

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

Thursday, May 10, 2018  
DPSS Staff Development, Moreno Valley, CA

AGENDA

1. Review IRP meeting summary from April 4, 2018
2. 2018 HUD-CoC Program Competition
  - Review Scorecard Summary Matrix/Ranking
  - Unspent funds
  - Cost-Effectiveness
  - Letter from Path of Life
  - Recommendation to the BOG
3. Overview of DedicatedPlus
4. 2018 California ESG Program
  - ESG and SB 2
5. CES Evaluation Criteria
6. IRP Meeting under Brown Act
7. Other Matters

**County of Riverside Continuum of Care  
2018 Continuum of Care Application  
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Independent Review Panel Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, April 4, 2018  
DPSS Staff Development Office, Moreno Valley, CA**

**Attendees**

Robin Gilliland, City of Temecula – Chair  
Angelina Coe, Shelter From the Storm – Vice Chair  
Frankie Riddle, City of Palm Desert  
Monica Sapien, Social Worker Action Group (SWAG)  
David Leahy, ABC Recovery Center  
Lt. Dean Spivacke, Riverside County Sheriff  
Paul Flores, Health and Hope

**DPSS Staff**

Jill Kowalski, Admin Services Manager II  
Rowena Concepcion, Admin Services Officer  
Amie St. Croix, Secretary II  
Linda Salas, Program Specialist II

**Review IRP Meeting Summary from March 6, 2018**

1. Review and Approve meeting summary:
  - A. Motion was made by Frankie Riddle to approve summary meeting minutes from March 6, 2018 meeting. Monica Sapien seconded the motion. **Ayes: *Unanimous.***
  - B. Per the BOG, the HUD Project Rating and Ranking Tool will be implemented in 2020 to give agencies a chance to review and prepare.
  - C. The IRP meeting may be under the Brown Act due to Angelina being a board member. Per the County Counsel, she would either have to step down from the board or the IRP. It is important to keep the independence of the IRP. County Counsel is checking on how the First 5 Commission is set-up.

**Review 2018 HUD-CoC Program Completions Scorecards and matrix for renewal Projects**

2. The scorecard for following renewal projects was reviewed:
  - RUHS-BH Coachella Valley PH
  - RUHS-BH HHOPE Consolidated
  - RUHS-BH Men’s PH
  - RUHS-BH Riverside PH
  - City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless
  - City of Riverside PSH for Disabled
  - JFS Desert Horizon PSH
  - Housing Authority 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

3. DPSS **received letters from two agencies:**

- **Behavioral Health** – provided explanation on why the cost of their beds is high compared to others since they serve difficult population. Their level of services cost more.
- **Path of Life – provided explanation on 3 projects**
  - RRH East County: 0% of Participants Gained or Increased Any Income; 29% Bed Utilization; Match and spending was low at time of monitoring; Unspent Funds last year; Cost Effectiveness of Case Management and Other Supportive Services

After further review and analysis of data, the IRP agreed that POL score for all its 3 projects will remain.

Motion was made by Frankie Riddle to hold the recommendations as they stand for both organizations.  
**Ayes: Unanimous.**

The IRP also recommends checking the FMR since the cost per bed in the desert seems high for projects that serve that area.

**Fiscal Review**

- Unspent funds (analysis from 2017) will be discussed at the May meeting.
- The IRP will look at unspent funds for the past three years.

**2018 California ESG Program**

- County of Riverside allocation is \$996,600. The IRP recommended that funds be appropriated as follows:
  - RRH – 40%
  - Emergency Shelter – 30%
  - Homeless Prevention – 10%
  - CES Implementation – 10%
  - HMIS – 10%
- DPSS will start the RPF process

Motion was made by Angelina Coe that this is our recommendation. Dean Spivacke seconds the motion. **Ayes: Unanimous**

- The recommendation will be presented at the BOG meeting in May.

### **CES Evaluation Criteria**

- Need to come up with performance criteria, tools and deliverables.
- Standards and Evaluation Committee - April 19, May 17.
- CES should be able to provide reports- how long are clients stay on the list, when did they get referred, when they got housed, housing stability.

