Before Starting the CoC Application

The CoC Consolidated Application is made up of two parts: the CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listing, with all of the CoC’s project applications either approved and ranked, or rejected. The Collaborative Applicant is responsible for submitting both the CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listing in order for the CoC Consolidated Application to be considered complete.

The Collaborative Applicant is responsible for:

1. Reviewing the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA in its entirety for specific application and program requirements.
2. Ensuring all questions are answered completely.
3. Reviewing the FY 2017 CoC Consolidated Application Detailed Instructions, which gives additional information for each question.
4. Ensuring all imported responses in the application are fully reviewed and updated as needed.
5. The Collaborative Applicant must review and utilize responses provided by project applicants in their Project Applications.
6. Some questions require the Collaborative Applicant to attach documentation to receive credit for the question. This will be identified in the question.

- Note: For some questions, HUD has provided documents to assist Collaborative Applicants in filling out responses. These are noted in the application.
- All questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and must be completed in order to submit the CoC Application.

For CoC Application Detailed Instructions click here.
1A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Identification

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

1A-1. CoC Name and Number: CA-602 - Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC

1A-2. Collaborative Applicant Name: Orange County

1A-3. CoC Designation: CA

1A-4. HMIS Lead: 211OC
## 1B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Engagement

### Instructions:

For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

### 1B-1. From the list below, select those organization(s) and/or person(s) that participate in CoC meetings. Using the drop-down boxes, indicate if the organization(s) and/or person(s): (1) participate in CoC meetings; and (2) vote, including selection of CoC Board members. Responses should be for the period from 5/1/16 to 4/30/17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Person Categories</th>
<th>Participates in CoC Meetings</th>
<th>Votes, including electing CoC Board Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Staff/Officials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG/HOME/ESG Entitlement Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jail(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT/Crisis Response Team(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Service Organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Service Organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Developer(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Service Organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Advocates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Authorities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Funded Youth Homeless Organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CoC Funded Youth Homeless Organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Advocates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrators/Homeless Liaisons</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC Funded Victim Service Providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CoC Funded Victim Service Providers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Advocates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Outreach Team(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) Advocates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Service Organizations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies that serve survivors of human trafficking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other homeless subpopulation advocates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless or Formerly Homeless Persons</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:(limit 50 characters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Applicant must select Yes, No or Not Applicable for all of the listed organization/person categories in 1B-1.

1B-1a. Describe the specific strategy(s) the CoC uses to solicit and consider opinions from organizations and/or persons that have an interest in preventing or ending homelessness.
(limit 1000 characters)

The CoC collaborates with stakeholders to provide strategic leadership to prevent and end homelessness. An array of committees meet regularly to address specific goals and issues, implement best practices, and make recommendations to the CoC Board for approval/implementation. For example: The CoC Homeless Provider Forum (HPF) is targeted to individuals and homelessness service provider organizations throughout the region dedicated to ending homelessness and serving homeless and at-risk people. These monthly meetings offer opportunities to network, collaborate, and strategize as Orange County works together to prevent and end homelessness. The HPF also serves as our at-large CoC meetings where general announcements are made about CoC activities and opportunities are offered for committee participation and CoC membership. All CoC meetings are open to those interested in the development/coordination of homeless assistance.

1B-2. Describe the CoC's open invitation process for soliciting new members, including any special outreach.
(limit 1000 characters)

CoC staff and partners participate in various public forums in which non CoC funded agencies attend to disseminate information and encourage participation in CoC activities including one on one meetings as requested. Announcements regarding the release of an LOI for renewal applications and an RFQ for new PH projects were made at the Commission/CoC Board, Homeless Provider Forum, CoC Committee, and Subcommittee meetings. Additionally, all solicitations for new members are sent on eblast to over 1500 individuals and organizations.

1B-3. Describe how the CoC notified the public that it will accept and consider proposals from organizations that have not previously received CoC Program funding in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition, even if the CoC is not applying for new projects in FY 2017. The response must include the date(s) the CoC made publicly knowing they were open to proposals.
(limit 1000 characters)

CoC announcements and funding opportunities are shared at monthly Homeless Provider Forum meetings and via a listserv. For new projects, an email blast is sent to individuals, agencies and other stakeholders via a
comprehensive listserv and online posting for anyone interested in homeless issues and applicants interested in applying. For new projects, the RFQ was sent via an email blast on June 30, 2017. 211OC, the lead HMIS agency and CoC partner also posted information on their website on a page dedicated to the CoC/Commission. The RFQ was posted 211OC’s website on June 30, 2017 for any stakeholders interested in submitting an RFQ. Applicants who submitted an RFQ where then invited via email on July 28, 2017 to participate in the RFP process. The listserv that is used for this announcement includes a majority of non-CoC funded agencies from throughout the region. This year three new applicants not affiliated with the CoC submitted an RFQ. One that is new to Orange County.

