County of Riverside Continuum of Care
2018 HUD CoC Program Competition
Independent Review Panel Meeting

Wednesday, April 4, 2018 – 10:00 a.m.
DPSS Staff Development, Moreno Valley, CA

AGENDA

1. Review IRP meeting summary from March 7, 2018

2. Review 2018 HUD-CoC Program Competition Scorecards and matrix for renewal projects:
    - BH Coachella Valley PH
    - BH HHOPE Consolidated
    - BH Men's PH
    - BH Riverside PH
    - City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless
    - City of Riverside PSH for Disabled
    - Desert Horizon PSH
    - HA Consolidated All County
    - Housing Authority Consolidated
    - HA EHOP
    - HA Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH
    - HA Street to Home
    - JFS Desert Vista PH
    - Lighthouse SSC Disabled Women with Children
    - Lighthouse SSC RRH
    - Path of Life PSH
    - Path of Life Rapid Rehousing
    - POLM RRH East County

3. Fiscal Review
    - Unspent funds (analysis from 2017)

4. 2018 State ESG Program NOFA
    - Overview
    - Timeline
    - Selection of eligible activities for 2018 RFP
    - RPF Process

5. CES Evaluation Criteria

6. Other Matters

County of Riverside Continuum of Care
2018 Continuum of Care Consolidated Application
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Independent Review Panel (IRP)
Meeting Summary
Wednesday, March 7, 2018
DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA

Attendees:

Angelina Coe, Shelter From the Storm	DPSS staff:
Frankie Riddle, City of Palm Desert	Jill Kowalski, Admin Services Manager II
Monica Sapien, Social Worker Action Group (SWAG)	Rowena Concepcion, Admin Services Officer
David Leahy, ABC Recovery Center	Connie Hill, Admin Services Supervisor
Robin Gilliland, City of Temecula	Elizabeth Hernandez, Program Specialist II
Lt. Dean Spivacke, Riverside County Sheriff	Amie St. Croix, Secretary ll
Paul Flores, Health to Hope	Linda Salas, Program Specialist II

1. Welcome and Introduction

- IRP chair Robin Gilliland welcomed all members and DPSS staff. All IRP members were in attendance.

2. Review IRP Meeting Summary from Feb. 7, 2018

- Review and approve Feb. 7 meeting summary: Motion was made by Frankie Riddle to approve summary meeting minutes from February 7, 2018 meeting. David Leahy seconded the motion. ***Ayes: Unanimous.***

3. 2018 HUD CoC Program NOFA

- HUD Timeline: DPSS staff provided a timeline for the 2018 NOFA based on what they learned at the National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) Family and Youth Conference in Los Angeles last week. Information received by HUD on a tentative timeline includes:
  - The 2018 registration will be open in March.
  - The Grant Inventory Worksheet (GIW) will be open to review in March2018 HUD CoC Program NOFA to be released in May
  - Deadline for the CoC Consolidated Application will be in the "Fall"
  - Grant awards will be announced before the end of 2018

1. Update on CES Evaluation tool
   - The review panel discussed how to evaluate the CES project and lead. Currently, HUD has not provided an evaluation tool for CES. In addition, DPSS requested an extension to complete the CES Annual Performance Report (APR) because HUD is developing a new APR for the CES project.

There was also discussion and questions about what CoC committee is responsible for developing evaluation criteria for CES.

Recommendation: *The IRP recommends that the Board of Governance ask the CoC Standards and Evaluation Committee to review and address how to evaluation the CES project at its next meeting in April.* Motion by Frankie Riddle; seconded by Lt. Dean Spivacke; ***Ayes: Unanimous***

-

2. Review HUD Project Rating and Ranking Tool for Renewal Projects
   DPSS staff presented a summary of how each renewal project scored with the new HUD tool (hand-out). The names of each project were intentionally left off the summary so the IRP could focus on the totality of the scores rather than where each individual project ranked.

   A 2018 project matrix (hand-out) was also given to the IRP that broke out each measure on the HUD tool and how each project scored.

