County of Riverside Continuum of Care 2017 Continuum of Care Application U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Independent Review Panel Meeting DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA

June 7, 2017

1. Monitoring Response

Jill Kowalski

- City of Riverside
- Housing Authority
- US Vets
- RUHS-BH

2. Finalize Recommendation for BOG

Angelina Coe

- Review unspent funds
- Grants reduced
- Grants reallocated (continue review of DMH RRH)
- HMIS expansion
- Project ranking Tier 1 and Tier 2

3. Review and Evaluate Coordinated Entry System (CES) grant performance

4. RFP Timeline

DPSS HPU staff

- Release RFP for new projects June 8
- Mandatory Bidders Conference June 20
- Deadline for new project application July 6
- Review Panel meeting July 12
- BOG meeting July 13 or July 20

5. Other Matters

County of Riverside Continuum of Care 2017 Continuum of Care Application U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Independent Review Panel Meeting DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA

June 7, 2017 Summary of meeting

Review Panel attendees:

Steve Falk
Angelina Coe
Frankie Riddle
Paul Flores
Lt. Dean Spivacke
Sterlon Sims
Robin Gilliland

DPSS staff present: Jill Kowalski Rowena Concepcion

Linda Salas Elizabeth Hernandez

Elizabeth Hernandez Veronica Ramirez

Consultant: Joe Colletti

- 1. <u>Monitoring Response:</u> Four agencies submitted written responses to their most recent monitoring reports. The responses were emailed to the review panel members and discussed during the meeting. The agencies that submitted written responses are:
 - City of Riverside
 - Housing Authority
 - U.S. Vets
 - RUHS-BH

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 <u>did not change</u> any of the recommendations for reallocation that the BOG will decide on June 7.

The following documents will be posted to the DPSS website under the 2017 CoC Program Competition:

- 2017 HUD CoC Program Application Review Process and Timeline
 - Sub-recipient concerns regarding scorecard and monitoring reports
 - RUHS-BH: Concerns about scorecard and DPSS/Review Panel response (dated May 18)
 - RUHS-BH responses to monitoring reports (HHOPE, Rapid Rehousing, Riverside PH and Women's PH) (dated June 5)
 - Housing Authority: Concerns about scorecard and DPSS/Review Panel response (dated May 18)
 - Housing Authority: responses to monitoring report (All County I and II) (dated May 31)
 - U.S. Vets: Response to monitoring report for CHAMPS PSH project (dated June 6)
 - City of Riverside: responses to monitoring reports for Chronic PSH and RRH projects (dated May 31)
 - City of Riverside: response to scorecard for Disabled PSH project (dated June 5)

Note: there were some attachments in these documents that were not included in the posting because they contain client information.

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

• Whether any finding could be removed: in the case of all of the agencies with findings, there was more than one finding for each project. The scoring criteria are that a project may receive 5 points for no findings; and 0 points if there are one or more findings. 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 recommend any findings be removed based on the responses and documentation provided by the agencies impacted.

It was also brought to the attention of the review panel that some of the documents submitted in the monitoring response/corrective action plan were different from those in the file at the time of the monitoring. When DPSS staff conducts monitoring visits, they copy or take a photo of each document, especially if it means there will be a finding. The review panel directed DPSS to do a thorough and complete review of all of the attachments submitted by each agency to show that a finding should be overturned. DPSS will provide this information to the review panel at the July 12 meeting.

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

- 2. Finalize Recommendations for BOG
 - Review unspent funds: the review panel reviewed the report from DPSS fiscal on the history of funding 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 to the Board of Governance (to be included on the agenda June 15):

Recommendation: The review panel recommends reallocating \$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.

The review panel also discussed the significant amount of funding that is <u>projected</u> 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, are:

• 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; however, this will be reviewed again next year and if there are unspent funds, they will be recommended for reallocation. DPSS staff have reached out to Path of Life and asked them to consider giving any unspent funds in any project back 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.

• Recommendations for reallocation: the review panel also continued its review on the RUHS-BH Rapid Rehousing project. The biggest concern by the review panel regarding this project is that in the first seven months of the project, only one family has been housed (out of 10 households contracted). This was cited as a concern in the most recent monitoring report:

Concern 1: Unit utilization: the unit utilization for the project is only 10%. RUHS-BH response to this concern is (from the monitoring response submitted by RUHS-BH on June 5) is:

Concern 1: Unit utilization

Response:

- 1) As this is in the early phase of a new grant cycle, we have had three other families in the preparation for using this grant, who have not completed all the application documents nor have they located a site in which they can lease.
- 2) RUHS-BH is currently utilizing the CES. As a Rapid Re-Housing program for families. The CES has had minimal families that met the criteria due to shelters being resistant to enter into the CES system due to a Section 8 priority for families in shelters.

Plan: RUHS_BH has notified all of our children's clinics and adult clinics about the opportunity and is conducting Vi-SPDATS for appropriate families over the last few weeks.

This Review Panel confirmed this Concern stands based on the following:

- The grant started November 1 and as of May 31, only one unit (8 beds) has been filled (out of 10 units/20 beds). The grant is in its 7th month and still only has one unit occupied.
- In the previous year (2014) the bed utilization rate for this project was 31% (unit utilization was 30% (see attached bed utilization history).

