friends, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. HMIS or Comparable Database Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of records for All Clients</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Adults Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Leavers</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obtaining Permanent Housing: \((A + B) / C\) = % of persons obtaining permanent housing
Outcome B: Income (up to 7 pts)

PSH, RRH, general TH, and transition aged youth-serving Transitional Housing: For PSH and general Transitional Housing the Income Outcome measure is Adult Stayers and Leavers Who Maintain or Increase Income. For Rapid Re-Housing and transition aged youth-serving TH, the Income Outcome measure is Adult Stayers and Leavers Who Increase Income. Use the APR, Question 24b1 and 24b2. If your project started on or before 10/1/2014, you must attach a copy of your APR for 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015. If your project has a start date later than 10/1/2014 and one full year or program data, please run your APR from your start date to 12 months later. Using the formula below and the sample tables, identify each cell value to calculate the percentage of adults who obtained or maintained earned income.

### 24b1. Income Change by Income Category – Adult Stayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24.b.1 Income Change by Income Category (Universe: Adult Stayers with Income Info at Entry and Follow-up)</th>
<th>Had Income Category at Entry and Not at Follow-up</th>
<th>Retained Income Category but Had Less $ at Follow-up</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Same $ at Follow-up</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Increased $ at Follow-up</th>
<th>Did not Have Income Category at Entry and Gained it at Follow-up</th>
<th>Did not Have the Income Category at Entry or at Exit</th>
<th>Total Adults (Including Those with no Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Any Income</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Overall Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 24b2. Income Change by Income Category – Adult Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24.b.1 Income Change by Income Category (Universe: Adult Stayers with Income Info at Entry and Follow-up)</th>
<th>Had Income Category at Entry and Not at Exit</th>
<th>Retained Income Category but Had Less $ at Exit</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Same $ at Exit</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Increased $ at Exit</th>
<th>Did not Have Income Category at Entry and Gained it at Exit</th>
<th>Did not Have the Income Category at Entry or at Exit</th>
<th>Total Adults (Including Those with no Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Any Income</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Overall Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSH and general TH use the following formula:
Adults Who Maintained or Increased Income: \[(A+B+C+E+F+G)/(D+H) = \% \text{ of adult stayers and leavers who maintained or increased income}\]

**RRH and TAY serving TH** use the following formula:

Adults Who Increased Income: \[(B+C+F+G)/(D+H) = \% \text{ of adult stayers and leavers who increased income}\]

**Outcome C: Benefits (up to 7 points)**

**All project types:** produce the Access to Mainstream Benefits information from the *APR, Questions 26a2 and 26b2*. If your project started on or before 10/1/2014, you must attach a copy of your APR for 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015. If your project has a start date later than 10/1/2014 and one full year or program data, please run your APR from your start date to 12 months later. Calculate use of mainstream benefits as follows.

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

Client Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Non-Cash Benefits by Number of Persons - Leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know / Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Client Non-Cash Benefits by Exit Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Non-Cash Benefits by Number of Persons - Stayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+ Source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know / Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing this Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All project types:** use formula below to calculate this outcome

Adults Who Obtain or Maintain Non-Cash Mainstream Benefits: \[(B + G) / (E + J) = \% \text{ of adults with non-cash mainstream benefits}\]
Outcome D: Varied
- PSH: Exits to Homelessness
- RRH / TAY serving TH: Returns to Homelessness (click here for instructions)
- General-use TH: Length of Stay (click here for instructions)

Please use the charts and formulas below for your project type. Regardless of project type, if your project started on or before 10/1/2014, you must attach a copy of your APR for 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015. If your project has a start date later than 10/1/2014 and one full year or program data, please run your APR from your start date to 12 months later.

Permanent Supportive Housing

7. HMIS or Comparable Database Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of records for All Clients</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Adults Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Leavers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent Supportive Housing projects should use the formula below to calculate the percentage of:

29a1. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed More than 90 Days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary Destinations</th>
<th>Number of Leavers in Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Family, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Friends, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Not Meant for Human Habitation</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or Motel, Paid by Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29a2. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed 90 Days or Less)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary Destinations</th>
<th>Number of Leavers in Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Family, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Friends, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Not Meant for Human Habitation</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or Motel, Paid by Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
persons exiting to homelessness.

Exits to Homelessness: \((A + B + C + D) + (E + F + G + H) / I = \% \text{ of persons who exit to homelessness}\)

**Rapid Rehousing and TAY-serving Transitional Housing** ([click here for instructions]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit was from</th>
<th>Total # of Persons who Exited to Permanent Housing Destination (2 years prior)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness in less than 6 Months (0 - 180 days)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness from 6-12 Months (181 – 365 days)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366-730 days)</th>
<th>Number of Returns in 2 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from SO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from TH</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from PH</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rapid Rehousing use the formula below to calculate the percentage of persons returning to homelessness within two years from a RRH program:

*Returns to Homelessness in two years:* \(D/B\) = \% of persons who return to homelessness within two years

TAY Serving Transitional Housing use the formula below to determine the \% of people returning to homelessness from TH within two years:

*Returns to homelessness in two years from TH:* \(C/A\) = \% of persons returning to homelessness within two years.
### General-Use Transitional Housing (click here for instructions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universe (Persons)</th>
<th>Average LOT homeless (bed nights)</th>
<th>Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous FY</td>
<td>Current FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Persons in ES and SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General use Transitional Housing indicate the number in the yellow-shaded box above to show the average number of bed nights in your project for this fiscal year. Please round up to the nearest whole number.

Renewal projects should complete Tables 1, 2, or 3, depending on project type. New projects should complete tables 4 or 5 depending on project type. Proposed projects may submit up to three (3) APRs from comparable projects.

### 1. Permanent Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use APR for Outcomes A-D</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. People Retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adults stayers and leavers who maintain or increase income</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining non-cash mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. % of person who exited to homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Rapid Re-Housing and Transition Aged Youth-Serving TH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Use APR for Outcomes A-D</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. People Who Obtain Permanent Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adult Stayers and Leavers Who Increase Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining non-cash mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. General Use Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>APR for Outcomes A-D</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. People Who Obtain Permanent Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adults Stayers and Leavers Who Maintained or Increased Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adults obtaining or maintaining non-cash mainstream benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Average Length of Stay in Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average LOS &lt;180 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Proposed Permanent Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>APR #1 date range:</th>
<th>APR #2 date range:</th>
<th>APR #3 date range:</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. People Retaining permanent housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Adults Stayers and Leavers Who Maintained or Increased Income</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Adults obtaining or maintaining non-cash mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. % of person who exited to homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Proposed Rapid Rehouisng / Permanent Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>APR #1 date range:</th>
<th>APR #2 date range:</th>
<th>APR #3 date range:</th>
<th>Self Score: Please see scoring sheet for score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who obtain permanent housing</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Adult stayers and leavers who increase income</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Adults obtaining or maintaining non-cash mainstream benefits</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>&lt;10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. GRANT MANAGEMENT (25 Points)

a. Spending (up to 5 points):

HUD and Congress have both emphasized the importance of spending all allocated grant funds each contract year.

i. 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>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years previous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Please explain any unspent grant funds in the most recent program year. Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points.

iii. If in the most recent program year, and at least one other year in the last three, under-spent funds exceeded 5% or more of the grant, please provide additional detail on unspent funds in earlier years. Explain both patterns and one-time occurrences leading to this result. Describe what steps have been taken to increase expenditures in the current and coming years. Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points. (limit 250 words)

b. Reports and Invoicing (up to 10 pts)

i. Timely Submission of APRs:

Proof of timely submissions can be demonstrated via e-snaps as indicated in the screen shot below.

   End date of Grant

   Due date of APR
Submission dates of APR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Two years Prior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Jan 20, 2012 2:08:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Jan 8, 2013 8:49:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Jan 23, 2014 2:50:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Jan 15, 2015 6:41:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Jan 29, 2016 2:28:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Oct 21, 2009 7:02:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Oct 10, 2014 5:36:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Sep 18, 2015 6:45:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Sep 16, 2014 3:41:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Sep 17, 2008 12:40:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Mar 12, 2012 4:20:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Feb 27, 2013 7:19:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Mar 11, 2014 3:30:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Full Annual Performance Report CoC Full APR - General</td>
<td>Jul 19, 2010 to Jun 1, 2020</td>
<td>Primary Applicant</td>
<td>Mar 4, 2013 1:51:15 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submissions must include all columns presented below. Proposed projects may submit proof of timely submission of APRs for a comparable program and /or other federal grants and progress reports.

ii. Timely Draw Downs from LOCCS
Proof of timely draw downs can be demonstrated via LOCCS, as indicated in the screen shot below. (click here for instructions)

Grant year from ____ to ____

Dates of draw requests from last two grant cycles
Submissions must include all columns as presented below. Proposed projects may submit proof of timely draw downs for a comparable program or other federal grants and progress reports.

c. Proof of Eligibility (up to 5 points):

Describe the project’s eligibility criteria, and policy and procedures for documentation and verification of client eligibility. New projects can describe the proposed eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures.

d. Capacity and Utilization (up to 5 points):

Renewing projects should submit the information below, verifiable by their program APR. Proposed projects should submit the information below, verifiable by APR, for a comparable program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units in project:</th>
<th>or Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 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 | |

Utilization Rate = # of HouseHolds served in the program year / annual capacity =
5. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (13 points)

a. HMIS Data Quality (up to 2 points)

Please run a copy of the Data Completeness Report Card, Report 0252 (EE v.15) for 10/1/2014 - 9/30/2015. If your project started on or before 10/1/2014, you must attach a copy of your APR for 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015. If your project has a start date later than 10/1/2014 and one full year or program data, please run your APR from your start date to 12 months later. Proposed projects please submit a Data Quality report card from a comparable project. For non-HMIS using entities, a Data Quality report card from a comparable database is required. For report prompt ‘Include Services in Report Card’, select ‘no’.

Attach a copy of the Tab B “Overall Report Card” page only, as a PDF.

Before utilizing the formula below, remember to convert your percentages to numerical scores. Please use the screenshot of the chart below to complete the equation:
To find the average score for your project:

\[
\frac{(A + B + C + D + E + F + G + H + I + J + K + L + M + N)}{14} = \% \text{ that will serve as the project grade for the Data Completeness Report Card.}
\]

Insert your average percentage here: \% (from the equation above)

The Data Completeness Report Card can be found here in the InHOUSE HMIS Reporting:
b. Fiscal Management (up to 4 points)

Does this project or the applicant agency have any of the following issues: 1) Any audit or monitoring findings from any HUD source (these could include, but are not limited to: ESG, HOPWA, HOME, CDBG as well as CoC funding) that have not been satisfactorily resolved; 2) A current outstanding obligation to HUD which is in arrears or for which a payment schedule has not been agreed upon; 3) Audit findings from your Annual Independent Audit that have not been resolved?

☐ No  ☐ Yes

If yes, explain status of issues:

Attach a copy of the direct grantee’s most recent Annual Independent Audit / Financial Statement from no earlier than 12/31/2014 Audits from sub-grantees are not required. Applicants who are able to provide a link to an on-line version of your audit may do so for ease of submission by including the link in your cover email. All other applicants please submit your documents in PDF form attached to your submission email. Explain if the audit is not for the most recently finished fiscal year. All applicants must include a copy of their Annual Independent Audit regardless of answer to any of the questions in this section.
c. Quality Assurance Narrative (up to 7 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? New projects may respond to this question with examples from comparable programs and projected quality assurance policies for the proposed project.
### 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 – 5 Points maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Existing Permanent Housing (PH), RRH, Youth-Serving TH) = <strong>5 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Proposed new permanent (PSH and RRH) = <strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ General use (non-youth serving) Transitional Housing = <strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2. How Project helps address Local and HUD Priorities = 25 Points maximum |
| □ Provides PSH to 100% of chronically homeless households as evidenced by contract language or demographics report and a written agreement to utilize the Home Stretch prioritized by-name Registry = <strong>10 Points</strong> |
| □ Proposes to provide PSH to 100% of chronically homeless households as evidenced by a written agreement to utilize the Home Stretch prioritized by-name Registry = <strong>8 Points</strong> |
| □ Provides PSH and fills 100% of turnover with chronically homeless households as evidenced by contract language, demographics report and a written agreement to utilize the Home Stretch prioritized by-name Registry = <strong>8 Points</strong> |
| □ Provides PSH and has committed to fill 85% of turnover to chronically homeless as evidenced by contract language, demographics report and a written agreement to utilize the Home Stretch prioritized by-name Registry = <strong>6 Points</strong> |
| □ Provides Rapid Rehousing to families as evidenced by contract language and APRs = <strong>8 Points</strong> |
| □ Proposes Rapid Rehousing for families or individuals = <strong>6 Points</strong> |
| □ Project currently serves transition aged youth as evidenced by contract language and APR showing 80% plus of head of household in this category = <strong>6 Points</strong> |
| □ Project currently serves transition aged youth as evidenced by contract language and APR showing 50% plus of head of household in this category = <strong>3 Points</strong> |
| □ Project currently serves veterans as evidenced by contract language and APR showing 80% plus of head of household in this category = <strong>6 Points</strong> |
| □ Project currently serves veterans as evidenced by contract language and APR showing 50% plus of head of household in this category = <strong>3 Points</strong> |
| □ APR demonstrates that 75% or more of participants entered project from the streets or other places not meant for human habitation = <strong>8 Points</strong> |
| □ APR demonstrates that 50% or more of participants entered project from the streets or other places not meant for human habitation = <strong>4 Points</strong> |
| □ APR demonstrates that 75% or more of participants are fleeing domestic violence and/or human trafficking = <strong>6 Points</strong> |
| □ APR demonstrates that 50% or more of participants are fleeing domestic violence and/or human trafficking = <strong>3 Points</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.b Housing First and Low Barrier = 10 Points | - Narrative up to **3 points** as determined by application scorers.  
- Eligibility criteria/policies provided for renewing projects, **proposed for new projects** are low barrier = **2 points**  
- Policy and procedures provided for renewing projects, **proposed for new projects** support narrative claims and demonstrate Housing First approach, including voluntary participation in services and prioritization of housing stability/rapid placement in housing = **2 points**  
- Policy and procedures provided for renewing projects, **proposed for new projects** regarding involuntary exits from program support narrative claims and demonstrate Housing First approach = **2 points**  
- Evidence that policies and procedures have been discussed by board or equivalent body = **1 point** |
| 2.c Cost Effectiveness = 5 points | - Average annual per unit/slot is 25% or more below system average = **5 pts**  
- Average annual per unit/slot is 1-25% or more below system average = **3 pts**  
- Average annual per unit/slot is at system average = **2 pts**  
- Average annual per unit/slot is higher than system average = **0 pts** |
| Outcome Performance – 32 Points maximum | See Sector Specific Benchmarks and Self Scoring Charts on the following pages. |
| 4 | Grant Management: Section worth up to 25 points maximum |
| 4.a Spending = 5 Points maximum | - Existing project had no unexpended funds in the last grant year. = **5 Points**  
- Proposed project applicant has a record of fully expending comparable grants = **5 Points**  
- Proposed project applicant has a record of expending 95% of rental assistance grants in comparable projects = **3 Points**  
- Existing project had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount and is voluntarily reducing grant to expended amount = **5 Points**  
- Existing project had unexpended funds in the last grant year and has provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers) = **up to 5 Points**--Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points. |
| 4.b Reports and Invoicing = 8 points maximum | - Project provided evidence of on time submission of APRs and quarterly LOCCS draws for the last three grant cycles or for as long as the project has operated if less than three years old = **8 Points**  
- Proposed projects can provide evidence through three (3) maximum APRs and quarterly LOCCS draws for the last three grant cycles for a comparable program. = **8 Points**  
- Project provided evidence of on-time submission of APRs and quarterly LOCCS draws for the last three grant cycles or for as long as the project has operated if less than three years old, at least 75% of time = **4 Points** |
| 4.c Proof of Eligibility = 5 points maximum | - Narrative for existing and **proposed** project describes adequate procedures for determining and document participant eligibility; narratives for both project types |
4.d Utilization = 5 points maximum (question h in application)