**2017 - 2018 Project Review Comparison**

5/14/2018 2:50 PM

**Behavioral Health Projects**

Project Name:	2017 Comments:	Total Score:	2018 Comments:	Total Score:
1 Behavioral Health Coachella Valley Permanent Housing	High cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>94</b>	Low housing stability rate; 77.78%. Late claim submission. Project is 45% higher than average cost.	<b>92</b>
2 Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated PH	Monitoring findings (4 Program); unspent funds; did not meet HQS compliance.	<b>86</b>	Projects received maximum points.	<b>100</b>
3 Behavioral Health Men's PH	Unspent/recaptured funds (per fiscal).	<b>94</b>	Low bed utilization; 66%.	<b>96</b>
4 Behavioral Health Riverside PH	Monitoring finding; late claim submission; high cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>85</b>	Low housing stability rate; 76.47%.	<b>96</b>

**City of Riverside Projects**

Project Name:	2017 Comments:	Total Score:	2018 Comments:	Total Score:
1 City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless	4 monitoring findings (1 Fiscal, (2) HMIS, (1) Program - Occupancy/Lease Agreements; high cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>77</b>	\$4,113.57 unspent funds; 3.28%. Late APR submission to DPSS. Project is 30% higher than average cost.	<b>90</b>
2 City of Riverside Disabled	3 monitoring findings (1 Fiscal and (2) program - HQS & lease non-compliance.	<b>76</b>	Low income growth. Late claim submission.	<b>97</b>

**Housing Authority Projects**

Project Name:	2017 Comments:	Total Score:	2018 Comments:	Total Score:
1 Housing Authority Consolidated	Monitoring findings (5 Program & HMIS); late APR submission; unspent funds; late claim submission.	<b>71</b>	Late APR submission to DPSS. \$71,903.10 unspent funds; 14.09%. Late claim submission.	<b>89</b>
2 Housing Authority Consolidated All County	Monitoring finding (1 Program); unspent funds; no supportive services provided; late APR submission to DPSS.	<b>77</b>	Low bed utilization rate; 66%. \$53,943.04 unspent funds; 12.04%. Late claim submission.	<b>92</b>
3 Housing Authority EHOP	Monitoring finding (1 Program); late APR submission; unspent funds.	<b>82</b>	Late claim submission.	<b>95</b>
4 Housing Street to Home	Program finding (1); unspent funds.	<b>87</b>	Late claim submission.	<b>96</b>
5 Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH	Monitoring finding; late claim submission; low bed utilization; clients entering project not from the streets or emergency shelters.	<b>82</b>	Late APR submission to DPSS. Late claim submission.	<b>91</b>

**Jewish Family Services Projects**

Project Name:	2017 Comments:	Total Score:	2018 Comments:	Total Score:
1 Desert Horizon PSH	High cost per bed (per fiscal). Late claim submission.	<b>90</b>	Project is 54% higher than average cost. Late claim submission.	<b>91</b>
2 JFS Desert Vista PH	High cost per bed (per fiscal). Late claim submission.	<b>90</b>	Project is 36% higher than average cost. Late claim submission.	<b>90</b>

**Lighthouse Social Service Centers Projects**

Project Name:	2017 Comments:	Total Score:	2018 Comments:	Total Score:
1 Lighthouse PH for Disabled Women with Children	Unspent funds (per fiscal).	<b>97</b>	\$16,045.49 unspent funds; 6.91%. 2 monitoring findings (match and leases).	<b>94</b>
2 Lighthouse Rapid Rehousing	2 findings (match & eligibility Criteria)	<b>91</b>	Project is 10% higher than average cost. 1 monitoring finding (match).	<b>94</b>

**Path of Life Ministries Projects**

Project Name:	2017 Comments:	Total Score:	2018 Comments:	Total Score:
1 Path of Life PSH	Late claim submission; unspent funds; high cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>90</b>	\$84,167.70 unspent funds; 6.4%. 1 monitoring finding (match).	<b>94</b>
2 Path of Life Rapid Rehousing	4 monitoring findings (leases, HQS, ISP's, recordkeeping). Late claim submission.	<b>95</b>	\$132,560.15 unspent funds; 38.36%. 1 monitoring finding (match).	<b>91</b>
3 POLM RRH East County	This project did not have one full grant period so there was no historical data.	<b>N/A</b>	0% of clients had any income growth (wages/benefits). 29% bed utilization. 2 monitoring findings (match and slow spending). \$185,481.70 unspent funds; 49.17%. Project is 54% higher than average cost.	<b>76</b>