Additional considerations by the review panel:

- The RUHS-BH RRH spent 100% of the Supportive Services for the project while only housing one family.
- RUHS-BH should be pulling families from the Coordinated Entry System.
- In the application for this project, RUHS-BH states it will serve families with a "severe mental health diagnosis." This seems to be a barrier in identifying families eligible for the project, especially since it is stated in the agency's corrective action plan (see above) that they are trying to identify eligible families from mental health clinics, while there are families in CES and the CoC that are eligible for RRH but do not have a severe mental health diagnosis.

Based on this, the review panel made the following recommendation to the BOG, to be decided upon June 15:

<u>Recommendation:</u> The review panel recommends reallocating the full amount of funding for the Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousing project in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application based on low performance. The funding for this project, \$142,117, will be reallocated for new projects to

be included in the application. The motion passed unanimously. The review panel also recommended that to have full bed utilization in this project, the population to be served should be amended to include all clients/families experiencing homelessness and not just those with a mental health condition.

• <u>HMIS expansion</u>: In the 2017 CoC Program Application Registration, HUD indicated it will allow funding for new projects that include expanding the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). DPSS staff presented an HMIS expansion request and a comparison of staffing levels for other CoCs in Southern California (both are attached). Based on the information, the review panel made the following recommendation:

<u>Recommendation</u>: the review panel recommended designating \$196,182 in any reallocated funds toward an HMIS expansion grant to be included in the 2017 HUD CoC Program Consolidated Application. The motion passed unanimously.

- <u>Project ranking Tier 1 and Tier 2:</u> Since the 2017 HUD NOFA has not been released, the review panel will table this until the July 12 meeting.
- 3. Review and Evaluate Coordinated Entry System (CES) grant performance: the CES grant started in December 2016. There is no available evaluation tool to assess performance. DPSS staff is consulting with Margaret McFaddin, HUD consultant, to assist our CoC with CES implementation during the week of June 12. DPSS will consult with Margaret and the CES Oversight Committee on performance metrics for CES. The review panel expressed interest in meeting with Margaret to provide feedback on her findings based on her interviews and analysis of the CES satisfaction survey.

4. RFP Timeline:

- Release RFP for new projects June 8
- Mandatory Bidders Conference June 20
- Deadline for new project application July 6
- Review Panel meeting July 12
- BOG meeting July 13 or July 27

Total recommended reallocated amount = \$1,380,997 HMIS expansion \$ 196,182

\$1,184,815 available for new reallocated projects (if approved by the BoG on June 15)

The review panel meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

2017 HUD-CoC Program Competition SCORECARD

Renewal Permanent Housing Projects (Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH)

					Perform	ance Measur		Access to Main	and Supportive Se	ervices for Part	icipants (5)				Program Com			
		Duning			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9a	9b	9c	10	11	1 - 11
Project Name		Project Type	# of Units	# of Beds	Housing Stability (80%) (5)	Employment and Income Growth (5)	Bed Utilization (5)	Transportation Assistance (1)	Referrals to Mainstream Programs (1)	Conducts Regular follow-up with participants (1)	SSI/SSDI Technical Assistance (1)	Staff SOAR Training (1)	Timeliness (4)	Accuracy (3)	Completeness (3)	APR received on time (5)	Monitoring Reports (Findings) (5)	Score (40)
1 Housing	ey Permanent	PSH	13	25	4	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	39
2 Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated Permanent	НОРЕ	PSH	42	95	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	0	35
	/omen's PH	PSH	12	17	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	0	35
Behavioral Health Men's Perman	nent Housing	PSH	18	23	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	40
5 Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousi	ing	RRH	10	20	5	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	5	0	23
6 Behavioral Health Riverside Pern	nanent Housing	PSH	13	25	4	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	0	34
7 City of Riverside PSH Chronically	Homeless	PSH	8	8	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	5	0	25
City of Riverside PSH for Disabled	d	PSH	8	11	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	0	3	5	0	32
⁹ City of Riverside Rapid Re-Housin	ng	RRH	8	22	3	5	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	19
County of Riverside CES Project		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Desert Horizon PSH Housing Authority Consolidated	(All County Land	PSH	10	18	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	40
12 II) Housing Authority Consolidated		PSH	51	51	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	16
(ECON)	All County	PSH	41	92	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	0	0	26
Housing Authority EHOP Housing Street to Home Chronic	Homeless	PSH	4	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	0	0	27
Project	Tiomeless	PSH	13	13	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	5	0	31
JFS Desert Vista Permanent Supp	oortive Housing	PSH	34	40	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	40
Lighthouse Social Service Center Housing for Disabled Women wit		PSH	12	36	5	5	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	39
18 Lighthouse SSC Rapid Rehousing		RRH	12	40	3	5	2	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	0	30
Path of Life PSH		PSH	80	92	5	5	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	39
Path of Life Rapid Rehousing	7/1/46	RRH	13	38	0	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	5	35
POLM RRH East County (first yea 6/30/17)	r //1/16 -	RRH	15	27	new project	new project	new project	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	new project	5	n/a
Shelter Plus Care Project Based v	w/OSH	PSH	13	13	5	5	4	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	5	0	34
Stepping Up Riverside		PSH	51	59	new project	new project	new project	1	new project	new project	new project	1	new project new	new project	new project	new project	new project	n/a
Stepping Up Riverside Bonus		PSH	30	38	new project	new project	new project	1	new project	new project	new project	1	project	new project	new project	new project	new project	n/a
US Vets Riverside Permanent Ho	using	PSH	25	25	5	5	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	22

