

**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**

May 10, 2017

1. Overview of performance vs. violation of HUD regulations: Joe Colletti
2. Review CoC Renewal Matrix DPSS HPU staff
 - Project Scorecard
 - Unspent funds
 - Monitoring Findings (serving ineligible clients, HQS compliance)
 - Projects that that did not meet threshold (score = 90)
 - Projects recommended for renewal
3. Reallocation Angelina Coe, chair
 - Grants reduced
 - Grants eliminated
4. Guidelines for New Projects in 2017 Registration Notice Joe Colletti
 - Recommended Priorities for New Projects
5. Next Steps and Timeline DPSS HPU staff
 - Release RFP for new projects
 - Mandatory Bidders Conference
 - Deadline for new project application
6. Other Matters:
 - June 7 Review Panel meeting: agenda items
 - Review and evaluate Coordinated Entry System (CES) grant performance
 - Finalize recommendations to be presented to Board of Governance on June 15

2017 NOFA REVIEW COMMITTEE - FISCAL INFORMATION ON CURRENT HUD GRANTS

| PROJECT SUB-RECIPIENT | | GRANT TERM | 2016 GRANT | # OF BEDS | COST PER BED | # OF LATE CLAIMS <i>(last full grant period)</i> | Avg Cost Per Bed | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|---|------------------|-------------|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated | HHOPE | 10/1/17-9/30/18 | \$495,415 | 95 | \$5,214.89 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 2 | Permanent Housing | Women's | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless | | 1/1/18-12/31/18 | \$125,598 | 8 | \$15,699.75 | 3 | \$11,044.57 | | \$4,655.18 30% |
| 4 | City of Riverside PSH for Disabled | | 2/1/17-1/31/18 | \$123,556 | 11 | \$11,232.36 | 2 | \$11,044.57 | | \$187.79 2% |
| 5 | Desert Horizon PSH | | 1/1/18-12/31/18 | \$431,577 | 18 | \$23,976.50 | 5 | \$11,044.57 | | \$12,931.93 54% |
| 6 | Housing Authority Consolidated | All County 1 | 9/1/17-8/31/18 | \$510,304 | 51 | \$10,005.96 | 2 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 7 | | All County 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Housing Authority Consolidated All County | | 6/1/17-5/31/18 | \$448,217 | 92 | \$4,871.92 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 9 | Housing Authority EHOP | | 6/1/17-5/31/18 | \$42,739 | 5 | \$8,547.80 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 10 | Housing Authority Street to Home Chronic Homeless Project | | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$114,993 | 13 | \$8,845.62 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 11 | JFS Desert Vista Permanent Housing | | 4/1/17-3/31/18 | \$684,148 | 40 | \$17,103.70 | 6 | \$11,044.57 | | \$6,059.13 35% |
| 12 | Lighthouse SSC Permanent Housing for Disabled Women with Children | | 9/1/17-8/31/18 | \$232,149 | 36 | \$6,448.58 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 13 | Path of Life PSH | | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$1,314,354 | 92 | \$14,286.46 | 8 | \$11,044.57 | | \$3,241.89 23% |
| 14 | RCDMH Coachella Valley Permanent Housing | | 2/1/17-1/31/18 | \$498,468 | 25 | \$19,938.72 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | | \$8,894.15 45% |
| 15 | RCDMH Men's Permanent Housing | | 2/1/17-1/31/18 | \$149,366 | 23 | \$6,494.17 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 16 | RCDMH Riverside Permanent Housing | | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$359,743 | 25 | \$14,389.72 | 2 | \$11,044.57 | | \$3,345.15 23% |
| 17 | Shelter Plus Care Project Based with OSH | | 9/1/17-8/31/18 | \$72,803 | 13 | \$5,600.23 | 4 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 18 | US Vets Riverside Permanent Housing | | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$375,292 | 25 | \$15,011.68 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | | \$3,967.11 26% |
| 19 | City of Riverside Rapid Re-Housing | | 11/1/17-10/31/18 | \$229,728 | 22 | \$10,442.18 | 2 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 20 | Lighthouse SSC Rapid Rehousing | | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$263,274 | 40 | \$6,581.85 | 0 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 21 | Path of Life Rapid Rehousing | | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$345,549 | 38 | \$9,093.39 | 8 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |
| 22 | RCDMH Rapid Rehousing | | 11/1/16-10/31/17 | \$142,117 | 20 | \$7,105.85 | 2 | \$11,044.57 | 5 | |