   Highlights of the discussion about the new HUD tool included:
   - The scores are much lower than the local tools used in previous years.
   - HUD is showing what it is prioritizing as high performance among its projects. For example, there was 30 points given for serving high needs populations. Our collective CoC projects did not do well in this area and all of the projects received a zero for the third criteria (75% or greater of participants entering projects from place(s) not meant for human habitation). Most of the people being housed through CoC projects are coming from emergency shelter rather than encampments, etc.
   - HUD is also placing greater emphasis on serving participants with more than one disability and zero income when they enter housing.
   - Based on the scores on the HUD tool, all of the projects could be considered for reallocation due to low performance. There is concern if we use the HUD tool this year, it could jeopardize funding.
   - The CoC projects have scored higher based on the current scoring criteria and process that is in-place.
   - In 2017 the IRP recommended projects that scored in the low 70s or lower (60s) be reallocated. If the same criteria are used with the HUD tool, all but one project could be recommended for reallocation.
   - The IRP believes the scores using the HUD tool should be presented to the BoG and CoC for information this year and to show that improvements need to be made, especially in the area of better serving high need clients.

Recommendation: *The IRP rescinds its previous recommendation to the Board of Governance made on Feb. 7 to adopt the HUD CoC Project Rating and Ranking Tool to evaluate the 2018 CoC renewal and new projects.* Motion by Frankie Riddle; seconded by Robin Gilliland. ***Ayes: Unanimous (note: David Leahy was not present for the vote).***

Recommendation: *The IRP recommends that the Board of Governance approve using the 2017 review and evaluation tools and process for the 2018 HUD CoC Program NOFA process with the intent of introducing the new HUD tool in 2019.* Motion by Frankie Riddle; seconded by Robin Gilliland. ***Ayes: Unanimous (note: David Leahy was not present for the vote).***

- Review 2017 HUD CoC Project Review and Ranking Process
  - Discuss 90% score threshold for projects

- Appeal narrative

The IRP received the 2017 HUD CoC Project Review and Ranking Process prior to the meeting. Based on the review and discussion, the IRP did not recommend any changes to the document.

Recommendation: *The IRP recommends that the Board of Governance adopt the 2017 HUD CoC Project Review and Ranking Process for 2018 with no changes other than those changes needed to reflect the 2018 HUD CoC Program NOFA when it is released.* Motion by Frankie Riddle; seconded by Robin Gilliland. ***Ayes: Unanimous (note: David Leahy was not present for the vote).***

3. Meeting Schedule

The IRP approved the proposed meeting schedule for the 2018 HUD CoC Program NOFA cycle with a change to the meeting time from 1-3 p.m. to 10 a.m. to noon. Meetings will be held on the following Wednesdays:

- April 4
- May 2
- May 9
  - Board of Governance meeting: May 17
- June 6
- June 13
  - Board of Governance meeting: June 27
- July 11
  - Board of Governance meeting July 12 (should be July 19)
- Aug. 1
- Aug. 8
  - Board of Governance meeting August 16

Next meeting: April 4th

1. <u>April 4 meeting agenda items:</u>
   A. Review and recommend evaluation criteria for CES system.
   B. Provide the most current HMIS System Performance Report for the IRP to review.
   C. Use the 2017 evaluation scorecard for renewal projects and present to the IRP for their review and consideration.