Renewal Permanent Housing Projects (Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH)

	Fir	nancial Manag	ement and Reporti	ng (20)					HUD-Co	C Priorities/	s/Requirements (40)								
Project Name	Monthly Submission of Claims (5)	Recaptured Funds (unspent funds) (5)	Cost-effective case management and other supportive services (5)	15 Match (5)	Quickly move parts. into permanent housing (5)	Housing First		Outreach from Eligible Locations (5)	Participation of homeless in decision-making (1)	Participation of homeless through employment or volunteerism (1)	Engagement in religious activities (1)	Involuntary family separation (1)	Discrimination Policy (1)	CoC Part. (5)	26 HQS Compliance (5)	HQS Corrective Action Plan (5)	12 - 27 Score (60)	Comments	Total Score (100)
Behavioral Health Coachella Valley Permanent Housing	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	55	Cost per bed \$19,938.72.	94
Palancia and Markly MAGOS	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	5	51	Recaptured funds 2014 & 2015.	86
Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated Permanent Housing Women's PH	4	4	5	N/A	5	5	5	4	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	5	47	4 Findings (program). This grant was consolidated with HHOPE. The fiscal information for both grants was used to populate HHOPE. This project has 82 of 95 possible points.	82
Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	54	Returned funds 2012, 2013, 2014 & 2015.	94
Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousing	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	5	53	3 Findings (Program & HMIS). 2 late claims in last full grant period.	76
Behavioral Health Riverside Permanent Housing	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	5	51	1 Finding (Program). 2 late claims in last full grant period; Cost per bed \$14.389.72.	85
City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless	2	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	52	4 Findings (Fiscal, Program, HMIS). Cost per bed \$15,499.75.	77
City of Riverside PSH for Disabled	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	44	HMIS Finding, HQS & lease non-compliance.	76
City of Riverside Rapid Re-Housing	3	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	45	7 Findings (Fiscal, Program, HMIS). Cost per bed \$10,442.18.	64
County of Riverside CES Project	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	n/a	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	N/A	N/A	n/a	This project does not have one full grant period so there is no historical data.	n/a
Desert Horizon PSH	0	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	50	5 late claims in last full grant period; Cost per bed \$23,976.50.	90
Housing Authority Consolidated (All County I and II)	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	55	5 Findings (Program & HMIS), late APR submission; 2 late claims in last full grant period; Recaptured funds 2014 & 2015.	71
Housing Authority Consolidated All County (ECON)	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	51	1 Program Finding; Recaptured funds 2015.	77
Housing Authority EHOP	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	55	1 Program Finding, late APR submission; Returned funds 2014.	82
Project Project	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	0	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	56	1 Program Finding (not providing supportive services); Recaptured funds 2015.	87
JFS Desert Vista Permanent Supportive Housing	0	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	50	6 late claims in last full grant period; Cost per bed \$17,103.70.	90
Lighthouse Social Service Center Permanent Housing for Disabled Women with Children	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	58	Returned funds 2014.	97
Lighthouse SSC Rapid Rehousing	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	60	2 Findings (Program & Fiscal).	90
Path of Life PSH	0	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	51	8 late claims in last full grant period; Returned funds 2014; Cost per bed \$14,286.46.	90
Path of Life Rapid Rehousing	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	55	8 late claims in last full grant period.	90
POLM RRH East County	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	5	5	5	new project	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	n/a	This project does not have one full grant period so there is no historical data.	n/a
Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH	1	N/A	5	5	5	5	5	3	0	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	48	There are only 95 possible points for this project; 4 late claims in last 12 month period.	82
Stepping Up Riverside	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	5	5	5	new project new	1	1	1	1	1	5	new project new	new project new	n/a	This project has not started yet so there is no historical data.	n/a
Stepping Up Riverside Bonus	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	5	5	5	project	1	1	1	1	1	5	project	project	n/a	This project has not started yet so there is no historical data.	n/a
US Vets Riverside Permanent Housing	5	3	2	5	5	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	39	7 Findings (Program, HMIS), ineligible clients, HQS non-compliance; Recaptured funds 2015; Cost per bed \$15,011.68.	61
	NOTE: Did not count if claim less than 5 days late	Measures whether the project returned any funds in the last 3 years (completed).	Cost effectiveness based on avg cost per bed of \$11,044.57	Measures the percentage o match requirement (25%) as part of the overall projec budget and documentation	f t														

