

County of Riverside Continuum of Care (CoC)



Board of Governance (BoG) Meeting
July 27, 2017 | 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
County of Riverside DPSS Office
7894 Mission Grove Parkway S, Ste. 100
Riverside, CA 92508

Steve Falk, Chairperson

Leticia DeLara, Vice-chairperson

**Teleconference
Access:
866.918.2296
Code: 8752316**

1. **Call to Order:** Welcome & Introductions – Roll Call (Sign off)
2. **Minutes Approval:**
 - a. June 15, 2017
3. **Public comment:** Members of the Public are encouraged to address the Board. Anyone who wishes to speak must submit a comment request card to the board clerk. Each speaker should begin by identifying themselves for the record and is allowed up to three minutes.
4. **New Business:**
 - a. **2017 HUD CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)**

Joe Colletti, Consultant

The 2017 HUD CoC Program NOFA was released on July 14, 2017. Dr. Joe Colletti, CEO of Urban Initiatives and who has served as a consultant to DPSS on the annual HUD CoC Program application for the past several years, will provide an update on the NOFA.

- b. **2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel July 12 meeting update**

Angelina Coe, IRP Chair

5. **Old Business:**

- a. **2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel recommendations (tabled from June 15):**

Angelina Coe, IRP Chair

The recommendations made by the 2017 HUD Independent Review Panel (IRP) were on the agenda of the June 15 BoG meeting for approval; however, they were tabled so the BoG could review additional information and based on written concerns and public comments made by agencies that have projects recommended for reallocation. The BoG requested a second BoG workshop (held on July 13) to provide additional information about the HUD application review and ranking process that is in place.

The review panel recommends to **reallocate or reduce the following renewal projects:**

a-1. Motion: *Reallocate the full amount of funding for the U.S. Vets CHAMPS Permanent Supportive Housing project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$375,292, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application.*

Public comment on this item only.

a-2. Motion: *Reallocate the full amount of funding for the Housing Authority Consolidated All County I and II project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$510,304, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application.*

Public comment on this item only.

a-3. Motion: *Reallocate the full amount of funding for the City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing Project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$229,728, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the 2017 application.*

Public comment on this item only.

a-4. Motion: *Reallocate the full amount of funding for the City of Riverside Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) for the Disabled in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance and a finding by HUD related to a Housing Quality Standards (HQS) violation. The funding for this project, \$123,556, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the 2017 application.*

Public comment on this item only.

a-5. Motion (amended from June 15): *The board accepts the Riverside University Health System-Behavioral Health's request to rescind the Letter of Intent to renew the RUHS-BH Rapid Rehousing Project and reallocate the full amount of funding for the project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on the agency's intent to not renew the project. The funding for this project, \$142,117, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application.*

A letter stating the request to rescind the project's intent to renew is included on page 13 of this agenda.

Public comment on this item only.

a-6. Motion: *Reallocate \$20,000 from the Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing project due to a history of unspent funds for this project. The funding will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application. The motion passed unanimously.*

Public comment on this item only.

The review panel recommends to **prioritize projects types to be included in a local Request for Proposal for new projects** to be included in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application is as follows:

a-7. Motion: *Include the following project types in a local Request for Proposal: new Permanent supportive housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth; and a Dedicated Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) project that will allow an expansion of the current HMIS renewal grant.*

Public comment on this item only.

**b. Board of Governance meeting frequency and formation of Executive Committee:
Discussion only**

Steve Falk, BoG Chair

c. VASH Data in HMIS: Update (tabled from June 15)

Jill Kowalski, DPSS

At the March 16 Board of Governance meeting, DPSS presented on the status of bed coverage in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). It was reported that the overall coverage for Permanent Supportive Housing beds (as reported in the 2016 HUD CoC Program Application) was only 41% because a majority of housing vouchers for veterans (called VASH) were not being input into the system.

Since the meeting, the Housing Authority has dedicated significant resources to input the data. A more detailed update is included as a staff report.

6. BOG Member Comments

7. Call for Agenda Items for Next Meeting:

- a. **Motion:** *Approve new projects to be included in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application with any funding created through reallocation and for the PSH bonus award available for Riverside County. The Independent Review Panel will meet on August 2 to formulate recommendations for new projects and the PSH bonus project(s) based on the guidelines of the 2017 HUD CoC Program NOFA (released on July 14).*
- b. **Motion:** *Rank the 2017 renewal projects in Tier 1 in order of performance based on the project score. In the case of a tie, the project with the least amount of findings will be ranked above the other.*
- c. Presentation by Inland Empire Health Plan (IEHP) on a proposed housing strategy partnership with the Continuum of Care.

Public comment on this item only.

8. **Next Meeting:** The next scheduled meeting is **August 17, 2017**, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m. at 901 E. Ramsey Street Banning, CA 92220 (Conference Room 1).

9. Adjournment

**Board of Governance Meeting
July 27, 2017
Locations of board members who are teleconferencing**

The following Board of Governance members have confirmed they will call-in to the meeting from the locations indicated:

Board Member:

Call-in Location:

None

**Board of Governance Meeting
July 27, 2017**

Item 4a. 2017 HUD CoC Program Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA)

Subject: The 2017 HUD CoC Program NOFA was released on July 14, 2017. Dr. Joe Colletti, CEO of Urban Initiatives and who has served as a consultant to DPSS on the annual HUD CoC Program application for the past several years, will provide an update on the NOFA.

Contact: Jill Kowalski, Manager, DPSS Homeless Programs Unit (JKowalsk@RIVCO.org).

2017 HUD CoC Program NOFA highlights:

- \$10,978,453 equals 2017 ***Preliminary Pro Rata Need*** (based on CDBG formula)
- Formula includes “several measures of community need, including the extent of poverty, population, housing overcrowding, age of housing, and population growth lag in relationship to other metropolitan areas.”

- \$9,596,126 equals 2017 ***Annual Renewal Demand***
 - The amount equals the total request of 26 renewal applications;
 - A renewal project has to have its current contract expire in 2018;
 - A total funding request cannot exceed its current contract amount.

- \$9,020,358 equals ***Tier 1 amount***
 - The amount is 94% of Preliminary Pro Rata Need as required by HUD
 - a. \$575,768 equals Tier 2 amount, which is the HUD required 6% of Annual Renew Demand
 - The amount is 6% of Preliminary Pro Rata Need as required by HUD

- \$658,707 equals ***Permanent Housing Bonus amount***
 - The amount is 6% of Preliminary Pro Rata Need as required by HUD

- \$329,354 equals ***Planning Grant*** amount
 - The amount is 3% of Preliminary Pro Rata Need as required by HUD
 - Only the Collaborative Applicant can apply for these funds.

Total potential funding: \$10,584,187

- Equals total potential funding (Tier 1, Tier 2, Permanent Housing Bonus, and Planning Grant)

What's New in the NOFA?

- A CoC must have a CoC-wide anti-discrimination policy regarding the needs of LGBT individuals to receive maximum points in related subsection of the application;

- The grants to be awarded under this NOFA will be the first CoC Program grants that will be required to comply with the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and a CoC must establish an emergency transfer plan under 24 CFR 578.7(d) and make related updates to the written standards for administering CoC program assistance.