NOTE: Did not count if claim less than 5 days late

Source: 2016 HUD Grant Awards Rpt

\$6,959,390 checkpoint

Notes:

- 1) NOFA Period reviewed had to cover 12 completed months = last grant period
- 2) Claims are due 30 days following the end of the service month
- 3) Fiscal staff ensure that all projects meet their 25% match requirement
- 4) Projects not included (have not started yet):

| | | |
|--|----------------|-----------|
| County of Riverside CES Project | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$500,000 |
| County of Riverside CoC Planning Project | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$315,901 |
| HMIS Consolidated | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$344,072 |
| POLM RRH East County | 7/1/17-6/30/18 | \$377,260 |
| Stepping Up in Riverside | TBD | \$888,903 |

Avg cost per bed = \$11,044.57

Cost Effectiveness

PSH

| | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------|---|
| Behavioral Health HHOPE | HHOPE | \$7,690.93 | 5 |
| Consolidated Permanent | Women's | \$7,366.53 | 5 |
| City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless | | \$15,699.75 | 0 |
| City of Riverside PSH for Disabled | | \$11,232.36 | 5 |
| Desert Horizon PSH | | \$23,976.50 | 0 |
| Housing Authority Consolidated | All County 1 | \$9,162.57 | 5 |
| | All County 2 | \$11,567.48 | 5 |
| Housing Authority Consolidated All County | | \$4,871.92 | 5 |
| Housing Authority EHOP | | \$8,547.80 | 5 |
| Housing Authority Street to Home Chronic Homeless | | \$8,845.62 | 5 |
| JFS Desert Vista Permanent Housing | | \$17,103.70 | 0 |
| Lighthouse SSC Permanent Housing for Disabled Women | | \$6,448.58 | 5 |
| Path of Life PSH | | \$14,286.46 | 3 |
| RCDMH Coachella Valley Permanent Housing | | \$19,938.72 | 0 |
| RCDMH Men's Permanent Housing | | \$6,494.17 | 5 |
| RCDMH Riverside Permanent Housing | | \$14,389.72 | 3 |
| Shelter Plus Care Project Based with OSH | | \$5,600.23 | 5 |
| US Vets Riverside Permanent Housing | | \$15,011.68 | 2 |

RRH

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|---|
| City of Riverside Rapid Re-Housing | \$10,442.18 | 2 |
| Lighthouse SSC Rapid Rehousing | \$6,581.85 | 5 |
| Path of Life Rapid Rehousing | \$9,093.39 | 5 |
| RCDMH Rapid Rehousing | \$7,105.85 | 5 |

Avg cost PSH \$ 11,568.60

Avg cost RRH \$8,305.82

| PSH | |
|--|-----------------------|
| No more than 10% higher average cost (per bed) = 5 | \$ 12,725.46 |
| No more than 15% higher average cost (per bed) = 4 | \$ 13,303.89 |
| No more than 20% higher average cost (per bed) = 3 | \$ 13,882.32 |
| No more than 25% higher average cost (per bed) = 2 | \$ 14,460.74 |
| No more than 30% higher average cost (per bed) = 1 | \$ 15,039.17 |
| Higher than 30% of average cost (per bed) = 0 | more than \$15,039.17 |

| RRH | |
|--|-----------------------|
| No more than 10% higher average cost (per bed) = 5 | \$ 9,136.40 |
| No more than 15% higher average cost (per bed) = 4 | \$ 9,551.69 |
| No more than 20% higher average cost (per bed) = 3 | \$ 9,966.98 |
| No more than 25% higher average cost (per bed) = 2 | \$ 10,382.27 |
| No more than 30% higher average cost (per bed) = 1 | \$ 10,797.56 |
| Higher than 30% of average cost (per bed) = 0 | more than \$10,797.56 |