- The project was fully utilized during the program year = 5 pts.
- The existing project was utilized to 90% during the program year. Proposed projects who were fully utilized during the program year in a comparable program = 4 pts.
- The project was utilized to 80% during the program year = 2 pts.
- The project was utilized at less than 80% for the program year = 0 pts.

5. Organizational Capacity = 13 points maximum for entire section

5.a HMIS: Data Completeness Report Card = 2 Points maximum

- Exiting project’s data quality score is greater than or equal to 95%. Proposed projects have a data quality score greater than or equal to 95% for a comparable program = 2 Points
- Greater than or equal to 90% and below 95% = 1 Point
- Below 90% = 0 Points

5.b Fiscal Management = 4 points maximum

- Existing and proposed projects provided the most recent annual independent audit (or financial statement if audit is not required) from no earlier than FYE ending December 31, 2014, that shows no findings or areas of concern in the management letter = up to 4 pts.

5.c Quality Assurance = 7 Points maximum

- Existing or proposed project will be scored a maximum of 7 points for their quality assurance narrative.
### 2016 Scoring for Outcome Measures, by Sector

#### 1. Permanent Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Retains and/or exits to other Permanent Housing &gt; 12 months</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark in an existing project = <strong>10 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = <strong>9 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark in existing project = <strong>8 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark within an existing project = <strong>4 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Is &gt; 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = <strong>0 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = <strong>0 Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B | Adults who maintain or increase income | 50% of leavers and stayers |
| | ☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark in existing project = **7 Points** |
| | ☐ Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **7 Points** |
| | ☐ Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **5 Points** |
| | ☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **3 Points** |
| | ☐ Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark in existing project = **0 Points** |
| | ☐ Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |

| C | Obtains/ maintains non-cash mainstream benefits | 56% leavers and stayers |
| | ☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark in existing project = **7 Points** |
| | ☐ Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **7 Points** |
| | ☐ Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **5 Points** |
| | ☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **3 Points** |
| | ☐ Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark in existing project = **0 Points** |
| | ☐ Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |

| D | Exits to Homelessness | <10% |
| | ☐ Meets or exceeds local benchmark in existing project = **8 Points** |
| | ☐ Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **8 Points** |
| | ☐ Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **6 Points** |
| | ☐ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **3 Points** |
| | ☐ Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark in existing project = **0 Points** |
| | ☐ Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |
## 2. Rapid Re-housing and Youth Serving Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A | Obtains Permanent Housing | 80% | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark in an existing project = **10 Points**  
- Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new RRH project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **9 Points**  
- Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark in existing project = **8 Points**  
- Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark within an existing project = **4 Points**  
- Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = **0 Points**  
- Project proposes RRH outcomes that do not meet local benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |
| B | Adults who Increase Income | 50% of leavers and stayers | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark in existing project = **7 Points**  
- Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new RRH project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **7 Points**  
- Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **5 Points**  
- Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **3 Points**  
- Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark in existing project = **0 Points**  
- Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local RRH benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |
| C | Obtains or Maintains non-cash Mainstream Benefits | 56% of leavers and stayers | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark in existing project = **7 Points**  
- Proposes to meet or exceed local RRH benchmark in a new project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **7 Points**  
- Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **5 Points**  
- Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **3 Points**  
- Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark in existing project = **0 Points**  
- Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local RRH benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |
| D | Returns to Homelessness | <10% | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark in existing project = **8 Points**  
- Proposes to meet or exceed local benchmark in a new RRH project and has demonstrated capacity from similar projects = **8 Points**  
- Is within 5 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **6 Points**  
- Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark in existing project = **3 Points**  
- Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark in existing project = **0 Points**  
- Project proposes outcomes that do not meet local RRH benchmark and/or evidence from prior projects indicates that applicant cannot meet local benchmark = **0 Points** |
### 3. General (non-youth serving) Transitional Housing Renewals Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A       | Obtains Permanent Housing | 80% | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 10 Points  
- Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points  
- Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 4 Points  
- Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points |
| B       | Adults who maintain or increase income | 50% of leavers and stayers | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 7 Points  
- Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 6 Points  
- Is within 15 percentage points of local benchmark = 3 Points  
- Is > 15 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points |
| C       | Obtains or Maintains non-cash Mainstream Benefits | 56% leavers and stayers | - Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 7 Points  
- Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 6 Points  
- Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 3 Points  
- Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points |
| D       | Length of Time Homeless (length of stay in program) | Average LOS <180 days | - Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 8 Points  
- Is within 5% of local benchmark = 6 Points  
- Is within 10% of local benchmark = 3 Point  
- Is > 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points |
Supplemental Instructions
2016 HUD CoC NOFA
Local New and Renewal Application

1. **Instruction for running System Performance Measurement reports for Performance Outcome D for Rapid Rehousing and TAY Serving Transitional Housing and General Use Transitional Housing**

The System Performance Reports, while often displayed as a single document, are actually several separate reports, available in ServicePoint, in the ART Gallery Reports Folder. Please note they will be in the last set of reports. The System Performance Measurements required for the Renewal / New local application are:

- **0700 – Length of Time Persons Homeless – Metric 1 – v3**
- **0701 - Exits to Permanent Housing with Return to Homelessness, Metric 2 – v3**

**Advanced Reporting Tool**

Both reports can be run for the individual project in a given agency. Proposed projects can run these reports for a comparable program. Both 0700 and 0701 are requisite to Outcome Measure D in the Local Application.
A prompt screen is indicted in the screen shot below. This is for report 0700, though the prompt for Report 0701 is similar. **HMIS has confirmed that the prompts are not in the same order between reports, so please be sure to read set of prompts carefully to ensure the entered information is correct.**

![Prompt screen](image)

For each prompt, the conventions are as follows:

- **Select Provider:** Renewal applicants should select the project for which they are submitting an application. If you are submitting multiple projects to the competition, please run this report separately for each of them. Proposed projects can run this report for a comparable project.
- **Select CoC Codes:** Do not use
- **EDA Provider Default Provider:** Do not use
- **Enter Start Date:** This should be 10/1/2014. Report 0701 does not have a start date for the current year. For projects with one year of data, but a start date later than 10/1/14, please see the conventions for report range in the application instructions.
- **Enter end Date PLUS 1 Day:** This should be 9/30/2015. For projects with one year of data but a start date later than 10/1/14, please see conventions for report range in the application instructions.
• **Enter Prior Year Start Date:** This should be 10/1/2013 or for those projects with one year of data, but a start date later than 10/1/2014, should reflect 12 months prior to the start date indicated.

• **Enter Two Year Prior Start Date:** This should be 10/1/2012. Only report 0701 requires a two year prior start date. Again, please be sure to read through each report’s prompts and date ranges fully before answering so that you are sure to enter the correct information. For those projects with one year of data, but a start date later than 10/1/2014, should reflect 24 months prior to the start date indicated.

• **Enter Effective Date:** The effective date should reflect the report run date regardless of the report run period.

2. **Instruction for Accessing Information from e-LOCCS**

The information below is meant to serve as a guide for how to acquire proof of draw downs from the LOCCS system. If you are a sub-grantee, please confer with your lead agency about getting this information for collaborations in which you may be working.

1. Log into the e-LOCCS system
2. Click on the Program area pertaining to your grant
3. Click on Project Portfolio
4. Click on the Grant Number
5. Select the vouchers tab at the top of the page (if applicable to your project type)
6. You should see a screen very similar to the screenshot below, with your program (or your sub-grantee’s information) in place of redacted areas.

Both reports can be exported as PDF documents and added to the list of mandatory attachments. If you have further questions about this process, please email info@everyonehome.org before August 1st, and staff will respond as part of the FAQ period.
EveryOne Home, Alameda County’s Continuum of Care Lead Agency, is inviting applications for specific services related to the implementation of a Coordinated Entry System (CES) using reallocated funds from the CoC's existing Annual Renewal Demand (ARD).

Coordinated Entry is a standardized method to connect people experiencing homelessness to the resources available in a community. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the State of California are requiring that every community that receives State or Federal funds for programs serving homeless people operate a coordinated entry system that assesses and prioritizes people experiencing homelessness for all assistance within the Continuum of Care, including Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), and other interventions. As an initial step towards CES implementation in Alameda County, the EveryOne Home Board recently adopted a Coordinated Entry & Housing Resource Centers Initial Design Plan, described in more detail below. This plan can be found at http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/AC-CES-Initial-Design-final.pdf.

The 2016 NOFA allows CoCs to create a new Supportive Services Only project specifically for a centralized or coordinated assessment system. EveryOne Home’s HUD CoC committee has chosen to invite local proposals for this purpose. If a competitive application is identified, the CoC will use reallocated funds in order to include a CES application to HUD with the 2016 NOFA submission. EveryOne Home is seeking an entity or entities to deliver the services outlined in the scope of work described in detail below.

**Eligible Project Types:**

This application should be used for coordinated entry implementation projects only. Applicants submitting a renewal application or who are interested in proposing a new permanent housing program should use the separate application designed for that purpose.

**Available Funds:**

Up to $1,000,000 is available for this project through reallocation.

Applicants may submit projects for the entire scope of work included in this announcement for up to the full budget amount or may submit a proposal for a subpart of the total scope. Note that proposals submitted for a subpart of the scope should take into consideration that these funds are intended to fund the entire scope, whether through a single agency or through a combination of agencies, when preparing a budget.

**Eligible Applicants:**

Eligible applicants are nonprofit organizations, states, local governments, instrumentalities of state and local governments, and public housing agencies without limitation or exclusion (NOFA pg 20). Applicants do not need to be current CoC grantees in order to apply for reallocated funds.
Applicants may submit projects for the entire scope of work included in this announcement or may submit a proposal for a subpart of the total scope. Proposals that are approved for a subpart of the scope may be required to subcontract with an identified lead agency.

**Scoring:**

A detailed scoring tool is provided on page 12. Note however that one of the primary goals of CES is to ensure that service access is available across the entire county. In order to accomplish this goal, lower scoring proposals may be funded in order ensure geographic coverage.

**Right to Request Changes:**

EveryOne Home, the Continuum of Care Lead, reserves the right to request changes to proposals submitted in order to be responsive to HUD priorities as well as to ensure that CES is implemented in concert with the structure, guiding principles and design elements adopted by the EveryOne Home Leadership Board. These may include, but are not limited to: changes to the service delivery mechanisms, requiring multiple applicants to submit a collaborative application with a designated lead entity, changes to budget amounts, changes to staffing configurations, and changes to geographic reach.

As this a new and evolving system, applicants should be aware that EveryOne Home may require additional changes to how the program is implemented during the course of and/or following the first year of implementation.

**Submission Requirements:**

*Applications for coordinated assessment funds are due to EveryOne Home by 12pm (noon) on August 9th, 2016 via email at info@everyonehome.org.*

*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 August 30, 2016 whether they have been selected to submit a final application to HUD.*

Applicants must complete and submit the application included with this RFP. **It is not necessary to prepare an application in e-snaps at this time.** If your application is approved for inclusion in the CoC collaborative application you will be asked to complete the e-snaps application or to provide information to a designated lead applicant for inclusion in an e-snaps application. If your project is selected, the **New Project Application must be completed in e-snaps by September 7, 2016.** For any questions concerning e-snaps or that application process, please contact Riley Wilkerson at Riley.Wilkerson@acgov.org

Applicants responding to this RFP should be very familiar with the HUD NOFA issued June 28th 2016, and with the detailed guidance for completing new applications. Applicants are expected to know the eligible types of assistance, eligible populations, required match and other requirements from HUD. See [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=2016cocompnofa.pdf](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=2016cocompnofa.pdf) for more information.

Applicants may apply for one, two, three, or all of the components described in the scope of work below. A single application should be utilized regardless of the number of components included in the submission and/or number of collaborative partners and all components the applicant intends to cover should be detailed in the narrative sections of the application below.
You can download a Word version of this application from the EveryOne Home website at www.everyonehome.org. You will also be able to download the Fiscal Year 2016 Continuum of Care Program Competition, the e-snaps Instructional Guide for New Project Application, and the Local Addendum, as well as the Power Points from the community meetings and Bidder’s Conferences. All applicants are strongly encouraged to review the funding notice.

Applications should be submitted via email to info@everyonehome.org. Applications must include the completed form included with this RFP along with any attachments indicated on the application. Attachments should be submitted in the form of a PDF and the file name should include the agency and project name.

For questions regarding the completion of this application, please contact EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org. All questions received before August 1st, 2016 will be responded to in writing and posted to the EveryOne Home website.