- **DedicatedPLUS Project**
 - A renewal project where 100 percent of the beds were dedicated to chronically homeless individuals and families, as described in Section III.A.3.b., under the grant that is being renewed may either become a DedicatedPLUS project or may continue to dedicate 100 percent of its beds to chronically homeless individuals and families
 - A permanent supportive housing project where 100 percent of the beds are dedicated to serve individuals with disabilities and families in which one adult or child has a disability including unaccompanied homeless youth, that at intake are:
 - Chronically homeless
 - residing in a transitional housing project that will be eliminated and meets the definition of chronically homeless
 - residing in a place not meant for human habitation, emergency shelter, or safe haven; but the individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness as defined at 24 CFR 578.3 had been admitted and enrolled in a permanent housing project within the last year and were unable to maintain a housing placement

**Board of Governance Meeting
July 27, 2017**

Item 4b: 2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel July 12 meeting update

Subject: The Independent Review Panel met on July 12 to review projects submitted in the local Request for Proposal for new projects to be included in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application. Review Panel Chair Angelina Coe will give a brief presentation on the conditional applications that were approved by the panel.

Contact: Jill Kowalski, Manager, DPSS Homeless Programs Unit (JKowalsk@RIVCO.org).

From the July 12 Independent Review Panel meeting summary (attached):

1. Review and discuss new project applications

The IRP reviewed a summary of the applications received for new funding. Since the 2017 HUD NOFA has not been released yet, the panel reviewed the projects and made a recommendation to the Board of Governance based on conditional approval.

The following agencies responded to the local RFP (also see the attached summary):

- Jewish Family Services:
 - Requested \$586,460 for 20 units/ 24 beds of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.
- Lighthouse Social Services:
 - Requested \$334,452 for 15 units of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.
- Path of Life Ministries:
 - Requested \$597,559 for 31 units/36 beds of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.
- Step Up On Second:
 - Requested \$605,101 for 33 units/33 beds of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.

Three proposals were not considered because they did not pass the initial threshold review. They are:

- Housing Authority of the County of Riverside:
 - Requested \$220,897 for 13 units/beds of PSH. The application submitted by the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) did not pass the threshold review for the following reasons:
 - The application submitted was incomplete based on the following:
 - Did not present requested items in index tabs ordered A through I (as required in DPARC-546 Section 6.0 Terms and Conditions "General Proposal Submittal").
 - Did not provide subcontract agreement details as instructed on page 39, Tab E Question 19 of DPARC-546 Attachment A.
 - Did not provide a match amount or evidence of a match in the budget form or narrative (In Attachment A: page 44, Tab H Cost Proposal; page. 45 H-1 Cost proposal Line Item Services Table; and page 46 H-2 budget narrative).
 - Did not provide the following attachments:
 - Credentials and Resumes (no resumes/credentials were attached as indicated in Attachment A, page 17, Question #13 Credentials/Resumes/Certifications/Licenses)

- SAM Registration: Attachment A, page 18, Question 14. System for Award Management (SAM) states: “If this Request for Proposal is Federally or State funded, bidder’s must go to the following website and submit with their proposal that the contractor is not listed on the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov> for:
 - Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
 - Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
 - Online Representations and Certifications Application
 - Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

- Lutheran Social Services:
 - Submitted two proposals:
 - Requested \$458,803 in PSH bonus funds for 16 units/46 beds. The application did not pass threshold review and was not considered due to the following:
 - SAM Registration was not attached: As stated in Attachment A of the RFP (page 18), Question 14: System for Award Management (SAM) states: “If this Request for Proposal is Federally or State funded, bidder’s must go to the following website and submit with their proposal that the contractor is not listed on the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov> for:
 - Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
 - Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
 - Online Representations and Certifications Application
 - Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

 - Requested \$458,803 in new reallocated funds for PSH for 16 units/46 beds. The application did not pass threshold review and was not considered due to the following:
 - SAM Registration was not attached: As stated in Attachment A of the RFP (page 18), Question 14: System for Award Management (SAM) states: “If this Request for Proposal is Federally or State funded, bidder’s must go to the following website and submit with their proposal that the contractor is not listed on the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov> for:
 - Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
 - Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
 - Online Representations and Certifications Application
 - Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

A motion was made and seconded that the Housing Authority and Lutheran Social Services did not complete/submit required documents to pass RFP threshold. The IRP voted: Yay=5; Absent=2.

The IRP reviewed the remaining proposals and, since all of the applicants are currently receiving HUD CoC Program funding, the panel discussed the strengths, capacity and performance of the proposals and agencies. The panel decided that all four applications could be conditionally recommended for funding but they decided to rank the projects based on these factors.

The IRP voted to conditionally recommend the Board of Governance approve the projects in order of priority based on the amount of funding available through reallocated and/or PSH bonus funds:

1. Jewish Family Services: \$586,460 proposing 20 units of PSH. The IRP agreed JFS should have first priority for funding based on current performance and because this is the first time the agency has applied for new funding.
2. Step Up on 2nd: \$605,101 proposing 33 units of PSH. The IRP cited the cost effectiveness of the proposal and Step Up's capacity and track record in other areas as strengths.
3. Lighthouse Social Services Center: \$334,452 proposing 15 units. The IRP ranked Lighthouse third due to capacity in obtaining match (which has been resolved).
4. Path of Life: \$597,559 proposing 31 units. POLM was ranked last because of capacity (the current number of projects they have and because they are returning money in two projects).

While the new projects are ranked, the IRP voted to include all four applications in the 2017 NOFA if funding allows (contingent upon the yet to be released NOFA). The IRP voted: Yay= 5; Absent= 2.

The IRP agreed to meet on **August 2** to continue to formulate recommendations for the items below that had to be tabled because the 2017 NOFA has not been released:

2. Recommend new projects to be included in the CoC Consolidated Application:
 - Reallocated Amount
 - Permanent Supportive Housing Bonus (pending release of NOFA)

Tabled until the BoG meets on July 27, 2017

3. Complete Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranking
Tabled until the BoG meets on July 27, 2017

4. Other Matters: The Review panel scheduled two more meetings for August 2, 2017 and August 30, 2017 (only if the 2017 NOFA has not yet been released by August 2).

**Board of Governance Meeting
July 27, 2017**

Item 5a1 through 5a7: 2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel recommendations

Subject: The recommendations made by the 2017 HUD Independent Review Panel (IRP) were on the agenda of the June 15 BoG meeting for approval; however, they were tabled so the BoG could review additional information and based on written concerns and public comments made by agencies that have projects recommended for reallocation. The BoG requested a second BoG workshop (held on July 13) to provide additional information about the HUD application review and ranking process that is in place.

Contact: Jill Kowalski, Manager, DPSS Homeless Programs Unit (JKowalsk@RIVCO.org).

July 12 Independent Review Panel (IRP) meeting summary (attached):

At the June 15 BoG meeting, the recommendations made by the 2017 HUD Independent Review Panel were tabled so the Board could further review the process on how projects are evaluated for performance, ranked and recommended for reallocation.