Summary of 2016 Continuum of Care Applications

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |
|----|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Agency: | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | City of Riverside | City of Riverside | City of Riverside | DPSS | Housing Authority |
| 2 | Project: | Coachella Valley PH | Men's Permanent Housing | Rapid Rehousing | Riverside Per Housing | HHOPE Consolidated Per Hg | CES | PSH Chronically Hmls | PSH for Disabled | Rapid Rehousing | HMIS | Consolidated All County |
| 40 | Assessment of Service Needs | 576 | 3,660 | | | 55,183 | | | | | | |
| 41 | Assistance with Moving Costs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Case Management | 4,211 | 5,120 | 23,839 | 247,500 | 5,279 | 71,015 | | | | | |
| 43 | Child Care | | | | | | | 26,000 | 26,000 | 52,000 | | |
| 44 | Education Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | Employment Assistance | | | | | | | | | 3,048 | | |
| 46 | Food | 24,000 | 500 | | 22,831 | 2,000 | | 9,600 | 1,200 | | | |
| 47 | Housing/Counseling Services | 325,109 | | | 11,250 | | 41,280 | | | | | |
| 48 | Legal Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | Life Skills | | | | | | | 3,820 | 5,000 | 9,570 | | |
| 50 | Mental Health Services | 1,342 | 6,054 | | 11,350 | 15,402 | | | | | | |
| 51 | Outpatient Health Services | | | | | | | 2,000 | 2,246 | | | |
| 52 | Outreach Services | | | 58,971 | | | 331,996 | | | | | |
| 53 | Substance Abuse Treatment Services | | | | | | | 2,000 | 2,000 | | | |
| 54 | Transportation | 6,462 | | | 3,500 | 200 | 600 | 6,720 | 5,160 | | | |
| 55 | Utility Deposits | | | | | 400 | | 100 | 50 | 600 | | |
| 56 | Operating Costs | | | | | | 9,655 | | | | | |
| 57 | Total Supportive Services Cost: | 361,700 | 15,334 | 82,810 | 296,431 | 78,464 | 454,546 | 50,240 | 41,656 | 65,218 | | |
| 58 | Operations | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | Maintenance/Repair | 44,036 | | | 11,293 | | | 4,470 | 9,000 | | | |
| 60 | Property Taxes and Insurance | 8,970 | | | 4,000 | | | 1,200 | 1,050 | | | |
| 61 | Replacement Reserve | | | | | | | | 1,750 | | | |
| 62 | Building Security | | | | 6,000 | | | 32,220 | 43,697 | | | |
| 63 | Electricity, Gas, and Water | 43,025 | | | 14,085 | | | 11,495 | 11,400 | | | |
| 64 | Furniture | | | | | | | 9,627 | 4,460 | | | |
| 65 | Equipment (lease, buy) | 6,727 | | | 3,000 | | | 7,560 | 1,500 | | | |
| 66 | Total Operations Cost: | 102,758 | | | 38,378 | | | 66,572 | 72,857 | | | |
| 67 | HMIS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | Equipment | | | | | | | | | | 3,167 | |
| 69 | Software | | | | | | | | | | 88,654 | |
| 70 | Services | 700 | 354 | 732 | 700 | 354 | | | | | 1,600 | |
| 71 | Personnel | 700 | 355 | 1,014 | 700 | 355 | | 570 | 960 | 3,022 | 226,642 | |
| 72 | Space & Operations | | | | | | | | | | 1,500 | |
| 73 | Total HMIS Costs: | 1,400 | 709 | 1,746 | 1,400 | 709 | | | | | 321,563 | |
| 74 | Summary Budget: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | Leased Units | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 76 | Leased Structures | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37,080 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Summary of 2016 Continuum of Care Applications