2018 HUD-CoC Program Competition - Project Matrix
Renewal Permanent Housing Projects

	Project Name	Grant Amount	Operating Start Date	Operating End Date	Project Type	# of Units	# of Beds	Performance Measures 1 Housing Stability 80% (5)	Performance Measures 2 Employment and Income Growth (5)	Performance Measures 3 Bed Utilization (5)	Supportive Services 4 - 8 Case Management mainstream benefits (5)	HMIS 9 Data Quality, Accuracy, Timeliness (10)	Program Compliance 10 APR received on time (5)	Program Compliance 11 Monitoring Report Finding (5)	Financial Management and Reporting 12 Monthly Claim Submission (5)	Financial Management and Reporting 13 Unspent Funds (5)	Financial Management and Reporting 14 Cost effective (5)	Financial Management and Reporting 15 Match (5)	16 - 27 CoC Priorities (40)	Comments	Project Score
1	Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated	$381,528	10/01/16	09/30/17	PSH	54	112	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	5	40		100
2	City of Riverside Disabled	$123,556	02/01/16	01/31/17	PSH	8	11	5	3	5	5	10	5	5	4	5	5	5	40		97
3	Behavioral Health Men's PH	$149,366	02/01/16	01/31/17	PSH	18	23	5	5	3	5	10	5	5	5	3	5	5	40	$19,775.02 unspent funds; 13.24%.	96
4	Housing Authority Street to Home	$114,993	07/01/16	06/30/17	PSH	13	13	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	1	5	5	5	40		96
5	Behavioral Health Riverside PH	$359,743	07/01/16	06/30/17	PSH	13	25	4	5	5	5	10	5	5	5	5	1	5	40	Project is 24% higher than average cost per bed.	95
6	Housing Authority EHOP	$42,739	05/01/16	04/30/17	PSH	4	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	0	5	5	5	40		95
7	Lighthouse Rapid Rehousing	$263,274	07/01/16	06/30/17	RRH	13	38	5	5	5	5	10	5	0	5	5	4	5	40	Project is 10% higher than average cost per bed.	94
8	Lighthouse PH for Disabled Women with Children	$232,149	09/01/16	08/31/17	PSH	12	36	5	5	5	5	10	5	0	5	4	5	5	40	$16,045.49 unspent funds; 6.91%.	94
9	Path of Life PSH	$1,314,354	07/01/16	06/30/17	PSH	80	92	5	5	5	5	10	5	0	5	4	5	5	40	$84,167.70 unspent funds; 6.4%.	94
10	Behavioral Health Coachella PH	$498,468	02/01/16	01/31/17	PSH	13	25	4	5	5	5	10	5	5	3	5	0	5	40	Project is 45% higher than average cost per bed.	92
11	Housing Authority Consolidated All County	$448,217	06/01/16	05/31/17	PSH	41	92	5	5	3	5	10	5	5	1	3	5	5	40	$53,943.04 unspent funds; 12.04%.	92
12	Desert Horizon PSH	$431,577	01/01/17	12/31/17	PSH	10	18	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	1	5	0	5	40	Project is 54% higher than average cost per bed.	91
13	Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH	$349,200	09/01/16	08/31/17	PSH	13	13	5	5	4	5	10	0	5	2	5	5	5	40	APR late to DPSS (21 days).	91
14	Path of Life Rapid Rehousing	$345,549	07/01/16	06/30/17	RRH	12	40	5	5	5	5	10	5	0	5	1	5	5	40	$132,560.15 unspent funds; 38.36%.	91
15	JFS Desert Vista PH	$684,148	04/01/16	03/31/17	PSH	34	40	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	0	5	0	5	40	Project is 36% higher than average cost per bed.	90
16	Housing Authority Consolidated	$510,304	08/01/16	07/31/17	PSH	51	51	5	5	5	5	10	0	5	1	3	5	5	40	$71,903.10 unspent funds; 14.09%. APR late to DPSS.	89
17	City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless	$125,598	01/01/17	12/31/17	PSH	8	8	5	5	5	5	10	0	pending	5	5	0	5	40	$4,113.57 unspent funds; 3.28%. APR late to DPSS. Cost per bed 30% higher than average cost. Monitoring visit on 4/11/18. Score may increase by 5 points if no monitoring finding.	85
18	POLM RRH East County	$377,260	07/01/16	06/30/17	RRH	15	27	5	0	0	5	10	5	0	5	1	0	5	40	0% of clients had any income growth (wages/benefits). 29% bed utilization. 2 monitoring findings. $185,481.70 unspent funds; 49.17%. Cost per bed is $13,972.59. 54% higher than average.	76

County of Riverside CES Project	$500,000	12/01/16	11/30/17	Not Rated
Stepping Up Riverside	$888,903	07/01/17	06/30/18	New project
Stepping Up Riverside Bonus	$526,501	07/01/17	06/30/18	New project

Riverside University HEALTH SYSTEM Behavioral Health

March 28th , 2018

Riverside CoC
HUD Review Committee

C/o Department of Public Social Services

Attn : Review Committee Chair

Re: Scorecard for RUHS-BH :