The BoG voted to hold a special workshop prior to the next meeting on July 27 to learn more about the review process and all of the documentation reviewed and considered by the Independent Review Panel in developing the recommendations. These documents include (but are not limited to):

- Performance scorecard
- Monitoring reports
- Agency responses to both the scorecard and the monitoring reports
- History of project spending; and
- Responses to agencies prepared in coordination with the Independent Review Panel.

Jill Kowalski asked the IRP to consider reducing the Housing Authority All County I/II grant rather than reallocate the entire amount. This was after providing an update on the June 15 Board of Governance meeting when the Director of the Housing Authority spoke during the public comment period.

One panel member asked if the BoG specifically asked/directed the IRP to reconsider the recommendations made so far. The BoG did not ask the IRP to review or reconsider their recommendations (on June 15), so the IRP agreed that they would not change any of their recommendations. The panel members agreed not to make any changes to the recommendations and motions for the July 27 meeting.

The IRP also responded specifically to the request by the Housing Authority to reduce the grant rather than reallocate the full amount. The response was: *"The BOG did not request to reconsider any motions so we will not move forward with the Housing Authority's request."* The IRP members said the BoG may amend any of the recommendations made by the panel if they wish.

The IRP re-reviewed the scorecard for projects that were recommended for reallocation and, based on the review and the written concerns and responses made, they did not recommend any project scores be changed.

The IRP also discussed whether they should allow agencies that are recommended for reallocation to present to the panel. At this time, the IRP does not allow this; however, they will reconsider next year.

The NOFA has not been published by HUD.

Staff reports from the June 15 BoG meeting agenda (for reference):

DPSS sent the completed scorecards for each renewal project on May 9. Written responses with concerns about the scorecards were submitted by the following agencies: RUHS-BH, Housing Authority and Path of Life. The review panel reviewed the concerns and discussed with DPSS staff who drafted a response on behalf of the review panel. The review panel approved the written responses by DPSS and they were emailed to each agency on May 17.

The review panel received an email stating concerns about the scorecard from Lighthouse Social Services on May 12. The concerns were discussed by the panel and DPSS provided a response on May 19 (attached).

The review panel reviewed the following documents to determine if any projects should be reallocated or reduced: Project Scorecard matrix, unspent funds, monitoring findings (serving ineligible clients, HQS compliance) and specifically, projects that did not meet threshold (score = 90).

At the May 17 meeting, the review panel recommended to reallocate the following renewal projects:

Reallocate the full amount of funding for the U.S. Vets CHAMPS Permanent Supportive Housing project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$375,292, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application.

Reallocate the full amount of funding for the Housing Authority Consolidated All County I and II project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$510,304, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application.

Reallocate the full amount of funding for the City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing Project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$229,728, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the 2017 application.

Reallocate the full amount of funding for the City of Riverside Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) for the Disabled in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance and a finding by HUD related to a Housing Quality Standards (HQS) violation. The funding for this project, \$123,556, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the 2017 application.

June 7 Review Panel meeting:

DPSS received written responses to monitoring reports from four agencies: City of Riverside, Housing Authority, U.S. Vets and RUHS-BH. The responses were emailed to the review panel members and discussed during the meeting. DPSS staff provided an initial analysis of each response and is still reviewing the documents submitted with the responses. The panel focused its review on the projects that had been recommended for reallocation due to the timing of the BOG meeting on June 15.

Based on the review of the monitoring responses, the review panel did not change any of the recommendations for reallocation.

During the discussion of the sub-recipient responses, the review panel considered several factors, including:

- Whether any finding(s) could be removed: in the case of all of the agencies with findings, there was more than one finding for each project. A project may receive 5 points for no findings; and 0 points

if there is one or more finding. The following description of a concern vs. finding was provided in written responses by DPSS and the review panel:

DPSS follows HUD monitoring guidelines for sub-recipients. When a monitoring visit is conducted, any issues that are found are initially addressed as concerns and discussed with the sub-recipient during an exit interview. If the issues cited as concerns are not corrected in subsequent monitoring visits, they become findings. The exception for when an initial concern is immediately elevated to a finding is if there is a violation of HUD regulations. This would be the case in any Housing Quality Standards (HQS) and/or ineligible clients being served. The monitoring reports with findings are due to concerns cited in previous reports not being addressed.

In the case of the sub-recipients with findings, there were concerns documented in at least two consecutive years prior to becoming a finding.

The review panel also noted that of the 20 renewal projects reviewed, eight (8) projects had no monitoring findings; and another nine (9) projects had findings, but scored higher in other areas to receive a higher score threshold. The score is based on multiple metrics and not just the monitoring reports.

The review panel also contended that all of the findings for each project would need to be removed to receive the full 5 points. They did not find this to be the case based on the responses and documentation provided by the agencies impacted.

The review panel recommendation to the BOG on June 15 remains unchanged.

The review panel also continued to review information to evaluate the following:

- **Review unspent funds**: the panel reviewed the report from DPSS fiscal staff on the history of funding (attached) for each project (dating back 3 years or more) and whether there were unspent funds. Based on this analysis, the review panel made the following recommendation:

Reallocate \$20,000 from the Riverside University Health System - Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing project due to a history of unspent funds for this project. The funding will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application. The motion passed unanimously.

The review panel also discussed the significant amount of funding that is projected by DPSS fiscal staff to be left unspent in two Path of Life RRH projects. The projections, based on an analysis of spending to date, is:

- POL RRH (year 2): \$120,000 projected to be unspent
- POL RRH East County (year 1): \$185,000 projected to be unspent

The panel did not make a recommendation to reallocate unspent funds on these two projects because they are in their first or second year; however, this will be reviewed again next year and if there are unspent funds, they will be recommended for reallocation. DPSS staff has reached out to Path of Life and asked them to consider voluntarily giving back unspent funds to the CoC (before a recommendation is made to reallocate). DPSS will follow up with Path of Life to encourage them to voluntarily give back any unspent funds in the 2017 HUD NOFA.

Riverside University Health System –Behavioral Health (RUHS-BH) Rapid Rehousing Project:

The motion was amended based on a letter received by RUHS-BH on July 21 requesting to rescind their intent to renew the project (see attached letter):

a-5. Motion (amended from June 15): *The board to accept the Riverside University Health System-Behavioral Health’s request to rescind the Letter of Intent to renew the RUHS-BH Rapid Rehousing Project and reallocate the full amount of funding for the project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on the agency’s intent to not renew the project. The funding for this project, \$142,117, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application.*

A letter from RUHS-BH stating the request to rescind the project’s intent to renew was received on July 21 and is attached to this agenda. The letter states:

“After consideration of the recently released NOFA and HUD grant criteria, our Continuum of Care’s needs, the current needs of the families we serve in our community and the limited ability to rapidly fill the Rapid Re-Housing Grant, Riverside University Health System - Behavioral Health (RUHS-BH) is withdrawing our Letter of Intent to apply for grant funding for this grant in the current HUD NOFA.

RUHS-BH has determined that this is in the best interest of the Continuum of Care programs and the individuals living on the streets in our community, as well as those our department serves, to have these funds identified in the CoC for other Permanent Supportive Housing.