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |
|----|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Agency: | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | Behavioral Health | City of Riverside | City of Riverside | City of Riverside | DPSS | Housing Authority |
| 2 | Project: | Coachella Valley PH | Men's Permanent Housing | Rapid Rehousing | Riverside Per Housing | HHOPE Consolidated Per Hg | CES | PSH Chronically Hmls | PSH for Disabled | Rapid Rehousing | HMIS | Consolidated All County |
| 77 | Rental Assistance | 0 | 123,552 | 48,264 | 0 | 346,752 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146,460 | 0 | 418,896 |
| 78 | Supportive Services | 361,700 | 15,334 | 82,810 | 296,431 | 78,464 | 454,546 | 50,240 | 41,656 | 65,218 | 0 | 0 |
| 79 | Operating | 102,758 | 0 | 0 | 38,378 | 0 | 0 | 66,572 | 72,857 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 80 | HMIS | 1,400 | 709 | 1,746 | 1,400 | 709 | 0 | 570 | 960 | 3,022 | 321,563 | 0 |
| 81 | Sub-total Costs Requested: | 465,858 | 139,595 | 132,820 | 336,209 | 463,005 | 454,546 | 117,382 | 115,473 | 214,700 | 321,563 | 418,896 |
| 82 | Admin (Up to 10%) | 32,610 | 9,771 | 9,297 | 23,534 | 32,410 | 45,454 | 8,216 | 8,083 | 15,028 | 22,509 | 29,321 |
| 83 | Total Assistance plus Admin | 498,468 | 149,366 | 142,117 | 359,743 | 495,415 | 500,000 | 125,598 | 123,556 | 229,728 | 344,072 | 448,217 |
| 84 | Cash Match | 124,617 | 37,342 | 35,530 | 89,936 | 123,854 | 125,000 | 31,400 | 30,889 | 57,432 | 86,018 | 0 |
| 85 | In-kind Match | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112,055 |
| 86 | Total Match | 124,617 | 37,342 | 35,530 | 89,936 | 123,854 | 125,000 | 31,400 | 30,889 | 57,432 | 86,018 | 112,055 |
| 87 | Total Budget | 623,085 | 186,708 | 177,647 | 449,679 | 619,269 | 625,000 | 156,998 | 154,445 | 287,160 | 430,090 | 560,272 |

Summary of 2016 Continuum of Care Applications

| | A | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W |
|----|------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Agency: | Housing Authority | Housing Authority | Housing Authority | Housing Authority | Jewish Family Ser | Jewish Family Ser | Lighthouse SSC | Lighthouse SSC | Path of Life | Path of Life | US Vets |
| 2 | Project: | Consolidated | EHOP | Project Based w/OSH | Street to Home Chronic | Desert Horizon PSH | Desert Vista Per Housing | Per Hg for women with Kids | Rapid Rehousng | PSH | RRH | Riverside Per Housing |
| 40 | Assessment of Service Needs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | Assistance with Moving Costs | | | | | | | | | 10,000 | 2,250 | |
| 42 | Case Management | | | | | 58,819 | 108,911 | 38,500 | 36,800 | 136,660 | 43,348 | 70,757 |
| 43 | Child Care | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | Education Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | Employment Assistance | | | | | | | | | | 5,000 | |
| 46 | Food | | | | | 5,000 | 7,000 | | | 4,000 | 2,250 | |
| 47 | Housing/Counseling Services | | | | | | | | | 54,000 | 43,348 | |
| 48 | Legal Services | | | | | 2,000 | 2,000 | | | | | |
| 49 | Life Skills | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | Mental Health Services | | | | | 2,000 | 2,000 | | | | | |
| 51 | Outpatient Health Services | | | | | 2,000 | 2,000 | | | | | |
| 52 | Outreach Services | | | | | 32,006 | 55,578 | | | 47,650 | 2,786 | |
| 53 | Substance Abuse Treatment Services | | | | | 7,760 | | | | | | |
| 54 | Transportation | | | | | 5,640 | 7,713 | 4,341 | 5,973 | 20,800 | 9,474 | |
| 55 | Utility Deposits | | | | | | | | | 5,579 | 5,250 | |
| 56 | Operating Costs | | | | | 2,000 | 5,000 | | | | | |
| 57 | Total Supportive Services Cost: | | | | | 117,225 | 190,202 | 42,841 | 42,773 | 278,689 | 113,706 | 70,757 |
| 58 | Operations | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | Maintenance/Repair | | | | | 83,323 | 139,450 | | | | | 40,000 |
| 60 | Property Taxes and Insurance | | | | | 2,400 | 4,264 | 2,255 | | | | 4,500 |
| 61 | Replacement Reserve | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| 62 | Building Security | | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| 63 | Electricity, Gas, and Water | | | | | 15,600 | 10,535 | | | | | 20,500 |
| 64 | Furniture | | | | | 16,016 | 25,000 | | | | | 12,794 |
| 65 | Equipment (lease, buy) | | | | | 10,000 | 15,000 | | | | | 3,000 |
| 66 | Total Operations Cost: | | | | | 129,139 | 194,249 | 2,255 | | | | 80,794 |
| 67 | HMIS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | Equipment | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | Software | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | Services | | | | | 720 | | | | | | |
| 71 | Personnel | | | | | 15,495 | 2,160 | | 29,422 | | 9,238 | |
| 72 | Space & Operations | | | | | | 14,230 | | | | | |
| 73 | Total HMIS Costs: | | | | | 16,215 | 16,390 | | | | 9,238 | |
| 74 | Summary Budget: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | Leased Units | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116,823 | 213,879 | 171,866 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188,860 |
| 76 | Leased Structures | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23,941 | 24,671 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,330 |