SCOPE OF WORK

The EveryOne Home board recently adopted a Coordinated Entry & Housing Resource Centers Initial Design Plan. The plan describes a system that includes multiple entry points, referred to as Housing Resource Centers (HRC’s), to work with individuals and families experiencing homelessness in their region within the County. Each HRC will have assessors, access to shelter, rapid rehousing and other resources, and be able to provide connections to housing and community based services. Each individual HRC will be part of a network of agencies providing a set of common core services within defined geographic regions. Access to HRC services will be through a common initial referral point, such as a phone line and/or can be based on self-referral (walk-in). HRC’s will also serve as the "base" for mobile outreach teams that go out into the community to locate and engage with homeless people who are unlikely to independently access services. Each HRC will operate using shared eligibility criteria, protocols and outcome measures. In addition to the core services to address housing crises, HRCs will help clients access a range of "mainstream" services.

The development of the HRC network and CES protocols are still in process. By submitting an application, respondents are committing to implement the elements of CES for which they receive funding in a manner that is consistent with the CES Initial Design Plan and any future protocols developed and adopted by EveryOne Home to operationalize this plan.

It is anticipated that funding made available by HUD for this project will be matched to various other sources in order to provide the full complement of services described above. This may include both existing funding allocated to CES functions by local jurisdictions, as well as potential new sources such as Whole Person Care, Health Home funding, County Boomerang funds and other private and public resources.

Applicants are sought through this RFP to provide four components of CES. Applicants may submit applications as a single entity or through a collaboration of partners. Applications that include more than one entity must designate a lead applicant who will be responsible for subcontracting to other partners for specific activities. The functions included in the RFP are:

1. CES HUD lead agency
2. Central call center
3. Assessment and referral services
4. Expanded HRC services (if available funding allows)
Applicants may not submit proposals for expanded HRC services unless these activities are part of an application that includes at least one of the other functions above. Funding of expanded services will only be made if funding remains after the selection of contractors and subcontractors for items one through three.

1. **CES HUD lead agency**

The lead agency will be accountable to both the CoC and HUD and will administer multiple subcontracts that may include, but are not limited to, subcontracts for call center services, assessment services, employment/income support, and street outreach. Lead agency applicants may submit an application in coordination with subcontractors identified in their application or may be paired by EveryOne Home with other applicants with whom they will be asked to subcontract.

Applicants that wish to function as the lead agency for this submission must have the ability to serve the entire county and have experience administering HUD CoC grants or comparable system level federal grants. The successful applicant will be responsible for ensuring that CES components are implemented according to the approved CES Design Plan, and that the various CES components are effectively integrated with one another. The Lead Agency must also ensure that HUD funded CES components are effectively integrated with CES components funded by other non-HUD sources. Finally the Lead Agency will be accountable for partnering with EveryOne Home to ensure consistent CES implementation across the region and providing quality control for the entire CES system.

Individual agencies may apply to function both as a lead agency and as a service delivery agent for one or more other components or agencies may apply to function solely as the lead agency with all other services to be delivered by subcontractor agencies.

2. **Call Center**

The call center must be available countywide and be staffed with trained operators able to screen, triage, and problem solve based on the resources available. Core elements include:

**Triage/Initial Screening**: Conduct a brief initial screening with potential clients. Ask if the caller is in a safe place, screen for potential domestic violence. Provide direct referral to Domestic Violence provider or emergency services if needed. Request a verbal Release of Information. Determine whether the caller has a safe place to stay that night. Determine the appropriate regional HRC for people who need referral.

**Problem Solving**: For those who are at risk of becoming homeless and moving to streets or shelter, the center will work on problem solving to avoid having anyone lose a safe place. Well-trained staff will conduct a screening for immediate safety and homelessness and provide an initial problem solving conversation with all homeless and at-risk people seeking services to work with them to find a way to keep them in a safe place if they have one. In addition to training, staff will be resourced with sample scripts, procedures about the boundaries of diversion (e.g. what if 2nd or 3rd time calling?), and information about many other community resources.

**Warm hand off**: Where a call is appropriate to transfer to an HRC for additional support and assessment, there is interest in exploring a “warm hand off” where the call can be live transferred to the HRC in the appropriate region. Proposals should indicate the feasibility of this function.
3. **Assessment and Referral**

Once households have accessed the coordinated entry point, the system will need to be able to assess their type and level of need in order to refer them to appropriate resources. This will take place through a standard and comprehensive assessment for services in place across the entire county.

Every HRC will screen, assess, and refer clients with standardized protocols using standardized tools and processes. This will include a prioritization system that will govern how available resources are targeted based on the information gathered during the assessment process. The development of this protocol has not yet been finalized; however guiding principles that will inform the development were included in the CES Initial Design Plan (page 10). Applicants should review this section of the plan thoroughly before submitted a proposal.

A contractor or contractors are sought to implement the assessment protocol at HRCs countywide once the protocol has been developed and approved by the Continuum of Care.

The selected contractor will be required to operate within HMIS and not develop separate databases. This will include an obligation to enter into HMIS all households that are assessed regardless of whether the household does or does not subsequently enter a shelter or housing program.

4. **Expanded HRC Services**

Expanded HRC services will be funded only if additional funding is available once components one through three have been funded. Applicants may not submit proposals for expanded HRC services unless these activities are part of an application that includes at least one of the other functions above.

Services that may be included as part of expanded HRC services are; outreach, housing navigation, and/or employment/income services.

- **Outreach** includes contacting people living on the streets to connect them with Coordinated Entry and provide mobile access to services. This may also include mobile outreach teams that go out into the community to locate and engage with homeless people who are unlikely to independently access services.

- **Housing Navigation** includes developing housing location and stabilization plans with literally homeless clients. Services also include working with clients to access and complete housing applications and interviews and working to find housing alternatives for clients who are not able to access dedicated programs. When a consumer is in navigation services, the Navigator will coordinate regularly with other providers working with the consumer, and through HMIS notes.

- **Employment/income services** include assisting clients with the development of employment plans, resume development, employment readiness, and assistance with job search activities, job application assistance, linkage to employment opportunities, and assistance to access public benefit programs.


2016 CoC HUD NOFA CES Application

SECTION 1 – PROPOSAL INFORMATION

a. Project Name: 

b. Applicant Name: 

c. Please list name and title and contact information of person authorized to submit this application: 

Name and Title

Email and phone

d. Element(s) of scope included in proposal:

- CES HUD lead agency
- Call center
- Assessment services
- Expanded services: Please indicate which proposed expanded services the agency wishes to include:


e. If providing assessment services and/or expanded services, indicate region(s) in which services will be provided (see CES plan, Appendix ii, page 20 for a description of regions)

- North County
- Mid County
- South County
- East County

f. Total Request amount: 

$ 

g. List any subcontractors included in the proposal and anticipated subcontract amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcontractor</th>
<th>Subcontract amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2 - DEMONSTRATED CAPACITY

a. Describe the respective roles of the lead applicant and each subcontractor listed above. 


b. Has this set of partners or agencies worked together previously on a similar project? Please explain.


c. Describe the experience of the Project Applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing activities similar to those proposed in the application, given funding and time limitations. (Describe why the applicant, subrecipients, and partner organizations are the appropriate entities to receive funding. Provide concrete examples that illustrate their experience and expertise in the following: 1) working with and addressing the target population’s identified housing and supportive service needs; 2) developing and implementing relevant program systems and services; 3) identifying and securing matching funds from a variety of sources; and 4) managing basic organization operations including financial accounting systems.)

d. If proposal includes HUD lead agency functions, describe the lead agency’s experience with leading and managing complex collaborations.

e. Describe the experience of the Project Applicant and potential subrecipients (if any) in leveraging other Federal, State, local, and private sector funds.

f. Describe the basic organization and management structure of the Project Applicant and subrecipients (if any). (Include evidence of internal and external coordination and an adequate financial accounting system. Include the organization and management structure of the applicant and all subrecipients; be sure to include a description of internal and external coordination and the financial accounting system that will be used to administer the grant.)

g. Provide evidence of prior performance on relevant grants. Relevant information may be described below, and if applicable, applicants should submit prior year APRs, from either their own or sub-recipients’ projects of a similar type to demonstrate past relevant performance. APRs should be run for the time period of 10/1/2014-9/30/2015.

h. 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 are the quality of service, customer satisfaction, and program performance assessed and maintained? Please address how data is used in planning and programming and program management as well as how often it is updated, data quality reports run and errors corrected. How is staff trained and managed to assure high quality of care?
i. Do the lead agency or any proposed subcontractors have any unresolved monitoring findings for any HUD grants (including ESG)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, describe below.

SECTION 3 - PROJECT DETAIL

a. Provide a clear and concise description of the scope of the project. Include a description of the role that this grant will play in supporting the overall CES process’s implementation.

b. Provide a description of the estimated schedule for the proposed activities, the management plan, and the method for assuring effective and timely completion of all work. Demonstrate how full capacity will be achieved over the term requested in this application.

c. Describe how your project will collaborate with any existing CES components currently in place in the proposed service region(s) and will be integrated with existing relevant infrastructure.

d. Describe your agency’s participation, if any, in the ongoing CES design process.

e. Describe how your project will be consistent with the Alameda County CES Initial Design Plan. This plan can be found at [http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/AC-CES-Initial-Design-final.pdf](http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/AC-CES-Initial-Design-final.pdf).

SECTION 4 – BUDGET

Please provide a separate detailed project budget below for each of the components included in this proposal. Irrelevant budget tables may be deleted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION (UP TO 10%)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION (UP TO 10%)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION (UP TO 10%)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPANDED SERVICES BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION (UP TO 10%)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUEST</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 5 - MATCH

HUD requires that CES grants be matched by no less than 25% of the total grant amount, through cash or in-kind match. Describe below the sources that are available as match for this project. Note that applicants are not required to provide match in order to be considered, however ability to provide match is a factor in the scoring process.

SECTION 5 – LETTERS OF REFERENCE

If the submission includes CES HUD Lead Agency functions, please attached a minimum of two letters of reference that speak to your agency’s ability to lead complex collaborations.

If the submission includes assessment services and the service delivery organization is not a jurisdictional entity, please attach a letter of support from at least one local jurisdiction from each proposed service area.
SCORING FOR CES PROJECTS  
Total points available = 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion &amp; Source</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description of basis for assigning points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrated Project Capacity (Section 2; Letters of Reference)</td>
<td>30 points</td>
<td>Applicant and any sub recipients have recent relevant experience performing similar activities; If application has sub recipients, applicant organizations have experience working together; No applicant or sub recipient has outstanding monitoring or audit issues or issues are explained. Applicant has strong quality assurance plan in place. Assessment services have the support of local jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project Detail (Section 3, questions a-b)</td>
<td>25 points</td>
<td>Project description describes the type and purpose of project; project is well-designed to meet the identified need; services proposed are appropriate to CES goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Integration (Section 3, questions c-d; Jurisdictional support letters)</td>
<td>20 points</td>
<td>Project describes how collaboration and integration will occur. Project has plan for ensuring consistency with CES plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>Budget is reasonable for type of project and clearly articulated; Project is cost effective in a way that is clearly articulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Match</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>Projects that provide match of at least 25% will receive full points, however project match is not a requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Completeness and Clarity</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EveryOne Home, Alameda County’s Continuum of Care Lead Agency, is inviting local applications for renewing CoC projects and new permanent housing bonus projects and new projects created using reallocated funds from the CoC’s existing Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all projects applications to be rated and ranked by the local Continuum of Care (CoC) in order to be included in the collaborative application. Without a local application, projects cannot be scored or ranked and cannot be included in the final application package.

In previous rounds, renewing and new projects submitted different applications. In 2016, new and renewing applications are being combined into a single project application with some questions needing to be answered differently by new or renewing applicants. This application should be used for both Renewing and new HMIS applications. Applications for other project types are available on the EveryOne Home website: http://everyonehome.org/our-work/hud-coc-nofa/.

Local application due date: 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday August 9th via email to info@everyonehome.org

The results of the local rating and ranking process will be announced on August 30, 2016.

HMIS Applications must also be submitted in e-snaps by 5:00 p.m. on August 18, 2016. Any questions concerning e-snaps or that application process should be submitted to Riley Wilkerson at Riley.Wilkerson@acgov.org.

Available Funds:

Alameda County’s currently approved Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = $28,293,885.¹ The CoC can submit renewing and reallocated projects for up to that amount plus an additional $1,414,694 for new permanent housing projects.

The total funds requested from Alameda County cannot exceed the combined amounts of the ARD and the bonus funds, which currently = $29,708,579. The amount will be finalized by HUD on or after August 5, 2016.

Reallocated and bonus funds available for new projects:

Because no SSO projects not tied to Coordinated Entry or Permanent Housing will be submitted in 2016, Alameda County CoC will have a minimum $1,038,171 available to be reallocated to fund new

¹ The ARD is still under negotiation with HUD regarding the Fair Market Rents (FMRs) used to calculate grant amounts. If Alameda County is successful in having the grants awarded at the higher FMR amount, the ARD will go up by over $4 million. Other calculations will increase as well. To be safe the CoC is budgeting using the lower/approved ARD and will adjust upward if need be.
projects. Additional funds may come available because projects reduce their renewal amount or elect not to submit. The CoC welcomes voluntary reallocation of HUD funds. Projects that can be funded using reallocated dollars include:

a. New permanent supportive housing (PSH) with all beds dedicated to chronically homeless individuals and families
b. New rapid rehousing (RRH) that will serve individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, and include persons fleeing domestic violence
c. New Supportive Services Only project for a centralized or coordinated entry system (CES)
d. New dedicated HMIS project that must be carried out by the HMIS Lead

The Continuum is inviting proposals of up to $1,000,000 for centralized or coordinated entry. Those projects will complete a different application. Other application types will not be covered by these instructions. If no qualified CES proposals are submitted, funds will be reallocated to fund new project types a, b, and d.

Eligible Applicants:

Only the HMIS Lead Agency may apply to the HUD CoC program for operating a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development is the HMIS Lead agency for the Continuum of Care and the only eligible applicant for this project type. Applicants for renewing grants must be listed as the current grant recipient on the CoC’s 2016 Grant Inventory Worksheet approved by HUD. Eligible projects for renewal must have an existing contract or expect to be under contract by 12/31/16 for funds awarded in a previous application round.