5.a7: Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Expansion Request

The Review Panel also considered the following information in making its recommendation to use reallocated funding to support an expansion grant for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application.

Rationale: In 2001, Congress directed the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to provide data and analysis on the extent and nature of homelessness and the effectiveness of the McKinney Act Programs. HUD began requiring communities to implement Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) 15 years ago.

Per HUD, to end homelessness, communities must be able to analyze data at both the system and project levels and to evaluate their efforts by subpopulation, across project types, and in other ways. Not only must communities continue increasing HMIS bed coverage and improving data quality, they also should be using data to gain a more holistic picture of the communities' progress toward ending homelessness.

HMIS Lead Agency: The County of Riverside Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) is the designated HMIS Lead agency and has the "responsibility to establish, support and manage HMIS in a manner that will meet HUD's standards for data quality, privacy, security, and other requirements for organizations participating in HMIS." DPSS responsibilities include:

- Grant Administration requirements
- Reporting requirements for HUD CoC and ESG programs as well as other federal partners like Health and Human Services (HHS) and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)
- Training and technical support
- Monitoring and ensuring good data quality
- Generating data necessary for CoC application
- Customized reports as required by the BoG, CoC and HMIS Council

The County of Riverside CoC HMIS has received funding in the amount of \$344,072 that currently supports three full time staff:

- 2 - Administrative Services Analyst II
- 1 - Administrative Assistant I

In addition to supporting these staff positions, the HMIS grant also supports administrative costs for DPSS fiscal staff to processes claims and costs to contract with our HMIS vendor, Eccovia (formerly Client Track) to provide user licenses, software, upgrades, set up, etc. Attached is a comparison of HMIS staffing in other CoC's in Southern California.

Since 2012, there has not been an increase in funding to HMIS. Based on the 2017 HUD CoC Program Registration, HUD will allow reallocated funding to be used for HMIS expansion. This is a "window" that is not always available from year-to-year.

HMIS Data: The use of HMIS has expanded to include not just HUD CoC and ESG programs but other federal programs for the following agencies: Dept. of Veterans' Affairs (like VASH, GPD and SSVF), Dept. of Health and Human Services (RHY) and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Agency (SAMSHA). To date, the CoC HMIS has:

- 75 projects
- 147 users
- 6,555 unduplicated clients
- 10 reporting requirements
 - ✓ Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR)
 - ✓ Annual Performance Report (APR)
 - ✓ Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)
 - ✓ Housing Inventory Count (HIC)
 - ✓ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services (SAMHSA) Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH) Annual Report
 - ✓ Point in Time Count (PIT)
 - ✓ Runaway Homeless Youth (RHY)
 - ✓ Supportive Services for Veteran and Families (SSVF)
 - ✓ System Performance Measures (SPM)

Budget Request: Through the years, there has been increasing demands to use data and ensure data quality. Every year, the CoC Program Competition continues to increase the role of system-level performance, and encourage communities to use their data for local decision making. DPSS is requesting funding for an HMIS System Administrator that is highly skilled/technical to function as the HMIS Administrator responsible for software maintenance, system upgrade/changes and the overall security and privacy of the system. This position will also assist in the implementation of the Coordinated Entry System in HMIS.

It is important to note that this position – because of the high level of technical skills needed – must be contracted by the Riverside County Information Technology (RCIT) department. DPSS will contract with RCIT for this position to be 100% dedicated to HMIS.

Below is a break-out of the budget request for the HMIS Expansion.

- Business Systems Analyst III - \$153,348 (a portion of this position is also paid by the Planning Grant)
 - Additional cost for Eccovia - \$ 25,000*
- Total = \$178,348**

*The additional cost for Eccovia is requested to cover an increase in the service contract that includes user license fees, database maintenance, etc.

Board of Governance Meeting June 27, 2017

Item 5c: HUD VASH data in HMIS

Subject: At the request of the Board of Governance, an update is provided about the progress by the Housing Authority to input data for veteran clients receiving housing vouchers through the HUD VASH program into the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).

Contact: Jill Kowalski, Manager, DPSS Homeless Programs Unit (JKowalsk@RIVCO.org).

Background: At the March 16 Board of Governance meeting, DPSS presented as part of an overview of the 2016 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application the low bed coverage in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). It was reported that the overall coverage for Permanent Supportive Housing beds in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Application was only 41% because a majority of housing vouchers for veterans (called Veterans Administration Supportive Housing (VASH) were not being input into the system by the Housing Authority.

Since the meeting, the Housing Authority has dedicated significant resources to this effort and the following progress has been made to date:

A report from HMIS shows the following:

- There are currently **543** active HUD/VASH clients in HMIS as of 6/9/17 (a total of **388** households).
- On the 2017 Housing Inventory Chart (HIC), the point in time count is **756**. In the 2016 HIC, there were only **286** VASH clients entered in HMIS.
- **383** of the HUD/VASH clients were entered into HMIS in 2017 between January and May. In April, the Housing Authority dedicated staff to work weekends and evenings to input 247 VASH clients into HMIS!

The Housing Authority has also conducted an broad scale outreach effort to try and reach veterans who are missing data in HMIS so the data can be collected and entered into HMIS.

In the 2016 HUD CoC Program Application, our bed coverage was just 41% due to the VASH vouchers not being in HMIS (see below).

2C-2. 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.

Project Type	Total Beds in 2016 HIC	Total Beds in HIC Dedicated for DV	Total Beds in HMIS	HMIS Bed Coverage Rate
Emergency Shelter (ESG) beds	756	120	594	93.40%
Safe Haven (SH) beds	0	0	0	
Transitional Housing (TH) beds	334	0	334	100.00%
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) beds	292	0	292	100.00%
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds	1,538	0	630	40.96%
Other Permanent Housing (OPH) beds	0	0	0	

However, due to the effort by the Housing Authority to input this data, it is estimated that this will go up to about 72% bed coverage – a marked improvement! This will help improve our reporting in both the application and the annual report for HMIS.



Minutes for County of Riverside Continuum of Care Board of Governance (BoG)

June 15, 2017

9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

DPSS: Banning Children/Adult Services
901 E. Ramsey Street Banning, CA 92220

Minutes Recorded and Transcribed by Evelyn Pham, Office Assistant III, DPSS – Homeless Programs Unit