Summary of 2016 Continuum of Care Applications

| | A | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Agency: | Housing Authority | Housing Authority | Housing Authority | Housing Authority | Jewish Family Ser | Jewish Family Ser | Lighthouse SSC | Lighthouse SSC | Path of Life | Path of Life | US Vets |
| 2 | Project: | Consolidated | EHOP | Project Based w/OSH | Street to Home Chronic | Desert Horizon PSH | Desert Vista Per Housing | Per Hg for women with Kids | Rapid Rehousng | PSH | RRH | Riverside Per Housing |
| 77 | Rental Assistance | 475,896 | 39,948 | 68,040 | 107,472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173,856 | 949,680 | 220,020 | 0 |
| 78 | Supportive Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117,225 | 190,202 | 42,841 | 42,773 | 278,689 | 113,706 | 70,757 |
| 79 | Operating | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129,139 | 194,249 | 2,255 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,794 |
| 80 | HMIS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,215 | 16,390 | 0 | 29,422 | 0 | 9,238 | 0 |
| 81 | Sub-total Costs Requested: | 475,896 | 39,948 | 68,040 | 107,472 | 403,343 | 639,391 | 216,962 | 246,051 | 1,228,369 | 342,964 | 350,741 |
| 82 | Admin (Up to 10%) | 34,408 | 2,791 | 4,763 | 7,521 | 28,234 | 44,757 | 15,187 | 17,223 | 85,985 | 34,296 | 24,551 |
| 83 | Total Assistance plus Admin | 510,304 | 42,739 | 72,803 | 114,993 | 431,577 | 684,148 | 232,149 | 263,274 | 1,314,354 | 377,260 | 375,292 |
| 84 | Cash Match | 127,576 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72,704 | 111,400 | 15,071 | 0 | 67,588 | 40,000 | 20,838 |
| 85 | In-kind Match | 0 | 10,685 | 18,201 | 28,749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65,819 | 303,566 | 69,425 | 23,188 |
| 86 | Total Match | 127,576 | 10,685 | 18,201 | 28,749 | 72,704 | 111,400 | 15,071 | 65,819 | 371,154 | 109,425 | 44,026 |
| 87 | Total Budget | 637,880 | 53,424 | 91,004 | 143,742 | 504,281 | 795,548 | 247,220 | 329,093 | 1,685,508 | 486,685 | 419,318 |



May 4, 2017

SNAPS In Focus: FY 2016 CoC Program Competition Recap

As we move into the FY 2017 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program competition, I want to reflect on the FY 2016 competition. The factors that influenced the FY 2016 competition were the same as the ones I cited in my [recap message from the last competition](#): policy goals, congressional directives to be more competitive, and research. Our driving value continues to be increasing progress towards ending homelessness for all populations while ensuring that the programs we fund are as effective and efficient as possible.