Applicant: Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County
Project: CA-602 CoC Registration FY2017
1C. Continuum of Care (CoC) Coordination

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

1C-1. Using the chart below, identify the Federal, State, Local, Private and Other organizations that serve homeless individuals, families, unaccompanied youth, persons who are fleeing domestic violence, or those at risk of homelessness that are included in the CoC’s coordination; planning and operation of projects. Only select "Not Applicable" if the funding source(s) do not exist in the CoC’s geographic area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entities or Organizations the CoC coordinates planning and operation of projects</th>
<th>Coordinates with Planning and Operation of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and service programs funded through Department of Justice (DOJ) resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and service programs funded through Health and Human Services (HHS) resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and service programs funded through other Federal resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and service programs funded through state government resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and service programs funded through local government resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and service programs funded through private entities, including foundations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:(limit 50 characters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1C-2. Describe how the CoC actively consults with Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) recipient’s in the planning and allocation of ESG funds. Include in the response: (1) the interactions that occur between the CoC and the ESG Recipients in the planning and allocation of funds; (2) the CoCs participation in the local Consolidated Plan jurisdiction(s) process by providing Point-in-Time (PIT) and Housing Inventory Count (HIC) data to the Consolidated Plan jurisdictions; and (3) how the CoC ensures local homelessness information is clearly communicated and addressed in Consolidated Plan updates. (limit 1000 characters)

CoC has developed a collaborative of ESG recipient jurisdictions in geographic area. In order to inform funding decisions, ESG recipients participate in CoC meetings, committees, and have reps on the CoC Board. The CoC & ESG
recipients review & analyze their grants collectively to determine if CoC has right mix of housing & services & to ensure full participation of funded programs in HMIS & Coordinated Entry. CoC provided PIT, HIC, HMIS, & CES data to all Con Plan jurisdictions & related descriptions regarding nature & extent of homelessness, homeless facilities & services, homeless prevention, & returns to homelessness. CoC ensures that the info it provides is addressed in Con Plan by identifying homeless needs and priorities, services targeted to homeless, & providing the strategies to fill gaps as required by Con Plan & then reviews the related Con Plan sections to make sure info is accurate. CoC also helps provide & ensure accurate info in Annual Action Plans and CAPERs.

1C-3. CoCs must demonstrate the local efforts to address the unique needs of persons, and their families, fleeing domestic violence that includes access to housing and services that prioritizes safety and confidentiality of program participants.

(1000 characters)

Providers are connected to survivors in need who are immediately and confidentially provided with housing including TH/RRH/ES and services funded by a variety of sources. A privately funded collaborative provides a warm handoff to shelters and education to medical professionals. Records are kept confidential & safely stored in HMIS comparable database only accessible by authorized personnel. Files are shredded after retention requirements expire. Staff & clients agree in writing to maintain confidentiality of clients’ identities & locations. Clients agree in writing not to disclose their location or have contact with their abusers except for court-mandated visitation of children at a predetermined police station. Client choice is upheld regarding location, type of housing, level & type of services, what the program will expect and what can be expected of program as against rigid decisions made by staff about what household needs. Victim service providers are voting members of CoC.

1C-3a. CoCs must describe the following: (1) how regular training is provided to CoC providers and operators of coordinated entry processes that addresses best practices in serving survivors of domestic violence; (2) how the CoC uses statistics and other available data about domestic violence, including aggregate data from comparable databases, as appropriate, to assess the scope of community needs related to domestic violence and homelessness; and (3) the CoC safety and planning protocols and how they are included in the coordinated assessment.