Riverside Permanent Supportive Housing "The PLACE"
Coachella Valley Permanent Supportive Housing "The PATH"

Review Committee Chair,

Please allow us Riverside University Health system Behavioral Health (RUHS-BH) this opportunity to express to you, our significant thanks for your volunteering for this difficult group. RUHS-BH does recognize the challenges you face in making these decisions. Our intent is to maintain the integrity of this process and advocate for our projects and ensure clarity around our program successes and your understanding of any challenges . RUHS-BH has been providing more than a decade of supportive housing for the CoC and it our desire to continue to be a collaborative, effective and supportive member of the Continuum of Care in Riverside County. We are combining our response for both the above listed grants in our response, as they have similar issues and benefits and were designed to cover 2 geographic areas in the county. The original design met the COC and community goals and requests to have services aligned at access center points . Therefore with continuum support, one was located in the western end near the Path Of Life Shelter and the access center, while the other was located in the eastern end, next to Roys access center and shelter.

RUHS-BH noted on the scorecards two areas that we wanted to provide more specific detail around representing these specialized programs. From the start these programs used a unique shared housing program following a Safehaven model of very low barriers , Harm reduction and Housing First principles. They include 24 hr staffing and a drop in center, serving those who are the hardest to reach and engage , with the most challenging behaviors and risk issues. The drop in centers were designed to allow opportunities to engage individuals with significant behavioral health issues, build rapport , allow law enforcement 24 hour access to bring individuals to this service site rather than incarceration and diverts usage of higher costs resources.

At these locations our contractor provides 24 / 7 round the clock peer supports to help the residents as they learn to re-integrate themselves back into the community and acclimate to living indoors . We provide cooked meals, meals for drop in guests, food prep training and meal planning along with full utilities, other housing and personal needs , transportation, bus passes, onsite Behavioral health services, SSI applications assistance, and various other evidenced based best practices. The programs were designed as a shared housing program for a number of reasons including that it has a drop in center attached that allows the individual to see what a living situation could be and to help them feel a sense of community rather then isolated in an apartment.

This shared environment can be very positive as they work through their recovery, but also can be very challenging for an individual with active paranoia, anger issues and significant behavioral health symptoms. Due to the shared environment they also have the opportunity as they recover to begin to develop better life skills and relationships. Additionally the shared housing aspect naturally encourages them to move out and into their own housing as that recovery builds stronger.
Unfortunately at times , especially with the addition of the CES where we can receive an individual we have little rapport with, their disability challenges may result in unexpected behaviors, violent episodes or a refusal to follow the limited guidelines. Some will lose their eligibility, others will "fire" us and leave housing abruptly. With this challenging group of individuals, this is to be expected. This does affect our length of time in housing and can be reflected in our outcomes, although does not affect our behavioral health services to the individuals. We still attempt intensive engagements and outreach, trying to link them back to housing and behavioral health services.

Additionally, we noted the lowered score due to an above average cost factor. While we do acknowledge higher staffing and overhead costs, the programs both fully support the individuals while they are in housing, even if they refuse to accept their challenges or disability and apply for funding. Again, as some of the hardest to serve, they often struggle with insight into their challenges and as a Housing First provider we continue to be open to their needs and provide housing. Providing full 24 hr supports, meals and a drop in center, certainly increases our costs, but is a trade off of other community resources. We believe it is of significant importance that while these individuals are in this housing, many of them do not return to emergency rooms, behavioral health or other high cost inpatient systems, have repeat incarcerations or community policing efforts, nor are they using other community resources such as Cal Fresh and financial resources. While our program costs are increased, the community's costs are reduced.

RUHS-BH consistently attempts to look at our community and our clients with a holistic viewpoint. It is our goal to serve our individuals as best we can in all aspects, while serving our community as well.
We believe this program meets those goals.

Sincerely,

Lynne M Brockmeier
Administrative Services Manager
Housing Region

Independent Review Panel Comments
Path of Life Score Card
CA1364L9D081602 Path of Life PSH
2016/17

Score: 94 of 100 (-6)

<u>#11</u>: 0 of 5 (-5) for Second Consecutive concern that Match was low at time of monitoring.