**Project Review Comparison**

**2017 - 2018**

**Behavioral Health Projects**

<b>Project Name:</b>	<b>2017 Comments:</b>	<b>Total Score:</b>	<b>2018 Comments:</b>	<b>Total Score:</b>
1 Behavioral Health Coachella Valley Permanent Housing	High cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>94</b>	Low housing stability rate 77.78%. Late claim submission. High cost per bed (45% more than average cost)	<b>92</b>
2 Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated Permanent Housing	Monitoring findings (4 Program); unspent funds; did not meet HQS compliance.	<b>86</b>	Projects received all points.	<b>100</b>
3 Behavioral Health Men's PH	Unspent/recaptured funds.	<b>94</b>	Low bed utilization 66%.	<b>96</b>
4 Behavioral Health Riverside PH	Program Finding (1); Late claims; High cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>85</b>	Low housing stability rate 76.47%.	<b>96</b>

**Project Review Comparison  
2017 - 2018**

**City of Riverside Projects**

**2017 Review**

**2018 Review**

Project Name	Comments	Total Score	Comments
1 City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless	4 Monitoring Findings (1) Fiscal, (2) HMIS, (1) Program - Occupancy/Lease Agreements; Cost per bed \$15,499.75.	<b>77</b>	\$4,113.57 unspent funds; 3.28%. APR late to DPSS. Cost per bed 30% higher than average cost.
2 City of Riverside Disabled	3 Monitoring findings (1) Fiscal and (2) program - HQS & lease non-compliance.	<b>76</b>	Low employment and income growth Late claim submission.

Total Score
----------------

90
----

97
----



**Project Review Comparison  
2017 - 2018**

**Housing Authority Projects**

**2017 Review**

**2018 Review**

Project Name		Comments	Total Score	Comments	Total Score
1	Housing Authority Consolidated	Monitoring findings (5 Program & HMIS); late APR submission; unspent funds; late claim submission.	<b>71</b>	Late APR submission to DPSS. Unspent/recaptured funds. Late claim submission.	<b>89</b>
2	Housing Authority Consolidated All County	Monitoring finding (1 Program); unspent funds; no supportive services provided; late APR submission to DPSS.	<b>77</b>	Low bed utilization 66%. Unspent/recaptured funds. Late claim submission.	<b>92</b>
3	Housing Authority EHOP	Monitoring finding (1 Program); late APR submission; unspent funds.	<b>82</b>	Late claim submission.	<b>95</b>
4	Housing Street to Home Chronic Homeless Project	Program finding (1); unspent funds.	<b>87</b>	Late claim submission.	<b>96</b>
5	Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH	Monitoring finding (1); late claim submission; low bed utilization; clients entering project not from the streets or emergency shelters.	<b>82</b>	Late APR submission to DPSS. Late claim submission.	<b>91</b>

**Project Review Comparison**  
2017 - 2018

**Jewish Family Services Projects**

**2017 Review**

**2018 Review**

Project Name		Comments	Total Score	Comments		Total Score
1	Desert Horizon PSH	5 late claims in last full grant period; Cost per bed \$23,976.50.	<b>90</b>	Project is 54% higher than average cost per bed.	<b>91</b>	
2	JFS Desert Vista PH	6 late claims in last full grant period; Cost per bed \$17,103.70.	<b>90</b>	Project is 36% higher than average cost per bed.	<b>90</b>	

**Project Review Comparison  
2017 - 2018**

**Lighthouse Social Service Centers  
Projects**

		2017 Review		2018 Review	
Project Name		Comments	Total Score	Comments	Total Score
1	Lighthouse PH for Disabled Women with Children	Returned funds 2014.	<b>97</b>	\$16,045.49 unspent funds; 6.91%.	<b>94</b>
2	Lighthouse Rapid Rehousing	2 Findings (Program & Fiscal). Match & Eligibility Criteria	<b>91</b>	Project is 10% higher than average cost per bed.	<b>94</b>

**Project Review Comparison**  
2017 - 2018

**Path of Life Ministries Projects**

**2017 Review**

**2018 Review**

Project Name		Comments	Total Score	Comments	Total Score
1	Path of Life PSH	8 late claims in last full grant period; Returned funds 2014; Cost per bed \$14,286.46.	<b>90</b>	\$84,167.70 unspent funds; 6.4%.	<b>94</b>
2	Path of Life Rapid Rehousing	4 Program Findings - Occupancy/Lease Agreements, HQS, ISP's, Recordkeeping; 8 late claims in last full grant period.	<b>95</b>	\$132,560.15 unspent funds; 38.36%.	<b>91</b>
3	POLM RRH East County	This project did not have one full grant period so there was no historical data.	<b>N/A</b>	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.	<b>76</b>