As Ann [stated in her January message](#), those of us working in HUD's Office of Special Needs Assistance (SNAPS) and across the government on the issue of homelessness are deeply committed to working towards ending homelessness across the nation. We are constantly working to improve our programs, make them more effective, and find ways to serve more people with our resources. The FY 2016 CoC Program competition had a few key changes:

- We set a Tier 1 threshold of 93% (up from 85% in FY 2015) of each CoC's Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) amount.
- We reduced the bonus amount to 5% of Final Pro-Rata Need.
- We modified the project-level scoring based on project type to increase the emphasis on how the community ranked the project and reduced the emphasis on the project type and the CoC Score.

It was also evident by the caliber of both CoC and project applications that we received, that CoCs are improving their performance. I was impressed by how well many CoCs used data to prioritize projects that will ultimately lead to better outcomes. CoCs that scored well were able to increase assistance for people experiencing homelessness in their communities. There are also communities who lost funding in FY 2016 who face the difficult task for finding alternative funding for, reducing, or closing down longstanding programs. Like last year, HUD will provide guidance and technical assistance to help with this process.

Initial Outcomes of the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition

Here are some of our initial estimates of outcomes of the competition:

- Funding for permanent supportive housing projects increased by approximately \$26 million to \$1.43 billion. From 2014 to 2016 we have increased the number of permanent supportive housing units by 10% (from 113,180 to 124,371) and the number of beds dedicated to chronic homelessness by 50% (from 60,262 in FY 2014 to 90,317 in FY 2016).
- Funding for rapid re-housing projects continued to increase, up to nearly \$250 million. We estimate that this funding will serve approximately 17,000 more households experiencing homelessness than with FY 2015



funding.

- Funding for transitional housing projects declined by \$66 million from FY 2015 with 90% of this decrease being from reallocation at the CoC level.
- As a result of these changes, 22% more households will be served in CoC Program-funded permanent housing and transitional housing programs combined compared to 2014.
- The CoC Program is serving people more efficiently with permanent housing and transitional housing programs combining to serve 14% more households per dollar spent than with grants funded in FY 2014.

We also analyzed the number of projects that plan to serve people fleeing domestic violence. Funding for transitional housing projects has declined while funding has increased for rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing targeting people fleeing domestic violence. As a whole, CoC funded projects will serve approximately 7 percent more households fleeing domestic violence in residential programs than last year.

Preliminary CoC and Project Score Observations

Hopefully you have had the opportunity to participate in one of the [regional debriefing webinars](#) that SNAPS offered in February and each CoC should have received a debriefing summary outlining how they scored on each section of the CoC Application. Here are a few observations:

- Of the 200 points possible, the median score was 154.5, and the weighted mean score was 160.7. There were many factors that influenced a CoC's score, but the most important one was improving the performance of the CoC, especially in reducing the number of people experiencing homelessness and improving permanent housing outcomes.
- There were many smaller CoCs that had low CoC scores, and it is clear that many do not have enough capacity to take full advantage of the CoC program. CoCs that have scored poorly in the last two CoC Competitions should consider merging with Balance of State or other CoCs.
- This was the first year that CoCs had to report on system performance measurements. Although we did not evaluate the actual outcomes reflected in the system performance measures, we hope CoCs use this information to make system-level improvements moving forward.

CoC score was a large factor for the Tier 2 project score but there were other factors that affected whether individual projects ranked in Tier 2 received funding:

- **Project Ranking** – How a CoC ranked a project was a major factor in determining whether it was funded. A project that was ranked at the top of Tier 2 was much more likely to be funded than one at the bottom of Tier 2. The CoC ranking process continues to be a crucial part of the funding process, and CoCs should be continually strengthening their process for ensuring that projects are ranked based on their performance and the needs they address in a community.