2017 HUD-CoC Program Competition SCORECARD Projects by Score

	Project Name	Туре	P	roject Amount	Total Score (100)
	Lighthouse Social Service Center Permanent Housing for				
1	Disabled Women with Children	PSH	\$	232,149.00	97
2	Path of Life Rapid Rehousing	Rapid Rehousing	\$	345,549.00	95
3	Behavioral Health Coachella Valley Permanent Housing	PSH	\$	498,468.00	94
4	Behavioral Health Men's Permanent Housing	PSH	\$	149,366.00	94
5	Lighthouse SSC Rapid Rehousing	Rapid Rehousing	\$	263,274.00	91
6	Desert Horizon PSH	PSH	\$	431,577.00	90
7	JFS Desert Vista Permanent Supportive Housing	PSH	\$	684,148.00	90
8	Path of Life PSH	PSH	\$	1,314,354.00	90
9	Housing Street to Home Chronic Homeless Project	PSH	\$	114,993.00	87
10	Behavioral Health Riverside Permanent Housing	PSH	\$	359,743.00	85
11	Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated Permanent Housing (average score between HHOPE (86) & Women's (82))	PSH	\$	495,415.00	84
12	Housing Authority EHOP	PSH	\$	42,739.00	82
13	Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH	PSH	\$	72,803.00	82
14	City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless	PSH	\$	125,598.00	77
15	Housing Authority Consolidated All County (ECON)	PSH	\$	448,217.00	77
16	Behavioral Health Rapid Rehousing	Rapid Rehousing	\$	142,117.00	76
17	City of Riverside PSH for Disabled	PSH	\$	123,556.00	76
18	Housing Authority Consolidated (All County I and II)	PSH	\$	510,304.00	71
19	City of Riverside Rapid Re-Housing	Rapid Rehousing	\$	229,728.00	65
20	US Vets Riverside Permanent Housing	PSH	\$	375,292.00	61
*	County of Riverside CES Project		\$	500,000.00	n/a
•	HMIS Consolidated	5	\$	344,072.00	n/a
*	POLM RRH East County	Rapid Rehousing	\$	377,260.00	n/a
*	Stepping Up Riverside	PSH	\$	888,903.00	n/a
*	Stepping Up Riverside Bonus	PSH	\$	526,501.00	n/a

2017 NOFA REVIEW UNSPENT FUNDS ANALYSIS

Denotes grants that were reduced in prior NOFA's

			ERSIDE COUNTY				
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
Behavioral	10/01 - 9/30	2011	\$533,405.00	\$249,316.33	\$284,088.67	53.26%	
Health HHOPE		2012	\$543,565.00	\$395,800.30	\$147,764.70	27.18%	
Consolidated PH -		2013	\$543,565.00	\$453,264.22	\$90,300.78	16.61%	
HHOPE		2014	\$469,147.00	\$442,523.79	\$26,623.21	5.67%	Grant reduced \$67,000
(consolidated 2016)		2015	\$381,528.00				Grant reduced \$93,555
Project	Grant Term 12/01 - 11/30	NOFA	Grant Amount	\$69,004.13	Returned	5.02%	Comments
Behavioral	12/01 - 11/30	2011	\$72,654.00		\$3,649.87		
Health HHOPE		2012	\$107,789.00	\$101,663.30	\$6,125.70	5.68%	
Consolidated PH -		2013	\$108,041.00	\$108,041.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
Women's		2014	\$110,498.00	\$110,498.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
(consolidated 2016)		2015	\$113,887.00				
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
RCDMH	2/01 - 1/31	2011	\$476,070.00	\$476,069.80	\$0.20	0.00%	
Coachella Valley	,	2012	\$485,138.00	\$485,138.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
PH		2013	\$485,138.00	\$485,138.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2013	\$495,470.00	\$465,510.91	\$29,959.09	6.05%	
		2015	\$498,468.00	\$498,468.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$498,468.00				
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
RCDMH Men's	2/01 - 1/31	2011	\$89,373.00	\$89,373.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
PH		2012	\$140,264.00	\$122,402.20	\$17,861.80	12.73%	
		2013	\$140,660.00	\$132,884.84	\$7,775.16	5.53%	
		2013	\$144,284.00	\$105,976.57	\$38,307.43	26.55%	
		2014	\$144,284.00	\$103,576.37	\$19,775.02	13.24%	
		2013	\$149,500.00	\$129,590.96	\$19,775.02	13.24/0	Recommend reduction
		2016	\$149,366.00				of \$20K
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
RCDMH Riv PH	7/1-6/30	2011	\$350,857.00	\$350,857.00	\$0.00	0.00%	Comments
KCDIVIH KIV PH	7/1-0/30	2011	\$350,857.00	\$350,857.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2013	\$357,540.00	\$357,540.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2014	\$358,625.00	\$358,625.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	\$359,743.00				
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
RCDMH RRH	11/1-10/31	2013	\$139,045.00	\$139,045.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2014	\$140,377.00	\$140,377.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