Submission Requirements:

All project types must submit their application via email to EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org, by 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday August 9, 2016. In addition to the completed local application form, applicants must include copies of the required back up documentation as a PDF. The file name for the attachment document should reflect the applicant and project names.

The required documents and instructions for their uses are described in greater detail in the sections below.

HMIS Reports—

1. HMIS report verifying bed coverage (2016 HIC)
2. HMIS report verifying ability to generate, system-wide APRs, AHAR, and the CAPER (most recent submissions)
4. HMIS generated report on data completeness as described on page 5 of this application (Federal fiscal year ending 9/30/15)
5. HMIS reports verifying ability to produce HDX tables for systemwide performance report (Federal fiscal year ending 9/30/15)
Grant and Fiscal Management documents
6. Proof of submission of the last three APRs, including due date and date of submission
7. Proof of LOCCS draws, including date of draw request, for the last two complete grant cycles.
8. Applicants proposing new projects can include APRs and LOCCS draws for comparable projects.
9. Most recent annual audit with Management Letter—must be from a fiscal year ending December 31, 2014 or later. A link to an on-line audit is acceptable.

Please ensure the PDF is titled with the name of the project.

Applicants responding to this RFP should be very familiar with the HUD NOFA issued June 28, 2016, and with the detailed guidance for completing new and renewing applications. Applicants are expected to know the eligible types of assistance, eligible populations, required match and other requirements from HUD. See: [https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf](https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf) for more information

**Ranking and Tiering**

HUD has indicated that it will still require CoCs to rank their projects in two tiers, with Tier 1 projects assured of funding and Tier 2 projects at greater risk of not getting funded. HUD has also indicated that it is likely to have enough funds to cover every Continuum’s Annual Renewal Demand amount, indicating that being ranked in Tier 2 is less risky than in prior rounds. Tier 1 is 93% of our local package—a substantially larger Tier 1 than in last year’s round.

HUD will fund Tier 2 projects after it has made funding awards to **all** Tier 1 projects nationally. This year, HUD will again rank all Tier 2 projects against all other Tier 2 projects nationwide. Projects will be scored on a 100-point scale based on the following from page 14 of the NOFA:

a. Up to 50 points in direct proportion to the score received on the CoC Application rounded to the nearest whole point. Based on Last year’s CoC score of 164 our Tier 2 projects would have received 41 points out of 50.

b. Up to 35 points based on where the project is ranked locally and the ratio of the cumulative funds requested by projects ranked above it. See the NOFA for a detailed description of the formula.

c. Up to 5 points for project type which could be submitted from our continuum
   i. 5 points for new and renewing PSH and RRH, HMIS, SSO for Centralized Entry System, and renewing TH for homeless youth
   ii. 3 points for renewing TH not for unaccompanied youth
   iii. 1 point for renewing SSO that is not for Coordinated Assessment

d. Up to 10 points for commitment to applying the Housing First model.

Tier 2s from Continuums with high scores on their CoC Application and with project types worth 5 points or more have the best chance of sustaining or increasing their ARD in this competition.

Locally, project HMIS projects will be score on a 100 point scale in five categories:

1. Project Type = Up to 5 points
2. Bed Coverage = Up to 15 points
3. Generating Required Reports = Up to 15 points
4. Point-In-Time Count = 15 Points
5. Ability to Generate System Performance Report = 10 points
6. Fully Expending Grant = Up to 5 points
7. Timely Submission of Grant Reports = 10 points
8. Data Quality assurance = Up to 15 points
9. Quality Assurance = Up to 10 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 alongside many of the sections in order to self-score.

Projects must score a minimum of 60 points to be assured inclusion in the application package. Renewing projects scoring below that are subject to reallocation, new projects scoring below 60 points will not be included. 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, adjust the final ranking in order to place the maximum dollars in Tier 1, include projects that score below 60 points, and/or 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;
- the projected impact of the loss of any residential buildings on homeless people;
- the expiration date and amount of the grant

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 info@everyonehome.org to submit as described on page 1.
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 2016. 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 info@everyonehome.org

d. Please list name and title of person authorized to submit this application or withdraw it from consideration: 

e. **Primary Activity Type (5 points):** [ ] Existing HMIS  [ ] New HMIS

f. **Capacity**
   Number of records in data system: 

   Annual Growth in records: # of records added in program year October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015 
   # of active user licenses  # of member agencies 

g. **Service Area:**
   Primary location of Project (city): 
   Areas of the County served by Project (list specific cities or regions):

h. **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? $

i. **End date of current HUD grant:** 

j. **Please insert the General Description of your project**
k. 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:

Attach a copy of the direct grantee’s most recent Annual Independent Audit. Audits from sub-grantees are not required. Applicants who are able to provide a link to an online version of your audit may do so for ease of submission. Include the link in your cover email. All other applicants please submit your documents in PDF form attached to your submission email. Explain if the audit is not for the most recently finished fiscal year. All applicants must include a copy of their Annual Independent Audit regardless of answer to any of the questions in this section.

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (Section worth up to 55 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 Report ☐ 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 2015? ☐ No  ☐ Yes

Was it submitted in HDX by 4/30/2015? ☐ No  ☐ Yes
Did it include all sub-population data?  □ No  □ Yes

**Performance Factor D: Generation of new System Performance Measure Report**

Did HMIS generate the System Performance Report?  □ No  □ Yes (if yes, attach it)

Was it submitted in HDX by 8/1/2016?  □ No  □ Yes

Did it include all requested data?  □ No  □ Yes

**SPENDING (Section worth up to 5 points)**

HUD and Congress have both emphasized the importance of spending all allocated grant funds each contract year.

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>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years previous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Please explain any unspent grant funds in the most recent year. Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points.


c. If in the most recent year, and at least one other year in the last three, under-spent funds exceeded 5% or more of the grant, please provide additional detail on unspent funds in earlier years. Explain both patterns and one-time occurrences leading to this result. Describe what steps have been taken to increase expenditures in the current and coming years. Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points.


TIMELY SUBMISSION OF APRS AND LOCCS FUND DRAWS (Up to 10 points)

i. Timely Submission of APRs:
Proof of timely submissions can be demonstrated via e-snaps as indicated in the screen shot below.

End date of Grant

Due date of APR

Submission dates of APR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>Two years Prior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submissions must include all columns presented below. Proposed projects may submit proof of timely submission of APRs for a comparable program and/or other federal grants and progress reports.
ii. Timely Draw Downs from LOCCS
Proof of timely draw downs can be demonstrated via LOCCS, as indicated in the screen shot below (click here for instructions)

Grant year from [ ] to [ ]

Dates of draw requests from last two grant cycles

Submissions must include all columns as presented below. Proposed projects may submit proof of timely draw downs for a comparable program or other federal grants and progress reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voucher Query</th>
<th>Grant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant: CA9116L9T021407 (SNAP) Special Needs Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Budget</td>
<td>Vouchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voucher No</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Schedule No</th>
<th>Est Deposit Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501-239718</td>
<td>07-07-2016 by</td>
<td>187,675.48</td>
<td>L47932</td>
<td>05-26-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-239835</td>
<td>05-24-2016 by</td>
<td>771,336.00</td>
<td>L47932</td>
<td>05-26-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-329881</td>
<td>05-24-2016 by</td>
<td>186,605.00</td>
<td>L47932</td>
<td>05-26-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-206542</td>
<td>02-11-2016 by</td>
<td>1,055,543.00</td>
<td>L47932</td>
<td>02-16-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-386266</td>
<td>11-20-2015 by</td>
<td>170,012.00</td>
<td>L47932</td>
<td>11-20-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HMIS DATA QUALITY (Section worth up to 20 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.
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>201 Proposed ax value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Type = 5 Points Maximum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Renewing HMIS = 5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ New HMIS = 4 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Factor A:</strong> Bed Coverage = 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 15 for bed coverage of 86% or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 10 points for 64% or higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5 points under 64% with plan to increase coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 0 points for coverage under 64% and no plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Factor B:</strong> Generating required reports = 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 15 points if HMIS can generate APR, AHAR, CAPER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 10 points if HMIS can generate 2 of 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5 points if HMIS can generate 1 of 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 0 points if HMIS cannot generate these reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Factor C:</strong> Point in Time Count and sub populations = 15 Points Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 15 points if shelter PIT was conducted in Jan ’15, submitted in HDX by 4/30/2015, and included sub population data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 10 points if 2 of 3 occurred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5 points if 1 of 3 occurred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 0 points if these tasks were not complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Factor D:</strong> 10 points Can generate New System Performance Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 10 points if HMIS generates this report and submits information in HDX by 8/1/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expending the grant = 5 Points Maximum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Had no unexpended funds in the last grant year = 5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Had unexpended funds in the last grant year greater than 5% of grant amount and is voluntarily reducing grant = 4 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Had unexpended funds in the last grant year and has provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers) = up to 4 Points--Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Reports = up to 10 points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Project provided evidence of on time submission of APRs and quarterly LOCCS draws for the last three grant cycles or for as long as the project has operated if less than three years old = 10 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Project provided evidence of on-time submission of APRs and quarterly LOCCS draws for the last three grant cycles or for as long as the project has operated if less than three years old, at least 75% of time = 5 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Quality = 15 Points Maximum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 15 points if system has below 10% of null or missing data, and below 10% of refused or unknown responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 9 points if 1 of 2 criteria is met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 0 points if neither are met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality assurance = 10 Points Maximum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Possible Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 HUD CoC NOFA Competition
Bidders’ Conference

224 West Winton Avenue, Hayward
Public Hearing Room
July 19th, 2016
Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Strategic Direction from Hud CoC to the NOFA Committee
4. Overview of Local Renewal and New Application
5. Overview of Local CES Application
6. Q & A Session
The 2016 NOFA Committee’s Guiding Principles

• Maximize resources available to the community
• Package submitted will align with HUD priorities in order to meet local needs
• Prioritize ensuring existing residential capacity and housing stability is maintained system-wide
• Keep the renewal process as simple as possible
• Continue to emphasize project performance and the submission of projects that will meet HUD’s thresholds
• Support individual projects seeking to reallocate or reclassify where relevant
• Facilitate a clear, fair and transparent local process
Our Local Process and Key Dates

- **June 2016**: The NOFA Committee identified possible changes to the process and local application.
- **June 21st Community Input Session #1**: HUD CoC and NOFA Committees invited community input on strategies.
- **June 28th FY 2016 CoC Program Competition Opens**: Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) is released
- **July 7-11th Community Input Session #2 and On-line survey**: Committees introduced proposed strategies for additional feedback.
Our Local Process and Key Dates

• July 19th Bidders Conference: Committee finalized local process and application and releases it to applicants.

• July 19th – August 1st: Staff and NOFA Committee will address applicant questions. Answers to all questions will be published on the EveryOne Home website.

• August 9th: 12:00pm Renewal Applications due.

• August 30th: Renewal rankings and Scores released.

• September 14th: Consolidated Application due to HUD
Strategic Direction for 2016 NOFA

The HUD CoC Committee considered several factors and sources in the development of the strategic direction given to the HUD NOFA sub-committee, including:

• Reviewing the NOFA issued 6/28/16: https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf
• Reviewing our 2015 score and HUD’s feedback
• Soliciting community input at two open meetings
  • 6/21/16 and 7/7/16
  • attended by 45 stakeholders in total
• Conducting an anonymous online survey,
  • completed by 36 respondents.

A summary of input is available on the EveryOne Home website: http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Strategic-Direction-reprot-out-7-16-16-edC-edits.pdf
Strategic Direction

Strategic Reallocation
HUD CoC direct the HUD NOFA Committee to pursue reallocation that strengthens our system and application package and is aligned with our guiding principles.

Inviting a CES Application
HUD CoC Committee directs the NOFA Sub-Committee to invite proposals for operating a Coordinated Entry System.
Strategic Direction

Transitional Housing

HUD CoC Committee directs the NOFA Sub-committee to ensure renewal application scoring values the general TH programs that are in line with the approach below and improve Continuum performance, such that these projects can score well enough to rank competitively.

To score and rank competitively, general use Transitional Housing must follow a model inclusive of the following:

- Shorter stays;
- no barriers to entry;
- housing first;
- services minimal, voluntary, and focused on getting residents housed as quickly as possible.
Strategic Direction

Ranking New/Bonus Projects in Tier 1

HUD CoC recommends that the NOFA Sub-Committee rank both new and renewing projects together and ensure that existing residential capacity is appropriately valued in the scoring and ranking of projects.
2016 HUD CoC NOFA: The Basics

• Due September 14, 2016 by 8:00p.m. PST
• Requires projects to be submitted in rank order in two tiers
  A. Tier 1 = 93% of a CoC’s Annual Renewal Demand (ARD)
  B. Tier 2 = 7% of a CoC’s ARD + 5% of ARD for Permanent Housing Bonus projects
  C. Tier 1 funding amount is assured, Tier 2 is not
• Tier 2 Projects will Compete Nationally
  A. 100 points total
  B. 50 pts CoC score; 35 pts rank in package; 5 pts project type; 10 pts Housing 1st
2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Funds Available

- Current Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) for Alameda County = $28,293,885
- Tier 1 = 93% ARD = $26,313,313 (est)
- Tier 2 = balance of ARD + bonus amount = $3,395,266
  - 7% = $1,980,572 (est)
  - 5% = $1,414,694

- Total estimated amount that can be requested = $29,708,579
2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Submission Requirements

• Due to EveryOne Home Electronically on Tuesday, August 9, 2016 at noon
• Include Application and all mandatory attachments
• Send submissions in PDF form to info@everyonehome.org
• Projects must submit a local application in order to be part of CoC submission
• Due in e-snaps by 8/18/16 at 5:00 p.m.
• If selected, the CES application is due in e-snaps by 9/7/16
Combined Renewal and New Application
Changes to Application: Project Types

- A single application for renewing projects and new projects funded with reallocated or bonus funds for the following project types:
  - Renewing and Proposed Permanent Supportive Housing
  - Renewing and Proposed Rapid Rehousing
  - General and Youth Serving TH

- Existing SSO projects not tied to permanent housing will not be included in the 2016 application package. The funds will be available for reallocation.