- **Housing First Practices** - Projects that committed to using housing first practices received more points and were more likely to be funded than those that did not. Overall, a much higher proportion of Tier 2 projects were fully utilizing housing first practices in FY 2016 (93%) than in FY 2015 (78%).
- **Project Types** – The type of project that a CoC applied for was a smaller factor in determining whether a project received funding than it was in FY 2015. Transitional housing projects (except for those that serve youth) and supportive services only (SSO) projects (except for those for coordinated entry) received fewer points than other project types. This provided an incentive for CoCs to reallocate from those project types to create new permanent housing, Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), and SSO-coordinated entry projects.

I want to close by thanking our many partners in communities. You make very challenging decisions that affect many people's lives. Your work to end homelessness has resulted in large declines in homelessness over the past decade, and it has positioned us to continue that progress in the future. There is much more work ahead, but together, I am confident that we can finally and forever end homelessness.

Thank you.

Norm Suchar
Director
Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs

Guidelines for New Projects in 2017 Registration Notice

There are four sections in the 2017 Registration Notice that provides guidance for new projects through reallocation and the permanent housing bonus. They are as follows:

Page 3 in 2017 Registration Notice states:

CoCs may use the reallocation process to create the following types of new projects or to expand existing projects of the following types:

1. permanent supportive housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth;
2. rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth;
3. Joint Transitional Housing (TH) and Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing (PH-RRH) component projects, that will combine TH and PH-RRH into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness;
4. dedicated Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) projects; or
5. Supportive Services Only (SSO) project specifically for a centralized or coordinated assessment system.

Page 9 in 2017 Registration Notice states:

d. Joint TH and PH-RRH Component Project. In the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition, CoCs will be able to create new joint TH and PH-RRH component projects to better serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness. These projects will provide low-barrier, temporary housing while individuals and families quickly move to permanent housing with a seamless program design. The joint TH and PH-RRH component combines two existing program components—TH and PH-RRH—into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness. If funded, HUD will limit eligible costs as follows:

1. Capital costs (i.e., new construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition), leasing of a structure or units, and operating costs to provide transitional housing;
2. Short- or medium-term tenant-based rental assistance on behalf of program participants to pay for the rapid rehousing portion of the project;
3. Supportive services;
4. HMIS; and
5. Project administrative costs.

Joint TH and PH-RRH component projects that assist program participants must be able to provide both transitional housing assistance and rapid rehousing assistance to each program participant. HUD will require that applications for joint TH and PH-RRH component projects demonstrate that the project will have the capacity to provide both kinds of assistance as

needed to each program participant. Additional information will be provided in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA.

Page 11 of Registration Notice states:

j. Reallocation. When a CoC shifts funds in whole or part from existing eligible renewal projects to create one or more new projects without decreasing the CoC's ARD. All CoCs may use the reallocation process. In the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition, HUD anticipates allowing CoCs to use the reallocation process, at a minimum, the following new projects:

1. permanent supportive housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth;
2. rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, or persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness;
3. Joint Transitional Housing (TH) and Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing (PH-RRH) component projects, that will combine TH and PH-RRH into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness;
4. dedicated HMIS projects; or
5. Supportive Services Only (SSO) project specifically for a centralized or coordinated assessment system.

Page 32 of Registration Notice states:

5. Depending on the amount of funding made available in the FY 2017 Appropriation, HUD may continue the Permanent Housing Bonus. CoCs may create new projects through the permanent housing bonus based on a percentage of the CoC's FPRN for the following types of new projects for those CoCs that meet the criteria in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA:

- permanent supportive housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth;
- rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied youth, coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, or persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness;
- Joint Transitional Housing (TH) and Permanent Housing-Rapid Rehousing (PH-RRH) component projects, that will combine TH and PH-RRH into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

REALLOCATING PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

After years of emphasis on reallocating low performing transitional housing programs, many communities are finding their Continuum of Care (CoC) portfolios are almost entirely composed of permanent housing projects. CoCs should evaluate permanent supportive housing (PSH) projects and consider reallocation when it would improve the communities' ability to end chronic homelessness.

CoCs that do not have the ability or capacity to evaluate all of the suggested considerations below should choose a few questions to consider as part of the 2016 process, with the goal of evaluating these questions more in-depth in future funding competitions.