Notes/Comments:

We have projected what we will be applying to this contract for match through the end of the contract year and our projections show that we will fully meet the match requirement. In April, we will be receiving the documentation needed for a significant portion of this for the in-kind match we have available, and this will bring us up to compliance.

Path of Life has met its match requirement year over year. However, due to the many different contracts requiring match and the high volume of "In Kind" match that Path of Life receives/applies, it is difficult for us to provide it evenly throughout the year. Historically, we have been able to collect and properly apply the majority of our match toward the end of the contract period, especially once we have run out of administrative funds in the contract and begin to apply all of our administrative expenditures on each contract as match.

<u>#13</u>: 4 of 5 (-1) for Unspent Funds in Prior Year

Notes/Comments:

Our current projections for the year have us fully spending down this project.

This was year 2 of this project. It was also the first year that CES became fully functional under its new contract. When we first started to receive referrals through the new CES system, we were finding that many of those being referred (as a result of their prioritization) were assessed a long time ago and were, thus, difficult to track down and work with once we finally got in touch with these high obstacle participants.

Independent Review Panel Comments
Path of Life Monitoring Report Concerns and Findings
CA1365L9D081602 Path of Life Rapid Rehousing
2017/18
Score: 91 of 100 (-9)

#11: 0 of 5 (-5) for Second Consecutive Concern that Match was low at time of monitoring.

Notes/Comments:

We have projected what we will be applying to this contract for match through the end of the contract year and our projections show that we will fully meet the match requirement. In April, we will be receiving the documentation needed for a significant portion of this for the in-kind match we have available, and this will bring us up to compliance.

Path of Life has met its match requirement year over year. However, due to the many different contracts requiring match and the high volume of "In Kind" match that Path of Life receives/applies, it is difficult for us to provide it evenly throughout the year. Historically, we have been able to collect and properly apply the majority of our match toward the end of the contract period, especially once we have run out of administrative funds in the contract and begin to apply all of our administrative expenditures on each contract as match.

#13: 1 of 5 (-4) for Unspent Funds last year.

Notes/Comments:

Path of Life is on track to spend our full grant this year.

There were 2 very specific things that contributed to the unspent funds last year.

1. We made a mistake of planning exits according to our participant's Individual Service plans that were too close to one another. Since the Individual Service Plans were created separately, we did not catch that the exit dates from the program were so close together. As a result, the program went from over full utilization to almost zero very quickly, which meant that rental dollars were not being spent.
2. At the same time, we were experiencing an incredible slowdown of families who would accept RRH assistance throughout the CoC resulting from a preference rule at the Housing Authority for Families in shelter. Families became aware that if they could get into a shelter, or already were in a shelter, they could then get to the front of the

list for Section 8 Vouchers. In turn, since the Section 8 Vouchers are permanent and do not include an exit within 2 years, the Families were turning us down for RRH services that require a family to exit within 2 years. As a result, it took us MUCH longer than before for us to fill the RRH program – and last year we more than doubled the units we had to fill resulting from the additional RRH Project.

Independent Review Panel Comments
Path of Life Monitoring Report Concerns and Findings
CA1450L9D081601 POLM RRH East County
2017/18
Score: 76 of 100 (-24)
We believe that, based on the information below, this score should be at least 10 points higher.

#2: 0 of 5 (-5) for 0% of Participants Gained or Increased Any Income

Notes/Comments:

This score does not reflect the performance of our project in this area.

As a result, this score does not provide a fair "apples to apples" comparison between programs who have not had clients in their project for one full year at the time of the APR and those programs who have.

We believe that we should have received 5 points for this category for a fair comparison.

The APR's from which the monitors obtain this score come from 3 areas:

- Income at Entry (which is used as the baseline and collected on every participant)
  - We collect and report this information on everyone in the program as is exhibited in Q's 16-18.
- Income at Annual Reassessment (at one year of them being in the program)
  - No one in this program had been in the program for 1 year at the time of the APR, therefore there was no information to report for the questions asked, but the question does not allow for a N/A answer.
  - Q19 is populated by Q 5a, which shows that we had 0 people in the program for
- Income at Exit (When a participant Leaves the Program)
  - We only had one adult out of 19 adult participants leave the program. That one adult had the same amount of income as when they entered.