				\$140,377.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2014	\$140,377.00 \$142,117.00	\$140,377.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
			\$142,117.00	\$140,377.00 HTHOUSE	\$0.00	0.00%	
Project	Grant Term		\$142,117.00		Ş0.00 Returned	0.00%	Comments
Project Lighthouse SSC	Grant Term 9/1-8/31	2015	\$142,117.00	HTHOUSE		17.33%	Comments
		2015 NOFA	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount	HTHOUSE Expended	Returned		Comments
Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31	2015 NOFA 2014 2015	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00	HTHOUSE Expended \$187,718.98	Returned \$39,358.02		
Lighthouse SSC Disabled		2015 NOFA 2014	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00	HTHOUSE Expended	Returned		Comments
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31	2015 NOFA 2014 2015	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00	HTHOUSE Expended \$187,718.98	Returned \$39,358.02		
Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount	HTHOUSE Expended \$187,718.98 Expended	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned	17.33%	
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00	HTHOUSE Expended \$187,718.98 Expended	Returned \$39,358.02		
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount	HTHOUSE Expended \$187,718.98 Expended	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned	17.33%	
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00	HTHOUSE Expended \$187,718.98 Expended	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00	17.33%	
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC RRH	9/1-8/31 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014 2015	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00	#THOUSE Expended \$187,718.98 Expended \$258,054.00	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00	17.33%	
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC RRH Project	9/1-8/31 Grant Term 7/1-6/30 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014 2015	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00 USVETEF Grant Amount	Expended \$187,718.98 Expended \$258,054.00 EXANS INITIATIVE Expended	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00	0.00%	Comments
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC RRH Project US Vets	9/1-8/31 Grant Term 7/1-6/30	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014 2015	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00 US VETER Grant Amount \$792,383.00	Expended \$187,718.98 Expended \$258,054.00 EXAMS INITIATIV Expended \$598,650.91	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00 E Returned \$193,732.09	0.00%	Comments
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC RRH Project	9/1-8/31 Grant Term 7/1-6/30 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2011 2012	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00 US VITE Grant Amount \$792,383.00 \$403,738.00	Expended \$187,718.98 Expended \$258,054.00 Expended \$5258,054.00 Expended \$598,650.91 \$295,144.70	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00 E Returned \$193,732.09 \$108,593.30	0.00% 0.00% 24.45% 26.90%	Comments
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC RRH Project US Vets	9/1-8/31 Grant Term 7/1-6/30 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2011 2012 2013	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00 US VETE Grant Amount \$792,383.00 \$403,738.00 \$403,738.00	Expended \$187,718.98 Expended \$258,054.00 CANS INITIATIV Expended \$598,650.91 \$295,144.70 \$395,340.26	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00 E Returned \$193,732.09 \$108,593.30 \$8,397.74	0.00% 0.00% 24.45% 26.90% 2.08%	Comments
Lighthouse SSC Disabled Lighthouse SSC RRH Project US Vets	9/1-8/31 Grant Term 7/1-6/30 Grant Term	2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2014 2015 NOFA 2011 2012	\$142,117.00 LIG Grant Amount \$227,077.00 \$232,149.00 Grant Amount \$258,054.00 \$263,274.00 US VITE Grant Amount \$792,383.00 \$403,738.00	Expended \$187,718.98 Expended \$258,054.00 Expended \$5258,054.00 Expended \$598,650.91 \$295,144.70	Returned \$39,358.02 Returned \$0.00 E Returned \$193,732.09 \$108,593.30	0.00% 0.00% 24.45% 26.90%	Comments