TOPIC	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
1. <u>Call to Order:</u> Welcome & Introductions	Steve Falk, Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. A roll call of the BoG members was conducted. Eric Stopher, Deputy County Counsel for the County of Riverside was in attendance to counsel the Board of Governance.
2. <u>Minutes Approval:</u>	Steve Falk	<i>Motion was made by John Burnard to approve the minutes from March 16, 2017. Ron Vervick seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Yay – 10; Nay – 0; Abstained – 0. Motion carried.</i>
3. <u>Public Comment:</u>	Steve Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve announced public comment cards are available for members of the public to submit a request to speak. The speaker will stand in front of the board to identify themselves and have 3 minutes to address their comment. No public comment.
4. NEW BUSINESS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
<u>4a. 2017 HUD CoC Program Independent Review Panel recommendations</u>	Angelina Coe, Independent Review Panel (IRP) Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Independent Review Panel (IRP) consists of seven non-conflicted members that evaluate and rank project applications for CoC Program funds. Their recommendations for renewals and reallocation will be presented to the Board of Governance members for approval. Angelina Coe gave a brief recap of the 2017 HUD Consolidated CoC Application workshop on June 8. She reiterated HUD’s policy priorities and the importance of reallocation of lower performing projects to ensure our CoC receives the maximum amount of funding from HUD. The threshold for projects that <u>may</u> be recommended by the IRP for reallocation this year was raised from 70 points to 90 points; based on comments made by HUD during the 2016 HUD application debrief webinar where HUD strongly recommends continuing to reallocate lower performing projects to new projects that would be higher performers. <u>Tier process:</u> the purpose of the two-tiered approach (placing projects in Tier 1 and Tier 2), is to indicate to HUD which projects are prioritized for funding. Projects are listed in rank order by scores. The IRP will recommend which projects that fall into Tier 2 should be reallocated for new projects. Angelina summarized the past four Independent Review Panel meetings. The IRP made its recommendations based on documents and data sources that include: Letter of Intent (LOI), submitted by agencies at the beginning of the process; Annual Performance Reports (APRs); project

monitoring reports, fiscal reports, HUD Close-out Reports, HMIS Data, the 2016 Project Application, Housing Quality Standard (HQS) Reports and meeting and training attendance.

- Five agencies submitted concerns based on their scorecard and monitoring results:
 - RUHS – Behavioral Health
 - Housing Authority
 - Path of Life Ministries
 - City of Riverside
 - Lighthouse Social Services
- At the May 10 and May 17 IRP meetings, the members discussed the agency concerns and directed DPSS staff to provide a written response to each agency and inform them of the meeting today. The meeting was also publicly posted and announced as per Brown Act requirements.
- The IRP made six recommendations to reallocate or reduce the following renewal projects:
 - U.S. Vets CHAMPS Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) project, based on low performance, in the full amount of \$375,292
 - Housing Authority Consolidated All County I and II project, based on low performance, in the full amount of \$510,304
 - City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing project, based on low performance, in the full amount of \$229,728
 - City of Riverside Permanent Supportive Housing for the Disabled, based on low performance and a finding by HUD related to a Housing Quality Standards (HQS) violation, in the full amount of \$123,556
 - RUHS Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousing project, based on low performance, in the full amount of \$142,117
 - RUHS Behavioral Health Men’s Permanent Supportive Housing project, reallocate \$20,000 from the project based on a history of unspent funds.
- The Board members had a discussion regarding conflicted members and was directed by Eric Stopher, Deputy County Council, on how to proceed with voting on a motion.

Public Comment was made by Eddie Estrada, U.S. Vets, to urge the Board members not to reallocate funding for the U.S. Vets CHAMPS PSH project. Eddie stated that during their monitoring with DPSS, they were not provided the opportunity to speak in depth with the staff to rectify their findings. Reallocating their funds would displace 25 veterans.

- During discussion, the Board members asked DPSS to provide a thorough explanation of the monitoring process. DPSS responded by stating the monitoring process is the same with all agencies. Before a monitoring visit, the agency is notified in advance of the date and provided with a list of client files DPSS will be auditing. After the files are reviewed, DPSS provides an exit interview with project staff to go over the findings. The agency then has 30 days to provide their response. DPSS

also stated that they provide technical assistance to agencies to ensure they are performing at their best.

- Councilman John Burnard raised a concern with displacing 25 veterans back to the street if U.S. Vets' funds were reallocated. DPSS and Angelina Coe, Independent Review Panel Chair, assured the Board that the veterans will not go back on the streets. After losing funding, there is a year timeframe before the funding actually ends; the CoC and DPSS work collaboratively during this time with other agencies to ensure these clients will move to other housing.
- Joe Colletti of the Institute for Urban Initiatives and a consultant to DPSS emphasized from the 2016 HUD NOFA citation that HUD will continue to fund CoC's that prioritize projects and create new projects through reallocation of lower performing projects.

Motion was made by Leticia DeLara to reallocate the full amount of funding for the U.S. Vets CHAMPS Permanent Supportive Housing project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$375,292, will be reallocated for new projects to be included in the application. John Burnard seconded the motion.
Roll Call Vote: Yay – 9; Nay – 0; Abstained – 1. **Motion carried.**

Public Comment was made by Heidi Marshall, Assistant Director of the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside, to urge the Board not to reallocate their funds. Heidi said taking away their funds would affect the lives of 51 individuals. Her expressed concerns included the following:

- **Unspent funds:** Heidi said the monitoring report cited low spending for the project at 38%. She stated her team fully expects to spend all of the funds in this grant. She said the project is at 100% utilization and that the Housing Authority requests the board consider a reduction of funds rather than reallocation.
- **Individual Service Plans (ISPs):** In regard to the monitoring finding of missing documents for client Individual Service Plans (ISPs), Heidi stated that all clients are receiving these services, however, they are housed at the Department of Behavioral Health because they provide the supportive services.
- **Homeless Participation:** Heidi said the Housing Authority has “proved we have tried” to recruit a homeless/formerly homeless individual for their board but it has been a challenge because they are required to attend frequent board meetings. She asked for some technical assistance to assist the Housing Authority to find homeless clients who would be willing to serve.
- **Corrective Action:** Heidi asked that this be removed from the monitoring report since it was submitted.
- **Lease agreements:** Heidi stated that one (1) out of nine (9) files did not contain the proper lease agreement. She said the households they serve have significant barriers and it is difficult to get landlords to lease for a year. She also remarked that “HUD said you can have month-to-month lease agreements.”

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Annual Performance Reports (APRs): Heidi said that their files indicate an email received on October 28, 2016 requesting information for the APRs received by DPSS and a second email on November 2 that the APRs had been submitted.</i> • <i>HMIS data quality: Heidi said to the board, “we are absolutely guilty of this” when it comes to the findings related to inputting data in HMIS. She said the data quality issues were due to HMIS server upgrades and that all of the information has been provided.</i> <p><i>Heidi emphasized that the Housing Authority is a high performer and has been for the past 13 years. They continually reach their goals and are one of the key agencies that aided in ending veteran homelessness.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During discussion, the Board expressed concern with reallocating the Housing Authority’s funds due to their success rate and asked if they can reduce funding instead. • The Board also raised the question of what percentage does HUD require our annual demand this year to be placed into Tier 2. Since the NOFA is not released yet, the Board asked if they could table these decisions to the next meeting in July. It would be easier for them to make decisions once they have the exact amount of what HUD is requiring to be placed in Tier 2. • DPSS cautioned the Board members of the timeline that once the NOFA is released it will be due in 60-90 days and decisions about reallocated projects and new projects to be included in the application will need to be made quickly. In addition to reallocating funds, the Board members will also have to vote on new projects to be funded in regards to the Request for Proposals (RFP). • The Board members requested to review all documents relating to each agency’s findings and response to concerns before the next meeting to develop a better background before they vote. • Written concerns from the agencies will be provided by DPSS to the Board of Governance members and posted on the DPSS website. • An additional workshop will be held before the next Board of Governance meeting in July to further educate the Board members. Note: The date for the workshop was July 13. <p>Motion was made by Ray Osborne to bring U.S. Vets back to the table to change vote. Ron Vervick seconded the motion. Yay – 10; Nay – 0; Abstained – 0. Motion carried.</p> <p>Motion was made by Ron Vervick to suspend item 4a.) Motion #1-9 to the next Board of Governance meeting on July 27, 2017. John Burnard seconded the motion. Yay – 10; Nay – 0; Abstained – 0. Motion carried.</p>
<p><u>4b. Coordinated Entry System (CES): Presentation by HUD Consultant</u></p>	<p>Margaret McFaddin, HUD Consultant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A handout was provided on Margaret McFadden’s PowerPoint presentation for the Coordinated Entry System (CES).