## Project Review Comparison

2017 - 2018

### Behavioral Health Projects

#### 2017 Review

#### 2018 Review

	Project Name	Comments	Total Score	Comments	Total Score
1	Behavioral Health Coachella Valley Permanent Housing	High cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>94</b>	Low housing stability rate 77.78%. Late claim submission. High cost per bed (45% more than average cost).	<b>92</b>
2	Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated Permanent Housing	Monitoring findings (4 Program); unspent funds; did not meet HQS compliance.	<b>86</b>	Monitoring visit on 4/2/18. Score may increase by 5 points if there are no monitoring findings.	<b>95</b>
3	Behavioral Health Men's PH	Unspent/recaptured funds.	<b>94</b>	Low bed utilization 66%.	<b>96</b>
4	Behavioral Health Riverside PH	Program Finding (1); Late claims; High cost per bed (per fiscal).	<b>85</b>	Low housing stability rate 76.47%.	<b>96</b>

### Housing Authority Projects

#### 2017 Review

#### 2018 Review

	Project Name	Comments	Total Score	Comments	Total Score
1	Housing Authority Consolidated	Monitoring findings (5 Program & HMIS); late APR submission; unspent funds; late claim submission.	<b>71</b>	Late APR submission to DPSS. Unspent/recaptured funds. Late claim submission.	<b>89</b>
2	Housing Authority Consolidated All County	Monitoring finding (1 Program); unspent funds; no supportive services provided; late APR submission to DPSS.	<b>77</b>	Low bed utilization 66%. Unspent/recaptured funds. Late claim submission.	<b>92</b>
3	Housing Authority EHOP	Monitoring finding (1 Program); late APR submission; unspent funds.	<b>82</b>	Late claim submission.	<b>95</b>
4	Housing Street to Home Chronic Homeless Project	Program finding (1); unspent funds.	<b>87</b>	Late claim submission.	<b>96</b>
5	Shelter Plus Care Project Based w/OSH	Monitoring finding (1); late claim submission; low bed utilization; clients entering project not from the streets or emergency shelters.	<b>82</b>	Late APR submission to DPSS. Late claim submission.	<b>91</b>

### 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			Supportive Services	HMIS	Program Compliance		Financial Management and Reporting					Comments	Project Score
								1 Housing Stability 80% (5)	2 Employment and Income Growth (5)	3 Bed Utilization (5)	4 - 8 Case Management mainstream benefits (5)	9 Data Quality, Accuracy, Timeliness (10)	10 APR received on time (5)	11 Monitoring Report Finding (5)	12 Monthly Claim Submission (5)	13 Unspent Funds (5)	14 Cost effective (5)	15 Match (5)	16 - 27 CoC Priorities (40)		
1	Behavioral Health HHOPE	\$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.	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	City of Riverside PSH Chronically Homeless	\$125,598	01/01/17	12/31/17	PSH	8	8	5	5	5	5	10	0	5	5	5	0	5	40	\$4,113.57 unspent funds; 3.28%. APR late to DPSS. Cost per bed 30% higher than average cost.	90
17	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
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



Coordinated Entry System (CES) Performance Criteria

**Purpose**

Setting performance measures is accomplished through the construction of evaluation tools and processes that will accurately portray how efficiently and effectively the system is working (outcomes) and identify where adjustments need to be made to improve overall performance. There are two components to the evaluation of a coordinated entry system:

- Evaluation of the CES process (intake, assessment, prioritization, matching and referral)
- Evaluation of the services that are connected to the CES process (call center, outreach and navigation)