		DPSS (HIV	IIS & PLANNING	S)		
Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		
7/1-6/30	2011	\$260,498.00	\$260,498.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	2012	\$319,938.00	\$319,938.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	2013	\$344,072.00	\$344,072.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	2014	\$344,072.00	\$344,072.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	2015	\$344,072.00				
Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Γ
7/1-6/30	2014	\$104,365.00	\$104,365.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	2015	\$292,607.00				
		PAST GRA	NT REDUCTION	S		
			2015			
	Housin	g Authority ECO	N	\$94,764.00		
	Housin	g Authority Stree	t to Home	\$37,678.00		
	Housin	g Authority All Co	ounty I	\$2,112.00		
	Housin	g Authority All Co	ounty II	\$22,308.00		
	US Vet	CHAMPS		\$44,864.00		
	RCDMH	H HHOPE		\$93,559.00		
			2014			
	Housin	g Authority All Co	ounty I	\$67,000.00		
	RCDMH	HHOPE		\$67,000.00		
		·				

Comments

Comments

Project HMIS

Project PLANNING

HOUSING AUTHORITY												
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments					
Housing	9/1 - 8/31	2011	\$374,016.00	\$212,751.37	\$161,264.63	43.12%						
Authority		2012	\$316,018.00	\$202,669.00	\$113,349.00	35.87%						
Consolidated -		2013	\$317,026.00	\$243,484.33	\$73,541.67	23.20%	Grant reduced \$67,000					
All County I		2014	\$256,552.00	\$256,552.00	\$0.00	0.00%	Grant reduced \$2,112					
(consolidated 2015)		2015	\$510,304.00				Recommend reduction of \$60K					
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments					
	7/07 - 7/06	2007	\$1,134,900.00	\$930,101.57	\$204,798.43	18.05%	5 yr S+C gran					
HA Consolidated	•	2013	\$258,924.00	\$245,103.97	\$13,820.03	5.34%	, ,					
- All County II		2014	\$266,052.00	\$266,052.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Grant reduced \$22,308					
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments					
Housing	6/17 - 6/16	2011	\$523,800.00	\$395,575.15	\$128,224.85	24.48%						
Authority		2012	\$518,261.00	\$393,069.15	\$125,191.85	24.16%						
Consolidated		2013	\$519,905.00	\$407,707.48	\$112,197.52	21.58%						
All County		2014	\$534,245.00	\$384,884.63	\$149,360.37	27.96%						
	6/01 - 5/31	2015	\$448,217.00				Grant reduced \$94,764					
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments					
Housina	4/29 - 4/28	2008	\$213,300.00	\$212,917.34	\$382.66	0.18%	5 yr S+C grai					
Authority EHOP	4/23 - 4/28	2008	\$41,935.00	\$25,823.69	\$16,111.31	38.42%	3 yr 3+c grai					
Authority Erior	6/01 - 5/31	2015	\$42,739.00	\$25,025.05	ÿ10,111.51	30.4270						
	.,,.		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,									
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments					
Housing	6/10 - 6/09	2008	\$744,120.00	\$350,040.34	\$394,079.66	52.96%	5 yr S+C grai					
Authority Street		2014	\$151,279.00	\$132,914.61	\$18,364.39	12.14%						
to Home	7/01 - 6/30	2015	\$114,993.00				Grant Reduced \$37,678					

	PATH OF LIFE MINISTRIES													
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments							
Path of Life	7/1-6/30	2014	\$1,278,690.00	\$1,107,540.75	\$171,149.25	13.38%								
PSH		2015	\$1,314,354.00											
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments							
	7/1-6/30	2014	\$338,541.00	\$334,703.57	\$3,837.43	1.13%								
Path of Life							Projected to have \$120							
RRH		2015	\$345,549.00				in unspent funds							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments							
POL East County							Projected to have \$185							
RRH		2015	\$377,260.00				in unspent funds							

	JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE														
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments								
Jewish Family	4/1-3/31	2011	\$646,847.00	\$646,847.00	\$0.00	0.00%									
Svc - DV		2012	\$659,179.00	\$658,233.93	\$945.07	0.14%									
PSH		2013	\$659,179.00	\$659,179.00	\$0.00	0.00%									
		2014	\$671,479.00	\$670,341.31	\$1,137.69	0.17%									
		2015	\$684,148.00												
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments								
Jewish Family	1/1-12/31	2013	\$416,014.00	\$408,228.24	\$7,785.76	1.87%									
Svc - DH		2014	\$423,680.00	\$423,680.00	\$0.00	0.00%									
PSH		2015	\$431,577.00												

			CITY	OF RIVERSIDE			
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
	2/1-1/31	2011	\$117,127.00	\$117,127.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
City of Riverside		2012	\$119,358.00	\$119,358.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
Disabled PH		2013	\$119,358.00	\$119,358.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2014	\$121,426.00	\$113,144.40	\$8,281.60	6.82%	
		2015	\$123,556.00	\$123,556.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$123,556.00				
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
	1/1-1/31	2011	\$119,486.00	\$119,486.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
City of Riverside		2012	\$121,762.00	\$121,762.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
Chronic PH		2013	\$121,762.00	\$121,762.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2014	\$123,652.00	\$123,652.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	\$125,598.00				
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
	11/1-10/31	2013	\$221,028.00	\$214,388.26	\$6,639.74	3.00%	
City of Riverside		2014	\$225,612.00	\$225,612.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
RRH		2015	\$225,612.00				

DBH - RRH GRANT 11/2016-3/2017

RA \$3,547.48 1 client; sec dep and rent for 3 months
CASE MGMT \$1,876.20 \$238.46-Staff; \$1,637.74-Cell phones
FOOD \$1,208.57 Client food from Stater Bros & Costco

HOUSING/COUNSELING \$238.53 All for staff

OUTREACH \$86,060.70 \$83,110.94-Staff; \$1,099.62 computer equip; assorted Outreach supplies \$1,850.14

HMIS/EQUIPMENT \$50.83 Tablet cases

TOTAL \$92,982.31

DBH - RRH GRANT 11/2016-3/2017

		2015		2015								
	2015 Project	Proposed	2015 Project	Awarded			Actual HH	Actual				
	Renewal	Grant	Renewal	Grant	Proposed	Grant Cost	Units	Project Cost	Actual Grant	2015 Actual Costs		
	Proposed	Percentage	Awarded	Percentage	HH Units	per Bed	Served	per bed	Percentage	11/2016-3/2017	Actual	
Rental Assistance	\$46,524	33%	\$48,264	34%	10	\$14,037.70	1	\$92,982.31	4%	Rental Assistance	\$3,547.48	1 client; sec dep and rent for 3 months
Supportive Services	\$89,384	64%	\$89,384	63%					96%	Supportive Services	\$89,384.00	
Case Management	\$23,839									CASE MGMT	\$1,876.20	\$238.46-Staff; \$1,637.74-Cell phones
Outreach Services	\$65,545									FOOD	\$1,208.57	Client food from Stater Bros & Costco
HMIS	\$1,746	1%	\$1,746	1%						HOUSING/COUNSELING	\$238.53	All for staff
												\$83,110.94-Staff; \$1,099.62 computer equip; assorted
Services	\$732									OUTREACH	\$86,060.70	Outreach supplies \$1,850.14
Personnel	\$1,014								0%	HMIS	\$50.83	Tablet cases
Administration	\$2,723	2%	\$2,723	2%					0%	Administration	\$0.00	_
Total	\$140,377		\$142,117							TOTAL	\$92,982.31	after 5 claims.