<u>4c. Board of Governance meeting in July</u>	Steve Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to reschedule the July 20, 2017 Board of Governance meeting. <p>Motion was made by Ron Vervick to approve rescheduling the July Board of Governance to July 27, 2017, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m., due to the board chair, some board members and DPSS staff attending the 2017 National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) annual conference in Washington D.C., John Burnard seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Yay – 10; Nay – 0; Abstained – 0. Motion carried.</p>
<u>4d. Board of Governance meeting frequency and formation of Executive Committee: Discussion only</u>	Steve Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tabled for next meeting.
5. OLD BUSINESS		
<u>5a. VASH Data in HMIS: Update</u>	Jill Kowalski, DPSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tabled for next meeting. Information only.
<u>5b. 2016 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application: Score and HUD debrief: update</u>	Jill Kowalski, DPSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A handout was provided on the 2016 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application scorecard.
<u>5c. 2017 Homeless Point in Time County Report: Information only</u>	Jill Kowalski, DPSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A handout was provided on the 2017 Homeless Point in Time Count Report executive summary and unsheltered population and subpopulation data.
6. BoG MEMBER COMMENTS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
<u>Second HUD Workshop for BOG Members:</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion on dates for a second 2017 HUD CoC Application workshop. A doodle will be sent out to the Board of Governance members to decide on a date that would accommodate the most members.
7. CALL FOR AGENDA ITEMS	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
<u>Next Meeting Agenda Items:</u>	Steve Falk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Panel Recommendations
ADJOURNMENT	PRESENTER	ACTION/ OUTCOME
8. Next meeting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next Board of Governance meeting date is scheduled for July 27, 2017, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m. at 7894 Mission Grove Parkway South, Ste. 100 Riverside, CA 92508
9. Adjournment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m.

Board of Governance – March 16, 2017: Attendance Report

*Chair **Vice Chair

Total members present: 12 of 15

Total guests in attendance: 18

PUBLIC SECTOR	PRESENT (X) TELECONFERENCE (T)	PROXY
Brenda Freeman , Executive Director, Community Action Partnership of Riverside County	T	
Chuck Washington , District 3 Board Supervisor, County of Riverside		
David M. Brown , Chief of Police, Hemet Police Department		
John Burnard , Councilman, City of Riverside	X	
Melissa Conrad , Chief of Social Work Service, VA Loma Linda Healthcare	X	
Steve Steinberg , Director, Riverside University Health System		
PRIVATE SECTOR		
**Leticia DeLara , CEO, Regional Access Project (RAP) Foundation	X	
Tammy Marine , Executive Director, Habitat for Humanity, Inland Valley	X	
Ray Osborne , Executive Director, HomeAid Inland Empire	X	
NON-PROFIT SECTOR		
Angelina Coe , Executive Director, Shelter From The Storm, Inc.	X	
Karyn Young-Lowe , President/Chief Executive Officer, Lighthouse Social Service Centers	X	
*Steve Falk , Director, Community Mission of Hope; Temecula Pantry; HOPE in Elsinore	X	
FORMERLY HOMELESS		
Ron Vervick , Director, Whiteside Manor	X	
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS		
CoC Chair: Michelle Davis , Housing Authority Manager, City of Riverside	X	
Secretary: Jill Kowalski , Manager, County of Riverside, DPSS Homeless Programs	X	

Guests: 18

District 1 Board of Supervisors, County of Riverside Robin Reid
 District 4 Board of Supervisors, County of Riverside Greg Rodriguez
 District 5 Board of Supervisors, County of Riverside Debbie Rose
 Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Cindy Hui
 Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Heidi Marshall
 Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Carrie Harmon
 Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Tanya Torno
 Institute for Urban Initiatives Joe Colletti
 Jewish Family Services of San Diego Becky Ruiz
 Jewish Family Services of San Diego Stephanie Ramos
 Path of Life Ministries Kristii MacEwen
 Riverside Deputy County Counsel Eric Stopher

RUHS – Behavioral Health
 Step up on Second
 TDA Consulting Inc.
 U.S. Vets
 U.S. Vets
 Valley Restart Shelter

DPSS Staff: 3
 Homeless Programs, CoC Planner
 Homeless Programs, CoC Support
 Homeless Programs, CoC Support

Lynne Brockmeier
 Kimberlee Albers
 Margaret McFaddin
 Greg Coffos
 Eddie Estrada
 Susan Larkin

 Donyielle Holley
 Evelyn Pham
 Veronica Ramirez

**County of Riverside Continuum of Care
2017 Continuum of Care Application
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Independent Review Panel (IRP) Meeting**

Wednesday, July 12, 2017 – 12:00 to 3:30 p.m.
DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA

Members in attendance:

Angelina Coe
Frankie Riddle
Steve Falk
Paul Flores
Robin Gilliland
Joe Colletti, Consultant

DPSS staff:
Jill Kowalski
Rowena Concepcion
Linda Salas
Connie Hill
Elizabeth Hernandez
Veronica Ramirez

Members absent:

Sterlon Sims
Lt. Dean Spivacke

Meeting Summary:

1. Update on 2017 HUD NOFA
 - a. Renewal and reallocated projects:
 - i. Board of Governance meeting on June 15: Update
 1. Review current recommendations
2. Feedback/Comments from the BOG meeting
3. Board of Governance Training

At the June 15 BoG meeting, the recommendations made by the 2017 HUD Independent Review Panel were tabled so the Board could further review the process on how projects are evaluated for performance, ranked and recommended for reallocation.

The BoG voted to hold a special workshop prior to the next meeting on July 27 to learn more about the review process and all of the documentation reviewed and considered by the Independent Review Panel in developing the recommendations. These documents include (but are not limited to):

- Performance scorecard
- Monitoring reports
- Agency responses to both the scorecard and the monitoring reports
- History of project spending; and
- Responses to agencies prepared in coordination with the Independent Review Panel.

Jill Kowalski asked the IRP to consider reducing the Housing Authority All County I/II grant rather than reallocate the entire amount. This was after providing an update on the June 15 Board of Governance meeting when the Director of the Housing Authority spoke during the public comment period.

One panel member asked if the BoG specifically asked/directed the IRP to reconsider the recommendations made so far. The BoG did not ask the IRP to review or reconsider their recommendations (on June 15), so the IRP agreed that they would not change any of their recommendations. The panel members agreed not to make any changes to the recommendations and motions for the July 27 meeting.