- HMIS and SSO for operating a Coordinated Entry System projects will complete a different local application form.
Changes to Application: Required Attachments

*Indicates a new attachment

- Reports should be run for the federal fiscal year October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015.
  - Demographics Report
  - APR
  - System Performance Measurement*
  - Data Completeness

Additional Mandatory Attachments:
- Program participant agreement; lease, and/or “House Rules”*
- Eligibility Criteria and/or a housing application*

- Policy on basis for eviction or involuntary program termination*
- Grievance Policy*
- Evidence of site control if applicable*
- Proof of submission of last 3 APRs
- Proof of LOCCS draws for last two grant cycles*
- Most recent annual audit with Management Letter (no earlier than FYE 12/31/14) – Agencies can link to an online audit if available in that format.
- Proof of 501 © 3 standing if applicable*
- Proof of Site Control*
Changes to Application: Scoring Criteria

- Additional performance based scoring criteria have been added:
  - Existing scored criteria
    - Increased housing stability
    - Exit destination—includes returns to homelessness
    - Increasing income
    - Connecting participants to mainstream benefits
  - Added scored criteria
    - Utilization rates
    - Length of Time Homeless (Length of Stay)
    - Timely submission s of APRs
    - Timely draws from LOCCS
    - Participant Eligibility

- Applicants are encouraged to review the scoring grid in the local application for further detail.
Changes to Application: Scoring

PROJECTS CAN SCORE UP TO A TOTAL OF 100 POINTS

• Project Type—Up to 5 points
• Alignment with HUD and CoC Priorities—Up to 25 Points
• Outcome Performance—Up to 32 points
• Grant Management—Up to 25 Points
• Organizational Capacity—Up to 13 Points
Project Type and Meeting CoC and HUD Priorities (5 & 25 Points)

• Project Type – up to 5 points
  • 5 points for existing PH, youth serving TH, SSO for CES, & HMIS
  • 3 points for general TH proposed new PH

• CoC and HUD’s priorities -- up to 25 points
  • Target Populations and Severity of Need – 10 pts.
  • Housing First and Low Barrier – 10 points
  • Cost Effectiveness – 5 points

  Asked last year, now scored this year.
Target Population and Severity of Need

• Starts on page 8 of application
• Has new elements since last year
  ▫ Like last year points for providing PSH for serving chronically homeless or RRH for families
  ▫ This year can also get points for serving majority of persons who are vets, youth, directly from the streets or fleeing domestic violence
• Check all that apply
• Will get the point value of the highest scoring box that is verified for a maximum of 10.
Outcome Measures (32 Points)

- Uses information APR’s, complete outcomes measure charts for the project types.
- Measures required and benchmarks vary depending on program type
  - A. Obtains or Retains Permanent Housing (10 pts)
  - B. Adults who maintain or increase Income (7 pts)
  - C. Obtains/Maintains non-cash Mainstream Benefits (7 pts.)
  - D. Exits or Returns to Homelessness OR length of time homeless (8 pts)
Outcome A: Info from APR (PSH Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Participation by Exit Status</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than or equal to 30 days</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 60 days</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 180 days</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 365 days</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 to 730 Days (1-2 Yrs)</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 to 1095 Days (2-3 Yrs)</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096 to 1460 Days (3-4 Yrs)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461 to 1825 Days (4-5 Yrs)</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1825 Days (&gt;5 Yrs)</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average and Median Length of Participation in Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>

Length of Participation by Exit Status
Number of Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>D</td>
<td>K</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Retention >6 months: \( \frac{P - H - I - J - K + G}{(P - H - I - J - K + G)} \times 100 \) = % of persons
### Outcome A: Info from APR (RRH, Youth-serving TH, general TH)

29a1. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed More than 90 Days)

Number of Leavers in Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Destinations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Children</th>
<th>With Children and Adults</th>
<th>With Only Children</th>
<th>Unknown HH Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, no Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, with Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, no Ongoing subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with VASH Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with other Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Friends, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29a2. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed 90 Days or Less)

Number of Leavers in Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Destinations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Children</th>
<th>With Children and Adults</th>
<th>With Only Children</th>
<th>Unknown HH Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, no Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned by Client, with Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, no Ongoing subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with VASH Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental by Client, with other Ongoing Subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Family, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Friends, Permanent Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. HMIS or Comparable Database Data Quality

- Total number of records for All Clients
- Total number of records for Adults Only
- Total number of records for Unaccompanied Youth
- Total number of records for Leavers

Obtaining Permanent Housing: \((A + B) / C = \%\) of persons obtaining permanent housing
Outcome B - Income: (PSH, RRH, TAY Serving TH, General Use TH)

PSH and General Use TH:
\[
\frac{(A+B+C+E+F+G)}{(D+H)} = \% \text{ of adults who maintained or increased income}
\]

RRH and TAY serving TH:
\[
\frac{(B+C+F+G)}{(D+H)} = \% \text{ of adults who increased income}
\]

### Table

**24.1. Income Change by Income Category – Adult Stayers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Change by Income Category</th>
<th>Adult Stayers with Income Info at Entry and Follow-up</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Same $ at Follow-up</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Increased $ at Follow-up</th>
<th>Did not Have Income Category at Entry or at Follow-up</th>
<th>Did not Have the Income Category at Exit or at Follow-up</th>
<th>Total Adults (Including Those with no Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Any Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Overall Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**24.2. Income Change by Income Category – Adult Leavers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Change by Income Category</th>
<th>Adult Leavers with Income Info at Entry and Follow-up</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Same $ at Exit</th>
<th>Retained Income Category and Increased $ at Exit</th>
<th>Did not Have Income Category at Entry or at Exit</th>
<th>Did not Have the Income Category at Exit or at Exit</th>
<th>Total Adults (Including Those with no Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Earned Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults with Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Any Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Change in Overall Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome C: Info from APR (all project 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></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><strong>E</strong></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><strong>G</strong></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><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(B + G) / (E + J) = \% of adults non-cash mainstream benefits\]
# Outcome D: Exits to Homelessness

## Info from APR (PSH)

### 29a1. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed More than 90 Days)

**Number of Leavers in Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary Destinations</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Family, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Friends, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Not Meant for Human Habitation</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or Motel, Paid by Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 29a2. Destination by Household Type and Length of Stay (All Leavers who Stayed 90 Days or Less)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporary Destinations</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH for Homeless Persons</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Family, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with Friends, Temporary Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Not Meant for Human Habitation</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or Motel, Paid by Client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. HMIS or Comparable Database Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for All Clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Adults Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of records for Leavers</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PSH:** This project types should use the following formula to calculate their measure:

\[
\text{Exits to Homelessness: } \frac{(A + B + C + D) + (E + F + G + H)}{I} = \% \text{ of persons who exit to homelessness}
\]
Outcome D: RRH / TAY Serving TH – Returns to Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit was from</th>
<th>Total # of Persons who exited to Permanent Housing Destination (2 years prior)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness in less than 6 Months (0-180 days)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness from 6-12 Months (181-365 days)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366-730 days)</th>
<th>Number of Returns in 2 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td># of Returns</td>
<td>% of Returns</td>
<td># of Returns</td>
<td>% of Returns</td>
<td># of Returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rapid Rehousing use the formula below to calculate the percentage of persons returning to homelessness within two years from a RRH program:**

Returns to Homelessness in two years: \( \frac{D}{B} \times 100 \% \) of persons who return to homelessness within two years

**TAY Serving Transitional Housing use the formula below to determine the % of people returning to homelessness from TH within two years:**

Returns to homelessness in two years from TH: \( \frac{C}{A} \times 100 \% \) of persons returning to homelessness within two years.
Outcome D: General Use TH – Length of Stay

Unlike other project types, General Use TH will not use a formula to calculate the average length of stay. Instead it will use the number indicated in the yellow highlighted box, rounded up to the nearest whole number.
Grant Management (25 Points)

A. Spending (5 pts)

B. Reports and Invoicing (10 pts)

C. Proof of Eligibility (5 pts.)

B. Utilization (5 pts)
Spending (5 pts)

a. Report on amount of unspent funds for past 3 years
b. Explain unspent grant funds in most recent grant year
c. Underspending of 5% or greater in most recent year and one other in last 3 years must be explained

• Narratives with detailed explanations and corrective strategies will earn more points
Reports and Invoicing (10 pts)

• Timely Submission of APRs (Can be verified via e-snap. New projects can provide proof of their timely APR submissions and/or progress reports from other federal grants)

• Timely draws from LOCCS (can be verified via LOCCS, per the screen shot in the application)
Proof of Eligibility (5pts) and Capacity / Utilization (5pts)

Proof of Eligibility (5pts)
- provide eligibility criteria and procedures for documenting.

Capacity / Utilization (5 pts)
- Looking at how many people are served by the project on an annual basis, vs. how many people the project has capacity to serve.
HMIS (2 pts)


- Points based on percent of data quality must be higher than 95% to get 2 points, 90% to get 1

- When prompted to include services in the report, select ‘no’
Data quality report card

This is a screen shot for illustration only. Use the date ranges in the instructions (10/1/14 – 9/30/15)
Fiscal Management (4pts)

• Address any findings in the management letter or with the management of federal grants.

• Organizations whose budget size do not require an Annual Independent Audit must still submit a Financial Statement according to general accounting principles.

• Audits and reports can be for fiscal years ending no earlier than 12/31/2014.
Quality Assurance (7 pts)

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

• Reviewers will score on the quality and comprehensiveness of narrative as well as how specific it is to the project.
Coordinated Entry System Applications
Overview

- Coordinated Entry is a method to connect people to resources is federally required.
- The initial design for our CoC was adopted by the EveryOne Home Board and can be downloaded at www.everyonehome.org.
- EveryOne Home’s HUD CoC committee has chosen to invite local proposals for up to $1m for this purpose.
- If a competitive application is identified, the CoC will use reallocated funds for this purpose.
Scope of Work

The Coordinated Entry & Housing Resource Centers Initial Design Plan includes*:

- multiple entry points, referred to as Housing Resource Centers (HRC’s)
- common core services
- a common initial referral point
- a "base" for mobile outreach teams
- shared eligibility criteria, protocols and outcome measures.
- access to a range of "mainstream" services.

*note some of these are still in progress
Four Components of This Coordinated Entry Project

Applicants may apply for one, two, three, or all of the components described in the scope of work below

1. CES HUD lead agency
   • serve the entire county and have experience administering HUD CoC grants (or comparable)
   • ensure that CES components are implemented according to Design
   • ensure that HUD funded CES components are effectively integrated with CES components funded by other non-HUD sources.
Four Components of This Coordinated Entry Project

Lead Agency (cont.)

- Partner with EveryOne Home for consistent CES implementation across the region and providing quality control for the entire CES system.

- Individual agencies may apply to function both as a lead agency and as a service delivery agent for one or more other components or agencies may apply to function solely as the lead agency with all other services to be delivered by subcontractor agencies.
Four Components of This Coordinated Entry Project

2. **Call center** must be available countywide and be staffed with trained operators able to screen, triage, and problem solve based on the resources available. Core elements include:

- Triage/Initial Screening
- Problem Solving
- Warm hand off
Four Components of This Coordinated Entry Project

3. **Assessment and Referral**
   - Every HRC will screen, assess, and refer clients with standardized protocols using standardized tools and processes. Includes a prioritization system that will govern how available resources are targeted.
   - Contractor(s) implement the assessment protocol at HRCs countywide once developed and approved.
   - Operate within HMIS and not develop separate databases.
Four Components of This Coordinated Entry Project

4. **Expanded HRC Services** will be funded only if additional funding is available once components one through three have been funded.

- Outreach
- Housing Navigation
- Employment/income services
Scoring (100 pts)

- Demonstrated Project Capacity (30 pts)
- Project Detail (25 pts)
- Project Integration (20 pts)
- Budget (15 pts)
- Match (5 pts)
- Completeness and Clarity (5 pts)
Submission Deadlines and Requirements

• All project applications are due to EveryOne Home by Noon (12:00 pm) on Tuesday August 9th, 2016—applications should be submitted electronically to info@everyonehome.org

• Include back-up documentation in a PDF – this file name must include the name of the program and agency.

• Applicants that have on-line audits may provide a link in your cover email to the online location of your documents and do not need to submit a PDF of the audit.
Electronic versions of the applications can be downloaded from the EveryOne Home website at: www.everyonehome.org.
Questions or Comments
The following are questions received at the Bidders’ Conference, July 19, 2015. Answers indicated here were provided in the room and are included in the published FAQs for the benefit of those who were notable to attend.

1. What about projects that have just started?
   a. If you do not have 12 months of data, you will fill out the application through p.6, General Section, question e. Applicants should note they have not yet been in operation for 12 months but intend to renew. The project will reflect the score awarded as a new applicant. If you are not currently under contract, and do not expect to be at the end of 2016, you need to contact Riley Wilkerson at Riley.Wilkerson@acgov.org

2. What is the best way for public agencies to submit their audits? What parts of an audit are required?
   a. A link in the cover email accompanying the application and attachments will be sufficient for audits. This option is also available for non-public entities as well. Applicants who submit a link only should indicate pages and sections of the audit which reference the compliance with HUD funding and the management letter(s).

3. Which version of the APR should be submitted?
   a. The HMIS APR is the correct report, not the e-snaps APR.

4. How many APRs are required for agency submissions?
   a. Renewal projects are only required to submit one APR. Proposed projects are only required to submit one APR for a comparable project, but are allowed to submit up to three (3) APRs. All must be for comparable projects.

5. For the HUD Priorities section of the scoring chart (corresponding to p. 9, question 2.a of the local application), how many boxes should be filled in?
   a. Applicants are welcome to check all boxes that are true of the project. However, for this question point values are not cumulative – points will be only awarded for the checked box with the highest point value.

6. How do agencies get a written agreement with Home Stretch?
   a. If people are interested in entering into an agreement with Home Stretch, send an email homestretch@acgov.org indicating your interest in entering into a written agreement with the project.
7. Question 2.b in the scoring grid, indicates that one point is available for evidence that policies and procedures have been discussed by a board or equivalent body. Most agency boards do not consider policies like this. How can this evidence be provided?
   a. This is still a good faith effort to move forward – in this case, agencies will not automatically lose the points if there is not a dated form of approval, but minutes proving that the issues of Housing First and low barrier policies have been discussed with leadership will be sufficient. Staff and committee are looking for proof that non-profit boards understand and supporting this shift in philosophy.