#3: 0 of 5 (-5) for 29% Bed Utilization

Notes/Commments

This score does not reflect the performance of our project in this area.

As a result, this score does not provide a fair "apples to apples" comparison between programs who have not had clients in their project for one full year at the time of the APR and those programs who have.

We believe that we should have received at least 4 points for this category due to what our bed utilization was for the latest month in this new program (if not a 5 for where we ended the program that year) for a fair comparison.

This scored is determined not on the actual bed utilization reached or maintained in the program year, but on an average of "point in time counts" throughout the year – even for programs that are starting a new year and start at 0.

Our program started in July, and therefore the percentages reported are as follows:

- July 16 (first month of the program) – 0%
- October 16 (fourth month of the program) – 11.11%
- January 17 (seventh month of the program) – 29.63%
- April 17 (tenth month of the program) – 74.07%

We are confused as to why we would use an average of these months for first year programs rather than what bed utilization is ultimately achieved in the first year if we want to evaluate actual performance. Doesn't this put first year programs at an automatic and unfair disadvantage to renewal programs?

#11: 0 of 5 (-5) for Second Consecutive Concern that Match and spending was low at time of monitoring.

Notes/Comments:

We have projected what we will be applying to this contract for match through the end of the contract year and our projections show that we will fully meet the match requirement. In April, we will be receiving the documentation needed for a significant portion of this for the in-kind match we have available, and this will bring us up to compliance.

Path of Life has met its match requirement year over year. However, due to the many different contracts requiring match and the high volume of "In Kind" match that Path of Life receives/applies, it is difficult for us to provide it evenly throughout the year. Historically, we have been able to collect and properly apply the majority of our match toward the end of the contract period, especially once we have run out of administrative funds in the contract and begin to apply all of our administrative expenditures on each contract as match.

We address spending rates in #13.

#13: 1 of 5 (-4) for Unspent Funds last year.

Notes/Comments:

Last year was the first year of this project, we started with 0 participants and had to ramp up the amount of subsidies and, therefore, rents we were spending throughout the year.

At the same time, we were experiencing an incredible slowdown of families who would accept RRH assistance throughout the CoC resulting from a preference rule at the Housing Authority for Families in shelter. Families became aware that if they could get into a shelter, or already were in a shelter, they could then get to the front of the list for Section 8 Vouchers. In turn, since the Section 8 Vouchers are permanent and do not include an exit within 2 years, the Families were turning us down for RRH services that require a family to exit within 2 years. As a result, it took us MUCH longer than before for us to fill the RRH program – and last year we more than doubled the units we had to fill resulting from this additional RRH Project.

We are currently overserving for the number of households in the project this year and continuing to lease up additional people and overserve. The reason this is possible is because we have negotiated leases at rates significantly lower than the FMR projected in the budget.

Based at our run rate at this capacity, we are currently evaluating whether or not we can voluntarily return any of the funds in this project back to the CoC without underfunding the project in the coming year.

#14: 0 of 5 (-5) for Cost Effectiveness of Case Management and Other Supportive Services

Notes/Comments:

We are confused about how this is calculated and have asked for the following Technical Assistance on March 30th.

The scorecard reads: "Measures percentage of budget costs in case management and other supportive services." and then in the note: *HUD provides guidance and recommendations that supportive services/case management costs for PSH and RRH projects should not be higher than about 25% of the total project budget.*

This is the reason why we were under the impression that cost effectiveness was based on comparing the amount spent on supportive services against the amount spent on rent.

We have since been told that the score is based solely on dividing the number of beds by the total amount of the program.

We are confused on 4 things:

- How does using the total cost per bed (which includes rental costs along with supportive services and, therefore will be higher in some areas of the county than others) help demonstrate the percentage of budget costs in case management and other support services as compared to rent?
- Why would we use a <u>past application</u> that has already been approved by the CoC/HUD verses performance to help determine the score of a program's performance and determination for future funding.
- How does the percentage in a <u>past grant application</u> for a program that is already complete helpful in determining the score for this upcoming year's application that may be different than that past application?
- Using the total cost per bed numbers, can you show us how our score (30% higher than average cost) was determined so that we can address this in future applications?