The IRP also responded specifically to the request by the Housing Authority to reduce the grant rather than reallocate the full amount. The response was: “*The BOG did not request to reconsider any motions so we will not move forward with the Housing Authority’s request.*” The IRP members said the BoG may amend any of the recommendations made by the panel if they wish.

The IRP re-reviewed the scorecard for projects that were recommended for reallocation and, based on the review and the written concerns and responses made, they did not recommend any project scores be changed.

The IRP also discussed whether they should allow agencies that are recommended for reallocation to present to the panel. At this time, the IRP does not allow this, however, they will reconsider next year.

The NOFA has not been published by HUD.

4. Review and discuss new project applications

The IRP reviewed a summary of the applications received for new funding. Since the 2017 HUD NOFA has not been released yet, the panel reviewed the projects and made a recommendation to the Board of Governance based on conditional approval.

The following agencies responded to the local RFP (also see the attached summary):

- Jewish Family Services:
 - Requested \$586,460 for 20 units/ 24 beds of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.
- Lighthouse Social Services:
 - Requested \$334,452 for 15 units of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.
- Path of Life Ministries:
 - Requested \$597,559 for 31 units/36 beds of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.
- Step Up On Second:
 - Requested \$605,101 for 33 units/33 beds of PSH. The application passed all RFP threshold requirements.

Three proposals were not considered because they did not pass the initial threshold review. They are:

- Housing Authority of the County of Riverside:
 - Requested \$220,897 for 13 units/beds of PSH. The application submitted by the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) did not pass the threshold review for the following reasons:
 - The application submitted was incomplete based on the following:

- Did not present requested items in index tabs ordered A through I (as required in DPARC-546 Section 6.0 Terms and Conditions "General Proposal Submittal").
 - Did not provide subcontract agreement details as instructed on page 39, Tab E Question 19 of DPARC-546 Attachment A.
 - Did not provide a match amount or evidence of a match in the budget form or narrative (In Attachment A: page 44, Tab H Cost Proposal; page. 45 H-1 Cost proposal Line Item Services Table; and page 46 H-2 budget narrative).
 - Did not provide the following attachments:
 - Credentials and Resumes (no resumes/credentials were attached as indicated in Attachment A, page 17, Question #13 Credentials/Resumes/Certifications/Licenses)
 - SAM Registration: Attachment A, page 18, Question 14. System for Award Management (SAM) states: "If this Request for Proposal is Federally or State funded, bidder's must go to the following website and submit with their proposal that the contractor is not listed on the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov> for:
 - Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
 - Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
 - Online Representations and Certifications Application
 - Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

- Lutheran Social Services:
 - Submitted two proposals:
 - Requested \$458,803 in PSH bonus funds for 16 units/46 beds. The application did not pass threshold review and was not considered due to the following:
 - SAM Registration was not attached: As stated in Attachment A of the RFP (page 18), Question 14: System for Award Management (SAM) states: "If this Request for Proposal is Federally or State funded, bidder's must go to the following website and submit with their proposal that the contractor is not listed on the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov> for:
 - Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
 - Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
 - Online Representations and Certifications Application
 - Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)
 - Requested \$458,803 in new reallocated funds for PSH for 16 units/46 beds. The application did not pass threshold review and was not considered due to the following:
 - SAM Registration was not attached: As stated in Attachment A of the RFP (page 18), Question 14: System for Award Management (SAM) states: "If this Request for Proposal is Federally or State funded, bidder's must go to the following

website and submit with their proposal that the contractor is not listed on the System for Award Management (SAM) at <https://www.sam.gov> for:

- Central Contractor Registry (CCR)
- Federal Agency Registration (Fedreg)
- Online Representations and Certifications Application
- Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)

A motion was made and seconded that the Housing Authority and Lutheran Social Services did not complete/submit required documents to pass RFP threshold. The IRP voted: Yay=5; Absent=2.

The IRP reviewed the remaining proposals and, since all of the applicants are currently receiving HUD CoC Program funding, the panel discussed the strengths, capacity and performance of the proposals and agencies. The panel decided that all four applications could be conditionally recommended for funding but they decided to rank the projects based on these factors.

The IRP voted to conditionally recommend the Board of Governance approve the projects in order of priority based on the amount of funding available through reallocated and/or PSH bonus funds:

1. Jewish Family Services: \$586,460 proposing 20 units of PSH. The IRP agreed JFS should have first priority for funding based on current performance and because this is the first time the agency has applied for new funding.
2. Step Up on 2nd: \$605,101 proposing 33 units of PSH. The IRP cited the cost effectiveness of the proposal and Step Up's capacity and track record in other areas as strengths.
3. Lighthouse Social Services Center: \$334,452 proposing 15 units. The IRP ranked Lighthouse third due to capacity in obtaining match (which has been resolved).
4. Path of Life: \$597,559 proposing 31 units. POLM was ranked last because of capacity (the current number of projects they have and because they are returning money in two projects).

While the new projects are ranked, the IRP voted to include all four applications in the 2017 NOFA if funding allows (contingent upon the yet to be released NOFA). The IRP voted: Yay= 5; Absent= 2.

The IRP agreed to meet on **August 2** to continue to formulate recommendations for the items below that had to be tabled because the 2017 NOFA has not been released:

5. Recommend new projects to be included in the CoC Consolidated Application:
 - Reallocated Amount
 - Permanent Supportive Housing Bonus (pending release of NOFA)

Tabled until the BoG meets on July 27, 2017

6. Complete Tier 1 and Tier 2 ranking
Tabled until the BoG meets on July 27, 2017

7. Other Matters: The Review panel scheduled two more meetings for August 2, 2017 and August 30, 2017 (only if the 2017 NOFA has not yet been released by August 2).