	Housing Authority All County II												
NOFA 2013 - 07/072014	to 07/06/2015		NOFA 2014 - 07/07/2015	to 07/06/2016									
Bed Utilization	Rate:		Bed Utilization	Rate:									
Average Daily	100%		Average Daily	104%									
Utilization Rate	100%		Utilization Rate during	104%									
Point-in-Time bed utilization	on rate on the last		Point-in-Time bed utilization	on rate on the last									
Wednesday	in:		Wednesday	in:									
January	108%		January	104%									
April	108%		April	100%									
July	84%		July	100%									
October	104%		October	108%									

	Housing Authority All County II											
NOFA 2013 - 07/072014	to 07/06/2015		NOFA 2014 - 07/07/2015 to 07/06/2016									
Unit Utilization	Rate:		Unit Utilization	Rate:								
Point-in-Time unit utilization	n rate on the last		Point-in-Time unit utilization	on rate on the last								
Wednesday	in:		Wednesday	Wednesday in:								
January	104%		January	104%								
April	108%		April	100%								
July	80%		July	100%								
October	100%		October	108%								

Total Beds Proposed	23	Total Beds Proposed	23
Total Units Proposed	23	Total Units Proposed	23

Housing Authority All County I & All county II were consolidated to

Housing Authority Consolidated

		Housing Authority Consolidated - Grant Period: 8/01/2016 - 7/31/2017					
NOFA 2013 -09/01/2014 to 8/31/2015		NOFA 2014 - 09/01/2015 to 08/31/2016			NOFA 2015 - 8/01/2016 to Current		
Bed Utilization	Rate:	Bed Utilization	Rate:	Ш	Bed Utilization	Rate:	
Average Daily Utilization Rate	73%	Average Daily Utilization Rate during	89%		Average Daily Utilization Rate during	99%	
Point-in-Time bed utilizatio	n rate on the last	Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last			Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last		
Wednesday	in:	Wednesday in:			Wednesday in:		
January	68%	January	89%		January	96%	
April	81%	April	89%		April	98%	
July	89%	July	86%		July	102%	
October	62%	October	92%		October	100%	

					Housing Authority Consolid	lated - Grant	
					Period: 8/01/2016 -	7/31/2017	
NOFA 2013 -09/01/201	4 to 8/31/2015	NOFA 2014 - 09/0	1/2015 to 08/31/2016		NOFA 2015 - 08/01/20	16 to Current	
Unit Utilization	Rate:	Unit Uti	Unit Utilization Rate:		Unit Utilization Rate:		
Point-in-Time unit utilization	on rate on the last	Point-in-Time unit u	pint-in-Time unit utilization rate on the last		Point-in-Time unit utilization rate on the		
Wednesday in:		Wed	Wednesday in:		Wednesday in:		
January	68%	Januar	y 89%		January	96%	
April	81%	Арі	ril 89%		April	98%	
July	89%	Ju	ly 86%		July	102%	
October	62%	Octob	er 92%		October	100%	
Total Beds Proposed	28	Total Beds Propose	ed 28		Total Beds Proposed	51	
Total Units Proposed	28	Total Units Propose	ed 28		Total Units Proposed	51	

RCDMH Rapid Rehousing - Grant Period: 11/01 - 10/31									
NOFA 2013 - 11/01/201	NOFA 2013 - 11/01/2014 to 10/31/2015			to 10/31/2016	1	NOFA 2015 - 11/01/2016 to Current			
Bed Utilization	Bed Utilization Rate:			Rate:	Bed Utilization Rate:				
Average Daily	111%	П	Average Daily	31%		Average Daily	400/		
Utilization Rate	111%		Utilization Rate during			Utilization Rate during	40%		
Point-in-Time bed utilization	on rate on the last		Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last			Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last			
Wednesday	<i>i</i> in:		Wednesday in:			Wednesday in:			
January	183%		January	54%		January J	40%		
April	183%		April	60%		April	40%		
July	83%		July	19%		July			
October	72%		October	0%		October			

RCDMH Rapid Rehousing - Grant Period: 11/01 - 10/31									
NOFA 2013 - 11/01/2014 Unit Utilization		NOFA 2014 - 11/01/2015 Unit Utilization		NOFA 2015 - 11/01/2016 to Current Unit Utilization Rate:					
Point-in-Time unit utilization	n rate on the last	Point-in-Time unit utilization	n rate on the last	Point-in-Time unit utilizati	ion rate on the last				
Wednesday in:		Wednesday	in:	Wednesday in:					
January	90%	January	50%	January January	10%				
April	90%	April	57%	April April	10%				
July	40%	July	14%	July					
October	40%	October	0%	October					
Total Beds Proposed	20	Total Beds Proposed	20	Total Beds Proposed	20				
Total Units Proposed	10	Total Units Proposed	10	Total Units Proposed	10				