8. For Outcome Measure D, can staff send out instructions for running the required reports?
   a. On Friday, July 22\textsuperscript{nd}, Supplemental Instructions were uploaded to the EveryOne Home website with instructions for running the two required reports for Outcome Measure D, 0700 and 0701. The EveryOne Home website also has a re-issued application, published July 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2015. Applicants who have already started working on their submissions may copy and paste from the newly published application into the initial release. The Supplemental Instructions for running the Outcome Measure D reports remain applicable, and can be found here: http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016-Renewal-and-New-App.-Supplemental-Instructions.pdf

9. Since February, HUD has not been accepting APRs, so grants that ended in the last few months will not have an APR for the program year.
   a. Agencies should indicate that in the application, and show evidence of prior, timely submission of APRs.

10. Leveraging is now missing. Are there still points being awarded for it?
    a. The leverage letter is no longer required this year. HUD is no longer scoring leverage, and neither is the Continuum.

11. Please confirm if client rents can be used as part of match for PSH projects.
    a. Yes – client rent can be used as part of the match, but only for eligible activities within your project (2016 HUD NOFA for FY 2016 Continuum of Care Competition p. 2-3, https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf).

12. For Coordinated Entry, is there a vision of the ideal applicant?
    a. The NOFA and HUD CoC committees do not want to be overly prescriptive. The grant is looking for a lead agency with adequate capacity and cash flow to administer sub-contracts.
The following are questions which have been received via email between July 20th and July 25th

1. Does System Performance rely on APR data? If so, does that mean there are only three items which should be under HMIS reports in the check lists?
   a. The list of HMIS reports is correct – System Performance is not measured via data found in the APR. The System Performance reports, Returns to Homelessness and Length of Stay, correspond to Outcome Measure D. Please see the Supplemental Instructions on the EveryOne Home website for specific instructions on how to run these reports, which can be found here: [http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016-Renewal-and-New-App.-Supplemental-Instructions.pdf](http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016-Renewal-and-New-App.-Supplemental-Instructions.pdf)

2. For the Proof of LOCCS draws, audit and management letters, and 501c3 documentation, which of these are sub-grantees required to submit?
   a. As discussed in the Bidders’ Conference, LOCCS draws are the responsibilities of the lead agencies. The NOFA Committee has determined that proof of 501c3 status and audits and management letters are also the responsibility of lead agencies only. However, lead agencies are reminded that while sub-recipients are not required to submit the above documents, lead agencies are still responsible for ensuring that these documents are up to date and current.

3. The HMIS Data Quality report in the application indicates the report name as ‘Data Completeness Report Card, Report 0252 (EE v.10). Is this still correct?
   a. The name of the report and its code (0252) have not changed. However, the report is now on version 15 (v15). Applicants should look for the Data Completeness Report Card, Report 0252 (EE V.15). The remainder of the instructions in the application can be followed as written.

4. The HMIS Demographics Report is required – should agencies submit the Demographics Report, or Demographics with Detail?
   a. The HMIS Demographics Report is sufficient – agencies do not need to run HMIS Demographics With Detail.

5. Question 2.c, HUD Priorities, Cost Effectiveness, the formula asks for the total number of households who retained Permanent Housing. What report will best show the number of households? The APR refers to individuals, and the Demographics Report shows the number of households served in general and at year end. Is this accurate enough?
   a. Applicants should use the Demographics Report to address this question. The Demographics Report With Detail is not required for this question – the standard Demographics Report will be sufficient, run for the program year. Those whose projects began after 10/1/2014 should follow conventions indicated in the application.
6. In the CES application, what is the required documentation to support the 25% match requirement? Additionally, what is the difference between leverage and match?
   

   Only those submitting a CES application are required to submit the proof of match.

   The difference between leverage and match is that match is the required amount of money a project is required to bring in, and leverage is any amount above and beyond that amount. Furthermore, match is only for use in eligible activities, while use for leverage is a bit broader. Staff are asking HUD for further clarification and if received in time, will include that answer in the second round of FAQs.
The following are questions received via email between July 26\textsuperscript{th} and August 1, 2016

1. Does the CES application have any backup documentation that is required other than Match verification (if applicable) and letters of support? The new and renewal project application indicates proof of 501c3 status and site control etc.,
   a. The CES application does not have any backup documentation required other than match verification (if applicable), a link to which is in the first FAQ document, available on the EveryOne Home website. These documents may be required prior to final submission in e-snaps, including from both the lead and the sub-grantees.

2. What are some examples of ‘external coordination’ as referenced in question 2f of the CES application?
   a. Applicants should provide information about coordination between themselves and their sub-grantees; about the working relationship between their agencies, and coordination between them for financial and programmatic execution of the given contract.

3. In the CES application, what does ‘warm handoff’ mean if the HRC will not be operating 24/7? What can the HRC do after business hours? Are applicants expected to address this as well?
   a. It is unlikely the HRCs will be operating on a 24/7 schedule. Applicants should think through how they can make the strongest connection between a caller and an appointment to get help. The NOFA Committee and staff do not want to be overly prescriptive about this question; as such potential grantees are encouraged to think creatively about how they would train staff to address this gap and describe this training or program design.

4. How should agencies submitting a CES proposal handle the question of match? Under what circumstances is a match required?
   a. If an agency is proposing an expansion of services already undertaken as part of the proposal for CES, then existing funds can be part of the match. If the services are new, and not currently undertaken by the project, then the applicant needs to show how 25\% of budget is covered by a source other than HUD. For agencies proposing new services, there is a link to a verification of match letter in the first FAQ document which can be found on the EveryOne Home website: http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/FAQ-Questions-1-Bidders-Conference-through-July-25th-2016-FINAL.pdf
5. What are renewing Projects which have been in operation since or before 10/1/2014 to do with the questions concerning start dates on page 6 of the local application?
   a. Projects which have a start date of 10/1/14 or before and are renewing should indicate that they are a renewal, and that they have a start date of on or before 10/1/14. All projects, regardless of start date, are still required to supply their start date from the beginning of the program (not simply the program year). For those projects older than five (5) years, the starting month and year of program operation will be sufficient. Any project that is renewing, and has a start date of on or before 10/1/14, should run all reports for the program year (10/1/14 – 9/30/15).

6. There are some items which scattered site PSH projects are not able to provide as part of backup documentation. Please advise scattered site PSH projects on what they can do if they do not have certain items (such as house rules or a grievance policy).
   a. Scattered site PSH project administrators should show evidence of communication with projects that they are required to be low barrier and housing first. The committee is interested in good quality control from the subsidy administrator. Alternatives to the Project Management Documents listed in the application instructions to show evidence of housing first and low barrier include but are not limited to; specific language within the contract agreement, MOU, and/or scope of work, between subsidy administrator and landlords / partner agencies. If the project does not have any of the project management materials, and also has no language concerning housing first or low barrier in their contracts, MOUs, or scopes of work, they should develop these as soon as possible for this or future NOFA rounds.

7. For projects which do master leasing, are all individual leases required as part of evidence of site control?
   a. In instances where agencies have undertaken master leasing in scattered site units, individual unit leases are not required to demonstrate site control. In cases where all units are located in a single building or with a single landlord, the agreement between the agency and the landlord to lease a number of units can be provided. The proof of site control is required for buildings the agency owns, or spaces within buildings owned by other entities from which the agency leases administrative or operations space.

8. Something is wrong with the answer I get using the equation for Outcome D, for PSH projects. What should I do?
   a. The formula should be corrected as follows:
      Exits to Homelessness: \[\frac{(A + B + C + D) + (E + F + G + H)}{I} = \% \text{ of persons who exit to homelessness.}\] The brackets indicate that the addition for the numerator should be completed first. The addition itself has not changed.
9. For Local Application question 4.d, Capacity and Utilization, which date do applicants, use to answer the question of how many households were served during a point-in-time? The APR provides four dates.
   a. Applicants should average the data from the four dates indicated in the APR to calculate the number of households served during a point-in-time.

10. How should the Utilization Rate be calculated? It asks for the annual capacity, which is indicated above in both individuals and households. Which should be used in the Utilization formula?
   a. The utilization rate can be calculated using the total number of households served during the program year, divided by the annual capacity. The annual capacity value should be the households value, entered for that question. An annotated version of that formula is indicated below:
      i. Utilization Rate = # of households served in the program year / annual capacity (in households)

11. Where can I find information about households served in the program year for the Annual Capacity question?
   a. The required information about households can be found in the APR, question 9.

12. For the annual capacity question, how are agencies meant to calculate utilization using households? Use of ‘individuals’ is not a fair approach either, especially if agencies are only contracted to fill units.
   a. Staff and the NOFA Committee acknowledge that both households and individuals have limitations and challenges. However, for the question of annual capacity, households were chosen because in permanent housing, the housing type most supported by HUD, is often concerned with filling units.

13. What should projects submit for proof of timely submission of APRs if an APR or APRs is/are missing from their list of submissions?
   a. In the case that a submitted APR is missing from your list of submissions, please contact your HUD Program Officer to see about having the problem corrected. If the omission cannot be corrected before the local application due date, written verification of the on time submission from the Program Office to accompany the screen shot of previous submissions will be sufficient.

14. Are other forms of proof of LOCCS draws acceptable? For example, a print out from the time that the draw occurred (opposed to a screen shot of the list of draw down dates?).
   a. Screen shots from LOCCS are the preferred proof of timely submission. If unavailable the print out described in the question may be sufficient, provided it includes a date of draw request and the information in the non-redacted columns on the screen shot.
15. The instructions say to submit proof of two grant cycles of LOCCS. The scoring says it will be looking at 3 grant cycles of LOCCS. Which is the committee looking at?
   a. The committee will be scoring based off the language in the instructions. Applicants are required to submit proof of two (2) grant cycles of LOCCS draws.

16. For existing projects, it appears that the only scoring options are 8 points if everything (APRs and LOCCS) has been on time for the last 3 grant cycles, and 4 points if everything has been on time 75% of the time in the last 3 grant cycles. Which of these point values will applicants be scored on?
   a. The NOFA Committee will be looking at all possible draws and APR submissions, and ensuring that any combination of those were submitted / drawn down on time. If all APRs were submitted and LOCCS draws requested on time, that project will score full points. If a total of 75% of APRs and LOCCS draws were submitted / requested on time, in any combination that will also earn points (4 of the 8 available).

17. How will projects be scored if APRs have been 100% on time but e-LOCCS draws have not always been done quarterly? Is there a way to differentiate between these two systems?
   a. If a total of 75% of APRs and LOCCS draws were submitted / requested on time, that will also earn points (4 of the 8 available). The committee will only be scoring on those periods in which an agency was able to submit / request draw downs. For example, if a project was not in contract the first quarter of its program year due to the timing of HUD’s awards and contracting please indicate that in your cover email, and your project will only be evaluated on the timeliness of draws / submissions during periods when those were possible.

18. Due to HUD Regional Office delays in processing the grant awards, some grantees receive award letters at the end of the 1st quarter or later. Therefore, the most draws available to those programs are three. Will projects drawing down only three times be penalized in the scoring?
   a. Those projects that were unable to draw down from LOCCS due the timing of your funding cycle should provide evidence of this schedule, and will not be penalized in the scoring process. They will be evaluated only on those quarters in which they were able to draw down.

19. The community was not notified that LOCCS draws would be a scoring criteria, so there was not adequate time to make corrections.
   a. HUD has indicated in both the 2016 (pgs. 24 and 37) and 2015 (pgs 27 and 46) NOFAs that it wants to see quarterly draw downs from LOCCS. It further indicates that projects should be monitored and scored on this factor as well as timely submission of the APRs. In 2015, Alameda County did not score on the issue of LOCCS draw downs; however, feedback from HUD indicated that our scoring process was not objective or rigorous enough. The NOFA and HUD CoC Committees elected to score on this topic this year to have local scoring more in line with that of HUD’s priorities in hopes of making the consolidated application more competitive for all projects.
20. The Data Completeness Report Card is indicated in the application as v.15, but is showing up in HMIS as v.16. What is the correct course of action?
   a. At the time the application and FAQs were issued, Bowman had updated this report through version 15. On July 23rd, Bowman updated to v.16. Please proceed running the report using v.16.

21. The Data Completeness Report Card is displaying falsely low grades due to known issues around Disability Verification which Bowman is working to resolve. What can applicants do to avoid a lower score than they warrant?
   a. Please ignore the grades at the top of the Report Card. We are aware of the issue on Bowman's end with the disability verification. We will not be scoring based on the letter scores indicated by the report. Page 24 of the local application provides a formula, and a screen shot of the report which indicates the cells from which data should be pulled to calculate the score. That is the actual 'grade' on which the score for this question will be considered. If there are specific questions about how the report appears to be running beyond the grades indicated at the top of the report, please contact HMIS.
MEMORANDUM

To: EveryOne Home Continuum of Care Membership
From: HUD CoC Committee
Date: July 18, 2016
Re: Strategic Direction for Alameda County’s Application for HUD 2016 Continuum of Care Funds

BACKGROUND

The HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) Committee has provided the strategic direction outlined below to the NOFA Sub-Committee. The NOFA Sub-Committee is made up of non-conflicted persons responsible for developing the local application process for seeking these federal funds. They score and rank all project applications to be included in the application package submitted to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Strategic direction from the HUD CoC Committee on behalf of the membership guides their crafting of the application questions, instructions, and scoring.

The strategic direction was developed by the HUD CoC Committee after reviewing:

• The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) issued 6/28/16:
  https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/FY-2016-CoC-Program-NOFA.pdf
• Alameda County’s scores and HUD’s feedback on the 2015 consolidated application
• Community input from two open meetings (6/21/16 and 7/7/16) attended by 45 unduplicated people
• The results of an anonymous online survey, completed by 36 respondents

These recommendations are consistent with member input. A summary of input from the community meeting and the survey are included for reference.

STRATEGIC DIRECTION FOR THE NOFA SUB-COMMITTEE

I. Strategic Reallocation:

The HUD CoC Committee directs the NOFA Sub-committee to pursue reallocation that strengthens our system and application package and is aligned with our guiding principles. Potential benefits, such as expanded capacity and resources, need to exceed potential losses of existing services and housing.