Recommendations		
CES Process	Performance Criteria	Suggested Report/Tool /Deliverable
Intake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intake Data collection as provider               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CES have a comprehensive data tracking system?</li> <li>○ Are VI-SPDATS being completed thoroughly, with all signatures?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Intake Date collection as lead               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Track the total number of newly identified/assessed clients (de-duplicated) every month?</li> <li>○ Is CES tracking VI-SPDATs from community partners?</li> <li>○ IS CES data entering in a timely manner?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does the BNL include all known veterans experiencing literal homelessness?</li> <li>• Does BNL include all known homeless and CH individuals experiencing literal homelessness?</li> <li>• Does BNL include all youth and families experiencing homelessness?</li> <li>• Does BNL include al literally homeless and CH individuals exiting institutions for less than 90 days? (Jails, hospitals, etc.)</li> <li>• Does CES lead proactively update BNL based on current “homeless” status (including date of update)? Are updates provided in a timely manner?</li> <li>• Does CES Lead de-duplicate client records and proactively reconcile records with missing data?</li> <li>• Is BNL define active versus inactive clients?</li> <li>• Is there a clear process to activate an inactive client?</li> <li>• Does CES lead proactively track providers are contribute referrals, report data, and accept referrals?</li> <li>• Is BNL shared in a transparent manner with community partners according to the CoC’s CES policies and procedures?</li> <li>• Does CES Lead track the individuals that had been designated as “housed” or “inactive” and have returned to the BNL?</li> <li>• Does the CES Lead track the clients that were designated housed in a PH/PSH program, but were returned to the BNL?</li> <li>• Does the CES Lead track the number of homeless individuals that become chronic while they waited for services on the BNL?</li> <li>• Does CES lead track the number of clients that have timed out of chronicity by becoming housed again?</li> <li>• Is the BNL a one-stop: inflow of clients, by subpopulation: active &amp; inactive clients by housing status; referral agency; housing navigator; housing placement agency; and permanent housing date.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of all referrals, by access point, by subpopulation:</li> <li>• All clients referred through the “HomeConnect” hotline</li> <li>• All clients referred by a VI-SPDAT</li> <li>• All clients referred by a community access point</li> <li>• All clients referred by a CES Navigator</li> <li>• List of all clients that were diverted from CES</li> <li>• List of all clients that were not eligible for services and the reason</li> <li>• List of all client complaints (verbal and written)</li> <li>• List of discrimination complaints from federal, state or county regulatory agency</li> <li>• A fully transparent BNL that tracks and reports: inflow of clients, by subpopulation: active &amp; inactive clients by housing status; referral agency; housing navigator; days of homelessness prior to CES entry; days on the BNL; housing placement agency; and permanent housing date (exit date).</li> </ul>
Assessment Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the length of time between when a client first became homeless to when the client was added to the BNL?</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the length of time between when a client is added to the BNL to when the client is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a housing referral for PH</li> <li>• Provided a referral for ES/BH</li> <li>• Permanently housed</li> <li>• Exited from navigation services</li> <li>•</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do all homeless individuals have fair and equal access to the CES, and added to the BNL, regardless of the access point or how they present for services?</li> <li>• Are any clients turned away from services at the CES Lead access point? Which reasons warrant a turn-away?</li> <li>• Does CES lead collect data on turn-aways from all access points?</li> </ul>	
<b>Assessment Tool(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the assessment tool used?</li> <li>• How many assessment tools is CES utilizing?</li> <li>• Was there a process to choose the assessment tool?</li> <li>• Who was involved in the process?</li> </ul>	
<b>Prioritization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the CES Lead consistently implement the written prioritization policy according to the <u>CES Policies and Procedures, and federal regulations?</u></li> </ul>	
<b>Matching</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there an open and transparent process for matching clients for the next available housing resource?</li> </ul>	
<b>Referral</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a referral procedure?</li> <li>• Is there a client notification of eligibility and referral decisions?</li> <li>• Is CES tracking the referrals submitted?</li> <li>• Is CES tracking referrals that were denied? And, reason why?</li> <li>• Is CES tracking referrals that were approved?</li> <li>• Is there a specific amount of time to complete the referral process?</li> <li>• Are clients able to decline a referral (client choice)?</li> <li>• PS to PSH referral?</li> </ul>	<p>Reports shall include the following indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wait times for initial contact</li> <li>• Number/percentage of referrals that are accepted by receiving programs</li> <li>• Number/percentage of referrals that are not accepted by receiving programs</li> <li>• Number/percentage of persons declined by more than one provider</li> </ul>
<b>Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What specific resources are available for a homeless individual or family through CES?</li> <li>• Are the resources mainly CoC/ESG?</li> <li>• What mainstream resources does CES have?</li> <li>• How CES has determined what resources are available and where to send a client needing housing?</li> <li>• Is CES leveraging resources to maximize the services to individuals and families experiencing homelessness?</li> <li>• Are resources targeted to those who are most vulnerable and/or have been homeless the longest?</li> </ul>	
<b>CES Service Component</b>	<b>Performance Criteria</b>	<b>Suggested Report/Tool /Deliverable</b>
<b>Call Center</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is there a call center?</i></li> <li>• <i>What are the hours of operation?</i></li> <li>• <i>How many phone lines?</i></li> <li>• <i>How many staff attending the call center?</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Accessibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>As Access Point</i></li> <li>• <i>As identifying and coordinating access points</i></li> <li>• <i>Is there a process for regular reconciliation of the BNL with data collected by community partners like the VA, DPSS, etc?</i></li> </ul>	
<b>Access Coordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Does CES have a MOU with all service providers?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does CES have project eligibility requirement for every service provider in the county?</i></li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<b>Marketing Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<b>Marketing Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is there a marketing plan in place that clearly shows the</i></li> </ul>	