2017 NOFA REVIEW
UNSPENT FUNDS ANALYSIS

Denotes grants that were reduced in prior NOFA's

RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPT of MENTAL HEALTH

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 $93,559*

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
Behavioral	12/01 - 11/30	2011	$72,654.00	$69,004.13	$3,649.87	5.02%	
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%	
		2014	$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%	
		2014	$144,284.00	$105,976.57	$38,307.43	26.55%	
		2015	$149,366.00	$129,590.98	$19,775.02	13.24%	
		2016	$149,366.00				

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%	
		2012	$357,540.00	$357,540.00	$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%	
		2015	$142,117.00				

LIGHTHOUSE

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
Lighthouse SSC	9/1-8/31	2014	$227,077.00	$187,718.98	$39,358.02	17.33%	
Disabled Women		2015	$232,149.00	$96,393.24			

	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
Lighthouse SSC RRH	7/1-6/30	2014	$258,054.00	$258,054.00	$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	$263,274.00				

US VETERANS INITIATIVE

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
US Vets	7/01 - 6/30	2011	$792,383.00	$598,650.91	$193,732.09	24.45%	
Riverside PH		2012	$403,738.00	$295,144.70	$108,593.30	26.90%	
		2013	$403,738.00	$395,340.26	$8,397.74	2.08%	
		2014	$411,590.00	$386,568.51	$25,021.49	6.08%	*Grant reduced $44,864*
		2015	$375,292.00				

DPSS (HMIS & PLANNING)

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
HMIS	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				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
PLANNING	7/1-6/30	2014	$104,365.00	$104,365.00	$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	$292,607.00				

PAST GRANT REDUCTIONS	
2015	
Housing Authority ECON	$94,764.00
Housing Authority Street to Home	$37,678.00
Housing Authority All County I	$2,112.00
Housing Authority All County II	$22,308.00
US Vets CHAMPS	$44,864.00
RCDMH HHOPE	$93,559.00
2014	
Housing Authority All County I	$67,000.00
RCDMH HHOPE	$67,000.00

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				

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 grant
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%	
(ECON)	6/01 - 5/31	2015	$448,217.00	$394,273.96	$53,943.04	12.04%	*Grant reduced $94,764*

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
Housing	4/29 - 4/28	2008	$213,300.00	$212,917.34	$382.66	0.18%	5 yr S+C grant
Authority EHOP		2014	$41,935.00	$25,823.69	$16,111.31	38.42%	
	6/01 - 5/31	2015	$42,739.00				

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 grant
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
Path of Life	7/1-6/30	2014	$338,541.00	$334,703.57	$3,837.43	1.13%	
RRH		2015	$345,549.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
POL East County RRH		2015	$377,260.00				

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				

State Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

	2016 12/28/16 - 7/21/18			2017 3/27/18 - 10/30/19	
Agency	***Amount Funded***	***Project Type***	***Agency***	***Amount Funded***	***Project Type***
Coachella Valley Rescue Mission	$245,814	Emergency Shelter *250 beds*	**Coachella Valley Rescue Mission**	$235,088	Rapid Rehousing- *30 units/households; funding is to add 4 part-time Housing Assistants*
Coachella Valley Rescue Mission	$107,449	Rapid Rehousing - 36 individuals	**Path of Life Ministries**	$161,800	Rapid Rehousing- *45 units, will not increase units. Funding for 2 Housing Locator*
Path of Life Ministries	$200,000	Street Outreach- *assist 180 unsheltered individuals*	**Martha's Village & Kitchen**	$200,000	Emergency Shelter - *120 beds*
Path of Life Ministries	$46,362	Emergency Shelter - *add 13 beds*	**DPSS**	$33,869	HMIS
Valley Restart Shelter	$14,911	Emergency Shelter- *35 beds (no new beds)*			
Total	**$614,536**		**Total**	**$630,757**	