HUD CoC supports continuing to pursue strategies already in use:

1. Inviting voluntary reallocation
2. Initiating negotiated reallocation with local funders and projects
3. Establishing a minimum score threshold for inclusion in the package

HUD CoC supports pursuing the following policies:

1. Reallocate all SSO projects that are not for CES or tied to permanent housing
2. Recapture unspent grant funds that are not rental assistance dollars and have been under spent for 2 or more grant cycles
II. Inviting a proposal for Coordinated Entry:

Coordinated Entry is essential to an effective response to homelessness and is a requirement for those receiving HUD Homeless Assistance funds from the Continuum of Care and Emergency Solutions Grant programs.

Therefore, the HUD CoC Committee directs the NOFA Sub-Committee to invite proposals up to $1 million for operating a Coordinated Entry System. Those proposals need to ensure that the Continuum can implement required elements such as easy access (call center) and standard and comprehensive assessment for services across the entire county. All RFPs under consideration must be in line with the design adopted by the EveryOne Home Leadership Board. ([http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/AC-CES-Initial-Design-final.pdf](http://everyonehome.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/AC-CES-Initial-Design-final.pdf))

III. Approach to Transitional Housing (TH):

Because of our large unsheltered population, the Continuum needs to protect quality residential capacity to the greatest degree possible, while maintaining overall competitiveness of the package submitted for funding. While the Continuum still values the classic transitional housing model for youth (site based, 12-24 months stays and service rich), general purpose transitional housing is evolving to:

- Shorter stays;
- no barriers to entry;
- housing first;
- services minimal, voluntary, and focused on getting residents housed as quickly as possible

HUD CoC Committee directs the NOFA Sub-committee to ensure renewal application scoring values the general TH programs that are in line with the approach above and improve Continuum performance, such that these projects can score well enough to rank competitively.

IV. Tier 1 Rankings:

The HUD CoC Committee wants our rating and ranking process and criteria to score well in the Consolidated Application, which it did not in the last round. It also values the housing stability of tenants in existing CoC funded projects. It therefore recommends that the NOFA Sub-Committee rank both new and renewing projects together and ensure that existing residential capacity is appropriately valued in the scoring and ranking of projects.

V. Guiding Principles:

The HUD CoC Committee made minor modifications to the 2015 Guiding Principles and added principle (b):

a. Maximize the resources available to community
b. Package submitted will align with HUD priorities in order to meet local needs
c. Prioritize ensuring existing residential capacity and housing stability is maintained systemwide
d. Keep the renewal process as simple as possible
e. Continue to emphasize project performance and the submission of projects that will meet HUD’s thresholds
f. Support individual projects seeking to reallocate or reclassify where relevant
g. Facilitate a clear, fair and transparent local process
Summary of Community Feedback Considered in Developing NOFA Strategies

Community input on the best approaches to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development’s 2016 Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (the HUD NOFA) was gathered through two open community meetings held on 6/21/16 and 7/7/16 and attended by 45 unduplicated people, as well as an anonymous online survey conducted July 8th-11th. The HUD Continuum of Care Committee used this input to craft strategic direction for the NOFA Committee who is responsible for developing the local application and rating and ranking process. It is summarized here in the interest of the transparency and integrity of our community process.

Each topic begins with a brief outline of the question or questions put before the community, and are followed by the community feedback heard in the room during input sessions, and the online survey. The pie charts summarize the portion of online survey responses that supported or did not support various options being considered.

Strategic Reallocation:

Four recommendations were put before the community; 1. To continue the current approaches, 2. To reallocated SSOs grants not tied to CES or permanent housing, 3. To institute a 2% cut across all projects’ grant amounts, and 4. To recapture any unspent funds of 10% or greater. In total, 35 people responded to the various questions about strategic reallocation. The responses to each are as follows:

1. The community was largely supportive of continuing with current approaches, in both the input sessions and the online survey responses (27 of 32 respondents (84%) in support).

![A) Continue using existing strategies 1-3.a 1. Voluntary 2. Negotiated 3. Using a minimum threshold score.](image)

![B) All SSO Projects not tied to PSH or CES will be reallocated](image)

2. In the input sessions community members acknowledged that this was a difficult process, with the realization that HUD has been headed in this direction concerning SSOs for several years. It was also noted that reallocating Rubicon, who was present at the meeting, would not get the community to a full 20% reallocation. The online survey received 27 of 33 respondents, with (81%) in support of reallocating SSOs not tied to CES or PH. Comments here again acknowledged that this was a difficult choice, but that there were less impacts to all parties since SSOs do not have occupied units. Further comments included support of including the CES project funded through this reallocation in tier 1, and direction to the CoC to try and maintain these services in the community through other means.
3. This option was met with a lack of support in both the input sessions and the online survey. Major concerns were raised about this approach, particularly for rental assistance programs, and the community was largely in agreement that decoupling from the FMRs was not the most strategic long game for our community. The online survey received 32 respondents, 26 (81%) of whom were not in support of this strategy, citing that it would be too injurious to rental assistance programs, that 2% was too arbitrary a number, and that this would be challenging to implement administratively for the CoC and grantees.

4. Similar concerns were raised in the input sessions about this potential course of action in relationship to rental assistance projects. There was, however, broad interest in reducing under spending in general. This question in the survey received 33 respondents, 21 (65%) of whom supported it. Comments were conflicted – some reflecting a desire to see all unspent funds recaptured, while others remarking that it only made sense to recapture non-rental assistance under spending. Others noted that technical assistance to projects was a more reasonable path.

Inviting a proposal for Coordinated Entry:

Three recommendations were put before the community at the input sessions; 1. Invite a coordinated entry proposal between $500k and $1 million, 2. require the proposal to include a call center and assessment functions, and 3. Allow for optional CES activities such as expanded outreach, housing navigation or employment services to be included.

1. Consensus was not reached during the input sessions – there were still many questions about CES including what we would be asking for and how HUD funds would fit into other resources. There was also a desire to use CoC Planning Grant funds to offset some of the one-time costs. The room was in agreement that Alameda County is out of compliance at present with the CES requirement. The online survey received 32 responses to this questions, 27 in favor (84%) of pursuing it. Comments included full support of a robust CES, thoughts that the current design was too expensive, and a request to see multiple submissions which could be reviewed rather than settling for a single plan.
2. This was an item that was largely not discussed at the input sessions due to time constraints. However, in the online survey, the question received 25 responses of 33 in favor (75%) of requiring proposals to include a call center and assessment functions. Comments ranged from these being requisite elements, to not having enough information to fully understand what these elements include.

3. Here again, there was not room in the input sessions to discuss this option at length. The survey question had 33 responses, 26 of whom (79%) were in favor of including additional elements in the CES application. Comments focused on creation of options/opportunities for collaborations with other providers to build on existing expertise. Other comments ranged from strong support for these elements’ inclusion, to support for securing funding for these elements from other sources.

Transitional Housing

Discussion during the first community meeting resulted in support for creating a scoring criteria that allowed general purpose TH to demonstrate it could improve system performance and thereby to score well enough to be competitive with other project types. That consensus was confirmed at the second meeting without additional discussion. The online survey received 26 respondents, 20 of whom (77%) were in support of this approach. Comments included that while this solution was good for the current round, it would be advisable to
phase out non-youth and DV transitional housing from the HUD package, supporting them with local funds. Comments recommended considering DV-serving TH in the “protected populations” as youth serving TH already are by HUD. Comments also reflected feeling that the current benchmarks were not aligned with credit given to projects serving more vulnerable populations.

**Tier 1 Rankings**

This topic was discussed at length in the second input session. Sentiment ranged from support for keeping renewals only in Tier 1, to recognition that this track, as taken last year, was likely something HUD deducted points for, viewing it is not objective or performance based. Concern was raised about favoring projects that did not yet house people over those which were already doing so. The survey had 27 respondents, 17 of whom (64%) were in support of opening Tier 1 to both renewing and reallocated / bonus projects. In this case, the online feedback was inconsistent with what was heard in the room. Comments in the meeting and on the survey reflected the tension of recognizing HUD’s desire for an objective rating and ranking system, losing beds, pushing PSH into Tier 2, and potentially creating a homelessness situation for currently housed persons.

**Guiding Principles**

The guiding principles we not discussed at either meeting. Feedback was invited through on-line survey. In that forum, 20 of 24 respondents (80%) felt that the current guiding principles were the right ones for our community. Comments here included a sentiment that the principles do not reflect the voice of those currently experiencing homelessness, and the need to reflect the community’s commitment to balancing HUD’s priorities with local needs.
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1. Welcome and Meeting Purpose

- Alameda County needs to make several critical strategic decisions about how to proceed in the 2016 HUD NOFA process.

- Community feedback from the first meeting has been considered by the HUD CoC and NOFA Committees. Each committee will meet again to consider input from today’s session.

- Feedback will inform the development of the local rating and ranking process, and the local application design. All comments and questions will be responded to in writing by the CoC or NOFA Committees, and published on the EveryOne Home website.
1. Meeting Design

- Staff will present options and recommendations developed by the HUD CoC and HUD NOFA committees.
- Recommendations will be presented initially in total to offer the largest strategic picture possible. Clarifying questions are welcome, but we ask you to hold discussion until after the full presentation.
- Discussion will follow the presentation—each recommendation will be considered separately. If achieved, consensus of those in the room will be articulated.
- Community members present can fill out the survey to convey to staff any additional thoughts or modifications they have, which were not voiced in the room today.
1. Meeting Follow-up: How is Input Used?

- Feedback voiced in this meeting and collected via surveys will be combined with input from online surveys.
- All input will be presented to the HUD CoC Committee for consideration.
- HUD CoC will use all feedback to arrive at strategic direction for the NOFA Committee.
- HUD CoC will report out to community a summary of the feedback including areas of agreement and difference and rationale for conclusions reached.
- Strategies will be published on the EveryOne Home website.
2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: The Basics

- Due September 14, 2016 by 8:00 p.m. PST
- Current Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) = $28,293,885
- Requires Projects to be Ranked in 2 Tiers
  a. Tier 1 = 93% ARD = $26,313,313 (est)
  b. Tier 1 was 85% last year
  c. Tier 2 = 7% = $1,980,572 (est)
- Allows for PH Bonus Project Applications
  a. CoCs can request up to 5% of ARD = $1,414,694
- Tier 2 Projects will Compete Nationally like in 2015
  a. 100 points total
  b. 50 pts CoC score; 35 pts rank in package; 5 pts project type; 10 pts Housing 1st
2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Policy and Program Priorities

1. Create a Systemic Response to Homelessness (pg 7):
   a. Measure System Performance
   b. Create Effective CES (emphasizes—prioritizing longest homeless and highest need; easy access; moving to PH quickly)
   c. Promote participant choice
   d. Plan as a system
   e. Delivery of services open, inclusive and transparent

2. Strategically Reallocate Resources (pg 8):
   a. Review project quality, performance and cost effectiveness (we only scored 5/13 pts in 2015)
   b. Maximize use of Mainstream resources
   c. Review TH projects
   d. Integration
3. **End Chronic Homelessness (pg 8):**
   a. Target persons with longest time homeless and highest needs for existing and new PSH
   b. Increase PSH units
   c. Improve Outreach

4. **End Family Homelessness (pg 9):**
   a. Views Rapid Rehousing as a primary strategy
   b. “HUD encourages CoCs to use reallocation to create new rapid rehousing projects”

5. **End Youth Homelessness (pg 9):**
   a. “CoCs and youth serving organizations should work together to develop resources and programs that better end youth homelessness”
6. **End Veteran Homelessness (pg 8):**
   a. “CoCs should take specific steps to reach this goal including prioritizing veterans for assistance when they cannot be assisted with VA services, and coordinating closely with veteran serving organizations.”

7. **Use a Housing First Approach (pg 10):**
   a. Use data to quickly and stably house homeless persons
   b. Engage landlords and property owners
   c. Remove barriers to entry
   d. Adopt client-centered services methods
2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

CoC Application worth 200 Points Total

- **Major Sections with Key Sub-Scores**
  1. CoC Coordination & Engagement = 43
  2. Project Ranking, Review & Capacity = 30
     a. Strategic Reallocation = 4
  3. HMIS = 18
  4. Point-in-Time Count = 9
  5. System Performance = 40 pts
     a. System Performance Measures = 10 pts if can attach HDX report
  6. Performance and Strategic Planning = 60
     a. Ending Chronic Homelessness = 15
     b. Ending Family Homelessness = 15
     c. Ending Youth Homelessness = 15
     d. Ending Vets Homelessness = 15
Comparison to 2015 Scoring

Major Sections the same, change in point values

1. CoC Coordination & Engagement = 43 was 49
2. Project Ranking, Review & Capacity = 30 was 26
3. HMIS = 18 same
4. Point in Time Count = 9 same
5. System Performance = 40 pts was 38
6. Performance and Strategic Planning = 60 same
2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

Comparison to 2015 Scoring

---

Key Sub-section Changes

a. Awarding 4 points for reallocation—CoCs must demonstrate that reallocation is actively encouraged or have already reallocated 20% of package since 2013 round. We have reallocated approximately 10%.

b. System Performance Scored directly linked to system outcome measures—CoCs can get 10 points for being able to generate the report, which we can. Other points are awarded for improvements on the HUD measures not our own. In previous rounds we used our own pts for Length of Stay and Returns to Homelessness.
2. 2016 HUD CoC NOFA: Scoring

**HUD Policy and Program Priorities**
As Reflected In the Scores for CoC Application (pgs 33-42)

1. Create a Systemic Response to Homeless: Appears to be worth 31 of the points for CoC Coordination and Engagement
2. Strategically Reallocate Resources: All 30 of the points for Project Ranking Review and Capacity appear to connect to the narrative for this priority.
3. End Chronic Homelessness: 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
4. End Family Homelessness: 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
5. End Youth Homelessness: 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
6. End Veteran Homelessness: 15 pts from Strategic Planning Section
7. Use a Housing First Approach: 12 pts from Coordination and Engagement Section
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Strategic Reallocation**