	<i>steps or actions that will be or have been taken to inform housing providers, program participants and the general public of CES?</i>	
Advertisement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What communication/information has been sent to the general public?</i></li> <li>• <i>What tools were used for advertisement?</i></li> </ul>	
Outreach—Full Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>How much of the CoC’s geographic area is covered by a documented and coordinated outreach system?</i></li> <li>• <i>Are all outreach contacts in HMIS?</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Outreach map</u> for the entire geographic area, including all encampments, flood channels, riverbed, lake bottoms, and hot spots where homeless are known to reside.</li> <li>• (1<sup>st</sup> layer) Known outreach workers with contact information actively providing street outreach in the jurisdiction</li> <li>• (2<sup>nd</sup> layer) Known Street Outreach Agencies with outreach subsidy committed to the jurisdiction</li> <li>• (3<sup>rd</sup> layer) Known encampments with clients BNL at each site</li> <li>• <u>Outreach schedule</u> that coordinates participating agencies and workers by jurisdiction.</li> <li>• <u>Outreach plan</u> that identifies gaps in services and coverage, and a strategy fill the gaps.</li> <li>• <u>Outreach plan</u> that coordinates with local law and/or code enforcement that identifies areas of priority or red-zones according to increased risk of death or danger? (Example: coordinating with law enforcement to identify areas at risk for flooding where swift water rescues or areas that are ablaze during a wildfire?)</li> <li>• <u>CES Outreach report</u> provided to the CES Oversight Committee, CoC, and Collaborative Applicant that informs on gaps for future planning purposes.</li> </ul>
Full Coverage--Coordination	<p><i>In order to accomplish effective coordination with mainstream and homeless services, formal agreements dictating client eligibility, intake, service provision expectations, and staffing must be developed. The agreements must ensure that all providers are using the system in an open, transparent, and consistent way.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Does CES have a MOU with all service providers?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does CES have project eligibility requirement for every service provider?</i></li> <li>• <i>Does CES have the geographic area/region that each service provider covers?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is there a map that provides detailed information on the specific area/region where street outreach, case managers, and housing navigators provide assistance?</i></li> <li>• <i>How street outreach, case managers, and housing navigators are assigned to specific areas and how was that determined?</i></li> </ul>	
Navigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What area/region have navigators been assigned to and how was that determined?</i></li> <li>• <i>What is the housing navigator responsibility?</i></li> <li>• <i>How is the progress tracked?</i></li> <li>• <i>How many housing navigators does Riverside County have?</i></li> </ul>	

To ensure that the County of Riverside CES Project meets the requirements of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH Act), at a minimum, the CoC must adopt written standards that include:

Policies and procedures for providing an initial housing assessment to determine the best housing and services intervention for individuals and families;

Policy on how to address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, but who are seeking services from non-victim service providers;

Policies and procedures for evaluating individuals' and families' eligibility for assistance;

Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive rapid rehousing and which will receive permanent supportive housing assistance.

**2018 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
<b>Behavioral Health HHOPE Consolidated PH</b> <i>(consolidated Women's 2016)</i>	10/01 - 9/30	2013	\$543,565.00	\$453,264.22	\$90,300.78	16.61%	
		2014	\$469,147.00	\$442,523.79	\$26,623.21	5.67%	Grant reduced \$67,000
		2015	\$381,528.00	\$381,528.00	\$0.00	0.00%	Grant reduced \$93,559
		2016	\$495,415.00				
<b>Behavioral Health Coachella Valley PH</b>	2/01 - 1/31	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	\$498,468.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2017	\$499,496.00				
<b>Behavioral Health Men's PH</b>	2/01 - 1/31	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	\$149,366.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2017	\$130,338.00				Grant reduced \$20,000