Agency	RFP Requirements	Does Agency have current CoC Projects? If so, how many?	Project Name	Reallocation/PSH Bonus	Project Type	Project Description Summary	Proposed Population Served	Amount Requested	Rental or Leasing Assistance	Amount for Supportive Services	% of Supportive Services	Amount for Operations	% of Operations	# of Beds	# of Units	# of Clients	Geographic Areas to be served	Housing First	CES	Participants will come from ? (streets / ES)	Fill vacant beds w/CH
1 Jewish Family Services	Passed	2	Jewish Family Services PSH Expansion	UNK	PSH	JFS will fully participate in CES, will provide case management, 20 units and 24 beds	JFSSD will provide services to three of the eligible chronically homeless subpopulations individuals families and youth age 18 - 24.	\$ 586,460.00	\$ 226,814.00	\$ 100,000.00	17.00%	\$ 144,800.00	25.00%	24	20	24	All County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2 Path of Life	Passed	3	Path of Life Expansion	UNK	PSH	Path of Life will participate in CES and receive referrals from CES and fill vacant beds through CES, will also provide case management, 31 units and 36 beds, Serves All County	Path of life will serve individuals families and unaccompanied youth.	\$ 597,559.00	\$ 413,881.00	\$ 125,254.00	21.00%	\$ 3,100.00	Less than 1%	36	31	36	All County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3 Step up on 2nd	Passed	2	Step Up on 2nd Expansion	UNK	PSH	Step Up will participate in CES and receive referrals from CES, is providing case management budgeted in supportive services serving City of Riverside	Step Up will serve all chronically homeless individuals and families under this proposed project. Step Up anticipates that the project will serve a high percentage of transition-age youth and individuals experiencing severe mental illness.	\$ 605,101.00	\$ 402,012.00	\$ 136,080.00	22.00%	N/A	NA	33	33	33	All County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4 Lighthouse SSC	Passed	2	Lighthouse SSC PSH	UNK	PSH	LHSSC will participate in CES doing in reach and outreach services to homeless individuals and provide case management, 1 case manager 15 PSH Units	The LHSSC proposed program will serve an eligible subpopulation which is chronically homeless individuals and/or families including unaccompanied youth a stipulated in point No. 11.	\$ 334,452.00	\$ 264,000.00	\$ 53,568.00	16.00%	NA	NA	UNK	15	UNK	District 2, 3, and/or 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5 Lutheran Social Services	Missing: 1. SAM Registration	No	Lutheran Social Services PSH	Bonus	PSH	Lutheran will participate in CES doing in reach and outreach services to homeless individuals and provide case management, 14 @ 2 bedroom, 2 @ 1 bedroom	Lutheran Social Services of Southern California affirms that Amelia's Light will serve chronically homeless families/individuals including youth.	\$ 458,803.00	\$ 224,064.00	\$ 118,908.00	26.00%	\$ 56,100.00	12%	46	16	46	All County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6 Lutheran Social Services	Missing: 1. SAM Registration	No	Lutheran Social Services PSH	Reallocation	PSH	Lutheran will participate in CES doing in reach and outreach to homeless individuals and provide case management, 14 @ 2 bedroom, 2 @ 1 bedroom	Lutheran Social Services of Southern California affirms that Amelia's Light will serve chronically homeless families/individuals including youth.	\$ 458,803.00	\$ 224,064.00	\$ 118,908.00	26.00%	\$ 56,100.00	12%	46	16	46	All County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7 Housing Authority	Application incomplete: 1) Did not present in index tabs; 2) Did not provide subcontract agreement details; 3) Did not provide match amount or evidence of match in budget; 4) Did not provide the following attachments: Credentials/resumes and SAM registration	5	Housing Authority PSH	UNK	PSH	HACR has partnered to provide case management and outreach services, CoR will have a designated CM to assist and guide program participants, and receive clients through CES, proposing 13 beds and 13 units	The Permanent Supportive Housing Program will serve homeless individuals, families with children, and unaccompanied youth coming from the streets or emergency shelters with the longest history of homelessness. The program will prioritize the individuals with the longest histories of homelessness and most severe needs to ensure that person with the highest needs are prioritized for permanent supportive housing.	\$ 220,897.00	\$ 153,312.00	\$ 56,075.00	25.00%	NA	NA	13	13	13	All County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Revised 7.26.17

Reply to: HHOPE Program Administration
Riverside University Health System –
Behavioral Health
1405 Spruce St. Ste A
Riverside, CA 92507

July 24, 2017

Department of Public Social Services (DPSS)
Homeless Programs
4060 County Circle Drive
Riverside, CA 92503

RE : Rapid Re-Housing HUD Grant
Letter of Intent to apply for HUD NOFA

Attn: Jill Kowalski

Dear Ms. Kowalski ,

After consideration of the recently released NOFA and HUD grant criteria, our Continuum of Care needs, the current needs of the families we serve in our community and the limited ability to rapidly fill the Rapid Re-Housing Grant, Riverside University Health System - Behavioral Health (RUHS-BH) is withdrawing our Letter of Intent to apply for grant funding for this grant in the current HUD NOFA.

RUHS-BH has determined that this is in the best interest of the Continuum of Care programs and the individuals living on the streets in our community, as well as our those our department serves, to have these funds identified in the CoC for other Permanent Supportive Housing.

Sincerely,

Lynne M. Brockmeier
Administrative Services Manager

Riverside University Health System
Behavioral Health

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Recommended for Reallocation for New Projects:		Project	Score			
2	Project Name:	Type:	Amount	(100 max pts):			
3	Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing Project	PSH	\$ 20,000	unspent funds			
4	Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousing	RRH	\$ 142,117	76			
5	City of Riverside PSH for Disabled	PSH	\$ 123,556	76			
6	Housing Authority Consolidated (All County I and II)	PSH	\$ 510,304	71			
7	City of Riverside Rapid Re-Housing	RRH	\$ 229,728	65			
8	US Vets Riverside Permanent Housing	PSH	\$ 375,292	61			
9	Total for Reallocation:		\$ 1,400,997				
10							
11	Scenario 1: Fulfill Tier 2 Requirement and	\$575,768	equals 6% of Annual Renewal Demand (9,596,126) which has to be				
12	Reallocate Two Lowest Scoring Projects:		placed in Tier 2				
13							
14		\$ 229,728	City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing Program				
15		\$ 375,292	U.S. Vets Riverside Permanent Housing Program				
16		\$ 605,020	exceeds Tier 2 requirement of \$575,768 by \$29,252				
17							
18	Scenario 2: Fulfill Tier 2 Requirement and						
19	Reallocate Two Lowest Scoring Projects and						
20	Reallocate Unspent Funds:	\$ 229,728	City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing Program				
21		\$ 375,292	U.S. Vets Riverside Permanent Housing Program				
22		\$20,000	Unspent funds - Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing Project				
23		\$88,000	Unspent funds - Housing Authority Consolidated (All County 1 and II)				
24		\$ 713,020	\$575,768 would go into Tier 2 and \$137,252 in Tier 1				
25							
26	Scenario 3: Fulfill Tier 2 Requirement and						
27	Reallocate Two Lowest Scoring Projects,						
28	Reallocate Unspent Funds, and						
29	Reallocate Rescinded Project:	\$ 229,728	City of Riverside Rapid Rehousing Program				
30		\$ 375,292	U.S. Vets Riverside Permanent Housing Program				
31		\$20,000	Unspent funds - Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing Project				
32		\$88,000	Unspent funds - Housing Authority Consolidated (All County 1 and II)				
33		\$ 142,117	Rescinded project - Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousing				
34		\$ 855,137	\$575,768 would go into Tier 2 and \$279,369 in Tier 1				



July 27, 2017

Continuum of Care Board of Governance
c/o Jill Kowalski
Department of Public Social Services
Homeless Programs
4060 County Circle Drive
Riverside, CA 92503

RE: Reallocation of Housing Authority Consolidated All County I and II Project Funds

Ms. Kowalski –

In light of recent presentations (and follow-up comments) to the Board of Governance and the Independent Review Panel, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development's subsequent release of the Notice of Funding Availability, I wanted to make sure that the Housing Authority's position is clear as it relates to our request for continued funding of our Consolidated All County I and II Project funds.

It is our understanding that our program is considered to be in Tier 1, and as such it is not necessary to cancel the financial support of this effort. Accordingly, it is our request that the Board reallocate those funds that have been traditionally difficult for our team to spend. Specifically, we are asking that \$88,000 be reallocated for new projects. We are asking that the balance of funds continue to be awarded to the Housing Authority so that we can continue to house families in this project.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Jeffrey A. Van Wagenen
Managing Director