How do you determine whether PSH should be reallocated?

In the 2016 NOFA, CoCs may reduce or eliminate funds from eligible renewal projects, including first-time renewal projects formerly funded under the Shelter Plus Care Program (S+C). CoCs can reallocate funds from one or more projects to create one or more new projects. CoCs should consider reallocating low performing projects, inefficient projects, and projects that no longer meet a community need.

Here are three key questions to consider when evaluating permanent supportive housing projects:

1. Does the permanent supportive housing project perform well?

Continually monitor project performance and work with projects to develop capacity or determine others who could provide high quality supportive housing.

Data or Information Needed

- Total number of households served in the year
- Number of households exited to any destination
- Number of households who exited to permanent housing destinations
- Number of households remaining in the project longer than 12 months¹
- Written project policy of prioritizing chronically homeless households
- Organizational policies and procedures
- Percentage of clients served in the past year who were chronically homeless
- HMIS data quality
- Consumer feedback

Things to Consider

- Did the project meet HUD's performance goal of 80 percent of households retaining housing or exiting to permanent housing?
- If the CoC set a higher performance goal, did the project also meet the CoC's performance goal?
- How did the project compare relative to other PSH projects in the CoC?
- Are the high or low performers serving chronically homeless households?
- Has the project shown improvements or have plans in place to make improvements?
- Are consumers satisfied with the housing and services?
- Does the project embrace a Housing First philosophy, and is this reflected in their policies and procedures?
- How is the project's data quality?

¹ In the 2016 NOFA, points are available for CoCs that can demonstrate that 80 percent of people in CoC funded PSH remained for at least 12 months.

2. Is it cost effective?

Permanent housing resources are scarce. Measure cost effectiveness to determine if projects are maximizing their resources.

Data or Information Needed

- Total annual program budget (all funding sources)
- Total number of households served in a year
- Utilization Rates from Housing Inventory Chart
- Number of households who exited to permanent housing destinations
- Number of households remaining in the project longer than 12 months
- Written project policy of prioritizing chronically homeless households
- Percentage of clients served in the past year who were chronically homeless

Things to Consider

- What is the cost per household served?
- Are project costs high or low compared to other PSH projects in the CoC?
- Are high costs projects also serving chronically homeless households?
- Is the project operating at full capacity?
- What is the cost per positive outcome (exit to or retention of permanent housing)?

3. Does it continue to meet a community need?

CoC projects should reflect the needs of the community for permanent housing and be used strategically to end chronic homelessness.

Data or Information Needed

- Percentage of beds dedicated or prioritized for a specific population
- Percentage of beds serving households experiencing chronic homelessness as reported on the HIC
- PIT counts of chronically homeless individuals and families over time
- CoC gaps analysis
- Participation in coordinated entry
- Written project policy of prioritizing chronically homeless households
- Percentage of clients served in the past year who were chronically homeless

Things to Consider

- Does the project's target population match the need in your community?
- Has chronic homelessness gone up or down in your community?
- Is the project serving the intended target population?
- Is the project serving chronically homeless households?
- Is the project accepting referrals from coordinated entry?

What should CoCs reallocate funding to?

CoCs should consider data on community need and HUD's policy priorities when determining to what to reallocate. Reallocating from PSH to another PSH project should be the first consideration. CoCs with a need for more PSH should consider reallocating to a high performing PSH provider who can take over operations without displacing clients. If the PSH project does not currently serve a community need, CoCs should consider reallocating to PSH for another population. If, through move-on strategies and better targeting, the CoC has enough PSH to end chronic homelessness they may want to reallocate to rapid re-housing, HMIS, or SSO for coordinated entry.

If CoCs do find they have PSH that is low performing, inefficient, or no longer meets a community need, the following chart outlines to what CoCs should consider reallocating.

| | Reallocate from PSH to high performing PSH provider | Reallocate from PSH serving one population to PSH serving a higher priority population | Reallocate from PSH to rapid re-housing, HMIS, or SSO for coordinated entry |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| Low performing | x | x | |
| Not cost effective | x | | |
| Does not meet need | | x | x |