- According to HUD’s 2015 debrief, communities that did the best in the competition did the most strategic reallocation.
  - HUD has set a target for 20% of the ARD since 2013 (pg. 36) for full pts
  - We have done 10% reallocation to date

- Strategies for reallocation pursued in prior rounds
  1. Inviting Voluntary Reallocation initiated by grantees
  2. Negotiating Reallocation initiated by the CoC or a local funder
  3. Setting one or more Reallocation Policies
     a. Projects who failed to earn a minimum score were subject to reallocation (below 60 pts in past rounds)
     b. Projects of certain types who fell into Tier 2 were automatically reallocated (SSO projects in 2013 & 14)
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Strategic Reallocation**

- The NOFA and HUD CoC Committees recommend we continue using Reallocation Strategies 1-3.a.
- We request input on the following additional Reallocation Policies
  1. All SSO projects not tied to PH or CES be reallocated. This policy would impact one project, the employment services SSO ranked 44 in Tier 2 last year.
  2. All Projects get reduced by 2%. This would impact all projects in the package.
  3. Recapture any unspent funds exceeding 10% of the grant amount, this would not impact grants that are in lease up phase or have not renewed previously.
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

Strategic Reallocation

- Pros of the added Reallocation Policy #1
  - Would make $1 million available to fund CES, HMIS or more PH
  - This would make our CoC application more competitive
  - This current project contains no units and would have to be placed in Tier 1 or would be very likely to be lost
  - Employment services is an allowable expenditure in a CES project

- Cons of the added Reallocation Policy #1
  - Could result in a reduction of employment services in the CoC
  - Is being set before a negotiated strategy is fully developed
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Strategic Reallocation**

- **Pros of the added Reallocation Policy #2**
  - Would make approximately $600,000 available to fund CES, HMIS or more PH
  - This might make our CoC application more competitive
  - This spreads the impact across the entire package rather than with 1 or a few

- **Cons of the added Reallocation Policy #2**
  - Could adversely impact smaller projects
  - Rental Assistance grants may have to delink from the FMRs which could adversely affect the grant over time
  - This is the most administratively difficult to implement
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Strategic Reallocation**

- **Pros of the added Reallocation Policy #3**
  - Would make an unknown amount available to fund CES, HMIS or more PH
  - This would make our CoC application more competitive
  - Utilizes funds that are currently going back to HUD

- **Cons of the added Reallocation Policy #3**
  - Because of the FMR problem this year under spending is far more likely than in subsequent years
  - This strategy could also delink Rental Assistance grants from the FMRs in a detrimental way
  - The amount is unknown at this time, and may not result in much funding
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Coordinated Entry System**

- Coordinated Entry is a key system element to ending homelessness.
- Communities that have made significant progress in lengths of time homeless and overall numbers of homeless are those with functioning CES’s.
- Stakeholders believe that the outreach, diversion, assessment, prioritization and matching, and permanent housing interventions offered through CES will enable our CoC to serve homeless people more effectively.
- We are required by HUD to have CES in place across the entire county with a comprehensive and standardized assessment tool. The system must be easily accessed and well advertised.
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Coordinated Entry System**

- Current resources expended in the Community allow for the following elements envisioned in our CES model:
  - Outreach to persons unlikely to seek service on their own
  - Housing Navigation
  - Rapid Rehousing
  - The prioritizing and matching of disabled homeless persons to existing housing
  - A full service HUB in Berkeley with shelter intakes and diversion as well as above services
  - A family HUB in Oakland with shelter intakes and diversion as well as above services

For more information on the CES design please visit the EveryOne Home page on the design: [http://everyonehome.org/our-work/coordinated-entry-system/](http://everyonehome.org/our-work/coordinated-entry-system/)
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Coordinated Entry System**

- Current resources are not adequate for the following required elements to be in place in across the entire CoC
  - A call center that provides initial screening, phone diversion, and matching to the HRCs—makes system accessible
  - Adequate assessment and prioritization across the county
  - Outreach, navigation and income services are underfunded for the need
- Countywide Coordination
  - Boomerang, city and HUD CoC resources can be combined to complete funding for CES
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Coordinated Entry System**

- The NOFA and HUD CoC Committees Recommend
  - The CoC invite a proposal for operating Coordinated Entry of between $500,000 and $1,000,000.
  - **Required proposal elements would include**
    - Operation of the Call Center
    - Ability to conduct assessments with a comprehensive standardized tool in all 5 regions of the County
  - **Optional elements could include**
    - Income services in all HUBS
    - Additional housing navigation
    - Additional street outreach
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Coordinated Entry System**

- **Pros of Inviting a Coordinated Entry Proposal**
  - Would ensure required elements of CES are funded
  - Would make our CoC application more competitive
  - Would draw funds from the funder requiring CES
  - Can modify proposal during technical submission depending on how local funding lines up over the next 6-9 months

- **Cons of the added Reallocation Policy**
  - Would need to be funded with Reallocated Funds
  - Not sure who the applicant would be
  - The initial design approved by Board is very broad and may not be enough detail to develop a proposal this year that meets HUD’s threshold and our needs
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

Current Performance Criteria

- This is the first year that we will have access to the Systemwide Performance Reports using the HUD metrics and benchmarks.
- 10 points can be added to our score for the inclusion of these reports.
- In 2015 our CoC scored 5 of 13 points for how we used performance criteria for project rating and ranking.
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

Current Performance Criteria

HUD lists the following as potential criteria for rating and ranking of projects (pg 37):

1. Increased housing stability
2. Exit destination—includes returns to homelessness
3. Increasing income
4. Connecting participants to mainstream benefits
5. Utilization rates
6. Length of Time Homeless (Length of Stay)
7. Timely submission s of APRs
8. Timely draws from LOCCS
9. Participant Eligibility
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Current Performance Criteria**

- The local process already measures criteria 1-4—need to modify according to the new data points from HUD
- HUD NOFA Committee will make the following adjustments to the Rating and Ranking Criteria in 2016:
  1. Continue to score criteria 1-4 and update the measures to use HUD tools rather than local measures
  2. Develop a way to score criteria 5-8 in the local applications
  3. Will not score participant eligibility until project monitoring is developed
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

**Transitional Housing: Confirming Consensus from last Community Meeting**

- We need Transitional Housing because of our large unsheltered population, but want to use it differently:
  - Shorter stays; no barriers to entry; housing first; services minimal, voluntary, and focused on getting residents housed as quickly as possible
  - Still value the more classic transitional housing approach for youth

- Want to reduce/eliminate “project type” score difference for TH versus other activities such as RRH and PSH

- Want to score TH based on how their performance contributes to improving overall system performance (Option #3)

- Want to advocate to HUD to design the CoC NOFA such that it makes room for this approach to site-based TH
3. Community Input: Options for TH in HUD package

*Transitional Housing: feedback for NOFA Committee on possible scoring approach to option #3*

- In order for non-youth serving TH programs to earn full points for some performance measures they would need to exceed CoCs average/median performance or meet HUD benchmarks. Examples:
  - Length of Stay: System average = 176 days. Full points would go to TH programs with average stays shorter than 176 days.
  - Exits to Permanent Housing = HUD benchmark is 80%. Full points would go to TH programs exceeding that
3. Community Input: Strategic Questions

Project Ranking in Tier 1

- Historically, all reallocated and bonus projects have been placed in Tier 2, with only renewing projects in Tier 1.
- In the 2016 round, should the community consider putting reallocated and/or bonus projects in Tier 1?
  - What are the benefits or risks to doing so?
3. Community Input

F. Guiding Principles

Guiding Principles were developed by the NOFA Committee and affirmed by the Leadership Board and the Community in each NOFA round. The most recent of these are below.

The 2015 NOFA Committee’s Guiding Principles

- Maximize the resources available to the community;
- Prioritize protecting programs in which people reside;
- Keep the renewal process as simple as possible;
- Continue to emphasize project performance and the submission of projects that will meet HUD’s thresholds;
- Support individual projects seeking to reallocate or reclassify where relevant;
- Facilitate a clear, fair, and transparent local process.
3. Community Input

F. Guiding Principles

- Are these principles still the right ones for our community?
- Are these still in line with what we want and need to prioritize?
- Does the community think there are principles we need to add, or take away?
- What adjustments do people want to see?
4. Next Steps

- Survey will go up on the website for additional feedback.
- HUD CoC will use all the feedback to arrive at a strategic direction for the NOFA Committee.
- HUD CoC will report out to community a summary of the feedback including areas of agreement and difference, and rationale for conclusions reached.
- Strategies will be published on the EveryOne Home website.
- The NOFA Committee will develop the local application, supported by EveryOne Home staff.
- Local Application will be released at a Bidders’ Conference on July 19th, 2016, 1:30-4:00 p.m. at Public Hearing Room 224 W. Winton Avenue, Hayward, CA.
Questions?

Email EveryOne Home at info@everyonehome.org
visit the HUD NOFA page on the website:
http://everyonehome.org/our-work/hud-coc-nofa/
## 2015 Local Application Scoring Criteria

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>
| **Primary Activity type** – 16 Points maximum | □ Permanent Housing (PH) = 16 Points  
□ Transitional Housing = 8 Points  
□ All other SSO = 0 Points |
| **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 with 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 |
| **Using Housing First Approach** = 6 Points maximum | Narrative up to 6 points as determined by application scorers. |
| **Outcome Performance** – 38 Points maximum | See Sector Specific Benchmarks and Self Scoring Charts on the following pages. |
| **Spending** = 12 Points maximum | □ Had no unexpended funds in the last grant year = 12 Points  
□ Had unexpended funds in the last grant year of greater than 5% of grant amount and is voluntarily reducing grant to expended amount = 12 Points  
□ Had unexpended funds in the last grant year and has provided a reasonable explanation (as determined by application scorers) = up to 12 Points—Narratives with detailed explanation and strategies to reduce under-spending will be awarded more points. |
| **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 |
| **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 |
| **Quality Assurance** = 12 Points maximum | Narrative up to 12 points as determined by application scorers. This section now requires projects to submit their full audits. |
| **Completeness** = up to 3 Points maximum | Maximum points will be awarded if application is complete and all questions relevant to the project are answered. |
# Transitional Housing Specific Outcomes Measures

Total points available = 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A | Obtains Permanent Housing | 80% | □ Meets or exceeds local benchmark* = 16 Points  
□ Is within 5 percentage points of the local benchmark = 12 Points  
□ Is within 10 percentage points of the local benchmark = 8 Points  
□ Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points |
| B | Of those adults entering with no income, % who obtain some income | 30% of leavers and stayers | □ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 9 Points  
□ Is within 10 percentage points of local benchmark = 6 Points  
□ Is within 15 percentage points of local benchmark= 3 Points  
□ Is > 15 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points |
| C | Obtains or Maintains non-cash Mainstream Benefits | 56% leavers and stayers | □ Meets or exceeds HUD benchmark = 9 Points  
□ Is within 5 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 6 Points  
□ Is within 10 percentage points of HUD benchmark = 3 Points  
□ Is > 10 percentage points below the local benchmark = 0 Points |
| D | Exits to Homelessness | <20% | □ Meets or exceeds local benchmark = 4 Points  
□ Is within 5% of local benchmark = 2 Points  
□ Is within 10% of local benchmark = 1 Point  
□ Is > 10% above local benchmark = 0 Points |

*having made a 10 percentage point improvement over the previous year is also considered to have met the local benchmark.
## Transitional Housing Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Treat Transitional Housing as we have in past rounds – where it will lose points for project type and meeting HUD priorities, means maximum TH program score = 84. Utilize the same performance criteria as in the 2013 and 2015 rounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Automatically place Transitional Housing in Tier 1 so it is not at risk while local funds are secured to support it as interim housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjust the performance criteria by which TH is evaluated so that it too could score up to 100 points. Criteria could include length of stay (4 months or less); % of clients served directly from the streets; exits to PH; cost per PH exit; others...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which approach do you favor and why?

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
Analysis of County Continuum of Care Awards Since 2012

**HUD NOFA 2015 Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td>$26,325,202</td>
<td>$26,208,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Reallocated</td>
<td>$948,202</td>
<td>$897,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Bonus</td>
<td>$4,091,009</td>
<td>$1,191,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$31,364,412</td>
<td>$28,980,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All but one renewal was funded
- Rental assistance projects were awarded at lower amounts because HUD lowered the 2015 FMRs
- Two of the three new projects proposed using reallocated funds were awarded.
- Two of four bonus applications were funded.
- First ever CoC Planning grant awarded to strengthen HMIS and CoC Lead.

**HUD CoC Program Awards 2012-2015**
### Impacts on the System of Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defunded Projects</th>
<th>Decreases in TH</th>
<th>Converted to PH non-CoC funded</th>
<th>New or Converted CoC Funded PH</th>
<th>Total Increases in PH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Laguna Commons 8 PSH</td>
<td>8 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$870k Goodwill employment services and $486k Boss SSO</td>
<td>47 Linkages</td>
<td>Linkages Converts to RRH 47; Welcome Home 29 PSH; NC Family RRH 22</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Boss SSO $544k</td>
<td>Pacheco Court 10 units, 26 beds</td>
<td>Pacheco Court 10 units 26 beds</td>
<td>Welcome Home SL 25 PSH</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Harrison House TH 9 units 26 beds</td>
<td>Housing Stabilization 14 units; BBC 22 units 3 BOSS projects totaling 47 units</td>
<td>BCC 12 units</td>
<td>Hsng Stblztn 14 RRH; BCC 10 PSH; 3 BOSS projects to PSH 47; Homes for Wellness 38 PSH; Redwood Hill 4 PSH; NC youth RRH 45</td>
<td>170 units/slots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>140 units</td>
<td>22 units</td>
<td>289 units</td>
<td>311 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Continuum of Care Application Score between 2013 and 2015

**2013 Total Score = 118.75/156 = 76%**
- CoC Coordination & Engagement = 24/28
- Housing and Services Structure = 12.25/13
- HMIS = 10.5/11
- Point in Time Count 8/9
- Strategic Planning & Performance = 49.5/69
- Bonus Pts = 4/6

**2015 Total Score = 164.25/203 = 81%**
- CoC Coordination & Engagement = 43.75/55
- System Performance = 74.5/98
- HMIS = 24/27
- Accessing Mainstream Benefits = 18.5/19
- Leveraging = 0.5/1
- Bonus Pts. = 3/3