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Behavioral Health Riv PH</b>	7/1-6/30	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	\$359,743.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$359,743.00				

LIGHTHOUSE							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Lighthouse SSC Disabled Women w/children</b>	9/1-8/31	2014	\$227,077.00	\$187,718.98	\$39,358.02	17.33%	
		2015	\$232,149.00	\$216,103.51	\$16,045.49	6.91%	
		2016	\$232,149.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Lighthouse SSC RRH</b>	7/1-6/30	2014	\$258,054.00	\$258,054.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	\$263,274.00	\$263,021.92	\$252.08	0.10%	
		2016	\$263,274.00				

DPSS (HMIS & PLANNING)							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>HMIS</b>	7/1-6/30	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	\$344,072.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$344,072.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>PLANNING</b>	7/1-6/30	2014	\$104,365.00	\$104,365.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	\$292,607.00	\$292,607.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$315,901.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Step Up on Second PSH</b>	7/1-6/30	2016	\$888,903.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Step Up on Second PHB</b>	7/1-6/30	2016	\$526,501.00				

PAST GRANT REDUCTIONS		
<b>2017</b>		
Behavioral Health - Men's		\$20,000.00
Housing Authority All County I/II		\$88,000.00
<b>2015</b>		
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

HOUSING AUTHORITY							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Housing Authority Consolidated - All County I/II</b> <i>(consolidated 2015)</i>	9/1 - 8/31	2013	\$317,026.00	\$243,484.33	\$73,541.67	23.20%	Grant reduced \$67,000
		2014	\$256,552.00	\$256,552.00	\$0.00	0.00%	Grant reduced \$2,112
		2015	\$510,304.00	\$438,400.90	\$71,903.10	14.09%	
		2016	\$510,304.00				
		2017	\$450,929.00				Grant reduced \$88,000

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Housing Authority Consolidated All County (ECON)</b>	6/17 - 6/16	2013	\$519,905.00	\$407,707.48	\$112,197.52	21.58%	
		2014	\$534,245.00	\$384,884.63	\$149,360.37	27.96%	
	5/01 - 4/30	2015	\$448,217.00	\$394,273.96	\$53,943.04	12.04%	Grant reduced \$94,764
		2016	\$448,217.00				
		2017	\$448,217.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Housing Authority EHOP</b>	4/29 - 4/28	2014	\$41,935.00	\$25,823.69	\$16,111.31	38.42%	
		2015	\$42,739.00	\$42,739.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	6/01 - 5/31	2015	\$42,739.00	\$42,739.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$42,739.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Housing Authority Street to Home</b>	7/01 - 6/30	2014	\$151,279.00	\$132,914.61	\$18,364.39	12.14%	
		2015	\$114,993.00	\$114,993.00	\$0.00	0.00%	Grant Reduced \$37,678
		2016	\$114,993.00				

PATH OF LIFE MINISTRIES							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Path of Life PSH</b>	7/1-6/30	2014	\$1,278,690.00	\$1,107,540.75	\$171,149.25	13.38%	
		2015	\$1,314,354.00	\$1,230,186.30	\$84,167.70	6.40%	
		2016	\$1,314,354.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Path of Life RRH</b>	7/1-6/30	2014	\$338,541.00	\$334,703.57	\$3,837.43	1.13%	
		2015	\$345,549.00	\$212,988.85	\$132,560.15	38.36%	
		2016	\$345,549.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>POL East County RRH</b>	7/1-6/30	2015	\$377,260.00	\$191,778.30	\$185,481.70	49.17%	
		2016	\$377,260.00				

JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Jewish Family Svc - DV PSH</b>	4/1-3/31	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	\$684,148.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$684,148.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>Jewish Family Svc - DH PSH</b>	1/1-12/31	2013	\$416,014.00	\$408,228.24	\$7,785.76	1.87%	
		2014	\$423,680.00	\$423,680.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2015	\$431,577.00	\$431,577.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2016	\$431,577.00				

CITY OF RIVERSIDE							
Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>City of Riverside Disabled PH</b>	2/1-1/31	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	\$123,556.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
		2017	\$124,285.00				

Project	Grant Term	NOFA	Grant Amount	Expended	Returned		Comments
<b>City of Riverside Chronic PH</b>	1/1-1/31	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	\$121,484.43	\$4,113.57	3.28%	
		2016	\$125,598.00				