RCDMH Men's - Grant Period: 2/01 - 1/31									
NOFA 2013 - 2/01/2014 to 1/31/2015			NOFA 2014 - 2/01/201	5 to 1/31/2016		NOFA 2015 - 2/01/2016 to 1/31/2017			
Bed Utilization	Rate:		Bed Utilization Rate:			Bed Utilization Rate:			
Average Daily	74%	% Average Daily 88%		Average Daily	66%				
Utilization Rate during	,,		tilization Rate during			Utilization Rate during	0070		
Point-in-Time bed utilization	Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last		Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last			Point-in-Time bed utilization rate on the last			
Wednesday	in:		Wednesday in:			Wednesday in:			
January	57%		January	88%		January	69.57%		
April	78%		April	76%		April	65.22%		
July	78%		July	94%		July	65.22%		
October	70%		October	88%		October	65.22%		

RCDMH Men's - Grant Period: 2/01 - 1/31									
NOFA 2013 - 2/01/201	4 to 1/31/2015	NOFA 2014 - 2/01/201	5 to 1/31/2016	NOFA 2015 - 2/01/201	6 to 1/31/2017				
Unit Utilization	n Rate:	Unit Utilization	n Rate:	Unit Utilizatio	n Rate:				
Point-in-Time unit utilization	on rate on the last	Point-in-Time unit utilizati	on rate on the last	Point-in-Time unit utilizati	on rate on the last				
Wednesday	Wednesday in:		in:	Wednesday in:					
January	56%	January	86%	January	72.22%				
April	83%	April	71%	April	66.67%				
July	78%	July	93%	July	66.67%				
October	67%	October	86%	October	66.67%				
Total Beds Proposed	11	Total Beds Proposed	20	Total Beds Proposed	23				
Total Units Proposed	11	Total Units Proposed	15	Total Units Proposed	18				

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Expansion Request

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 to support 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
- 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.

HMIS Staffing

HMIS Lead Agency	HUD Grant Amount – 2016	Number of CoC Projects	Number of Staff	Position Titles		
Glendale	\$2,371,801	13	2	HMIS System Administrator HMIS Program Assistant		
LAHSA, Los Angeles	\$104,971,653	800	18	1 HMIS Director 5 Data Analysts 3 Program Reports 2 Training Staff 2 Programmatic Specialist 2 IT Hardware Support 3 Data Specialists		
Long Beach	\$7,641,265	23	3	Program Coordinator Data Analyst Program Assistant		
OC Partnership	\$22,354,847	150	6	1 - SR Program Manager3 - Data Analysts1 - Jr Analyst1 - Program Assistant		
Pasadena	\$3,176,554	15	2	HMIS System Administrator HMIS Program Assistant		
Riverside	\$9,912,027	75	3	2 - Administrative Services Analyst II 1 - Administrative Assistant I		
San Bernardino	\$10,339,584	111	5	Business Systems Analyst III Automated Systems Analyst Automated Systems Technician Program Specialist I OA II		
San Diego	\$18,229,194	220	6	3 - Data Analysts 3 - Project Analysts		
Ventura	\$2,174,740	21	2.5	1 – HMIS Program Manager 1 – CES Program Specialist 1 - HMIS Technical Support (pt)		

DBH - CES GRANT 12/2016-3/2017

HOUSING/COUNSELING \$66,895.95 \$66,895.95-Staff

\$1,979.84-Cell phones; \$140.11-Costco (folding chairs & tables); \$1,257.01-County

Purchasing (more folding chairs, various office supply items); \$3,224.26-Event tents, table

OUTREACH \$6,948.60 covers, wristbands; \$347.38 Star lapel pins

TRANSPORTATION \$246.05 Fleet costs

TOTAL \$74,090.60

DBH - RRH GRANT 11/2016-3/2017

		2015		2015								
	2015 Project	Proposed	2015 Project	Awarded			Actual HH	Actual				
	Renewal	Grant	Renewal	Grant	Proposed	Grant Cost	Units	Project Cost	Actual Grant	2015 Actual Costs		
	Proposed	Percentage	Awarded	Percentage	HH Units	per Bed	Served	per bed	Percentage	11/2016-3/2017	Actual	
Rental Assistance	\$46,524	33%	\$48,264	34%	10	\$14,037.70	1	\$92,982.31	4%	Rental Assistance	\$3,547.48	1 client; sec dep and rent for 3 months
Supportive Services	\$89,384	64%	\$89,384	63%					96%	Supportive Services	\$89,384.00	
Case Management	\$23,839									CASE MGMT	\$1,876.20	\$238.46-Staff; \$1,637.74-Cell phones
Outreach Services	\$65,545									FOOD	\$1,208.57	Client food from Stater Bros & Costco
HMIS	\$1,746	1%	\$1,746	1%						HOUSING/COUNSELING	\$238.53	All for staff
												\$83,110.94-Staff; \$1,099.62 computer equip; assorted
Services	\$732									OUTREACH	\$86,060.70	Outreach supplies \$1,850.14
Personnel	\$1,014								0%	HMIS	\$50.83	Tablet cases
Administration	\$2,723	2%	\$2,723	2%					0%	Administration	\$0.00	_
Total	\$140,377		\$142,117							TOTAL	\$92,982.31	after 5 claims.