(1000 characters)

Best practices training is provided at the O.C. Provider’s Forum & the Housing Placement Match meetings which convene street outreach teams & housing providers for dialogue on how to serve survivors of DV & address concerns re: physical & emotional safety, privacy & confidentiality, culturally-relevant services, & emergency needs. CES has connected with service providers serving human trafficking victims to create safe access. Utilizing 2-1-1, CES has updated information on programs that serve households experiencing DV based on location, program model, & linkages to other supportive services. Valuing the need to safely refer survivors with a warm hand-off including a phone call or other transition to the victim service provider the CoC leverages a Health & DV dedicated phone line administered by 2-1-1. Safety planning protocols
safeguard survivors by allowing for a confidential assessment & transmission of client records using a unique identifier to protect personal information.

1C-4. Using the chart provided, for each of the Public Housing Agency’s (PHA) in the CoC’s geographic area: (1) identify the percentage of new admissions to the Public Housing or Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Programs in the PHA’s that were homeless at the time of admission; and (2) indicate whether the PHA has a homeless admission preference in its Public Housing and/or HCV program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Housing Agency Name</th>
<th>% New Admissions into Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program during FY 2016 who were homeless at entry</th>
<th>PHA has General or Limited Homeless Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Housing Authority</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>Yes-HCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove Housing Authority</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>Yes-HCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Housing Authority</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>Yes-HCV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Housing Authority</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>Yes-HCV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment Required: If the CoC selected, "Yes-Public Housing", "Yes-HCV" or "Yes-Both", attach an excerpt from the PHA(s) written policies or a letter from the PHA(s) that addresses homeless preference.

If you select "Yes--Public Housing," "Yes--HCV," or "Yes--Both" for "PHA has general or limited homeless preference," you must attach documentation of the preference from the PHA in order to receive credit.

1C-4a. For each PHA where there is not a homeless admission preference in their written policies, identify the steps the CoC has taken to encourage the PHA to adopt such a policy.
(limit 1000 characters)

There is no Public Housing in Orange County but all four PHAs work together and all have homeless preferences in HCV.

1C-5. Describe the actions the CoC has taken to: (1) address the needs of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) individuals and their families experiencing homelessness, (2) conduct regular CoC-wide training with providers on how to effectively implement the Equal Access to Housing in HUD Programs Regardless of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity, including Gender Identity Equal Access to Housing, Fina Rule; and (3) implementation of an anti-discrimination policy.
(limit 1000 characters)

The CoC has taken various actions to address the needs of the LGBT community. The CoC reached out to the LGBT community centers/providers so they are aware & engaged with the CoC services & resources. There has been discussion that the center become an in-reach center for CES. Continued discussions to identify best approaches to connect to the community. In June
the CoC conducted training on how to effectively implement the Equal Access Rule, it included publicly posting on bulletin boards & other public spaces where information is made available, the HUD notice to ensure clients and residents are aware of their rights to equal access. CoC placed on the HMIS&CES lead website the LGBT logo to communicate on a broad scale that all are welcome. All agencies were asked to place an affirming icon/banner on their website. Training including recordkeeping requirements communicated that providers must document and maintain records of compliance with the requirements of the Equal Access Rule.

1C-6. Criminalization: Select the specific strategies implemented by the CoC to prevent the criminalization of homelessness in the CoC’s geographic area. Select all that apply.

| Engaged/educated local policymakers: | X |
| Engaged/educated law enforcement:   | X |
| Engaged/educated local business leaders | X |
| Implemented communitywide plans:   | X |
| No strategies have been implemented |   |

Other:(limit 50 characters)

County Psychological Emergency Response Teams | X |

When "No Strategies have been implemented" is selected no other checkbox may be selected.
1D. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

1D-1. Discharge Planning-State and Local: Select from the list provided, the systems of care the CoC coordinates with and assists in state and local discharge planning efforts to ensure those who are discharged from that system of care are not released directly to the streets, emergency shelters, or other homeless assistance programs. Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Checkmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1D-1a. If the applicant did not check all the boxes in 1D-1, provide: (1) an explanation of the reason(s) the CoC does not have a discharge policy in place for the system of care; and (2) provide the actions the CoC is taking or plans to take to coordinate with or assist the State and local discharge planning efforts to ensure persons are not discharged to the street, emergency shelters, or other homeless assistance programs. (limit 1000 characters)

Not applicable

1D-2. Discharge Planning: Select the system(s) of care within the CoC’s geographic area the CoC actively coordinates with to ensure persons who have resided in any of the institutions listed below longer than 90 days are not discharged directly to the streets, emergency shelters, or other homeless assistance programs. Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Checkmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Care:</td>
<td>![X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facilities:</td>
<td>![X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1E. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review, Ranking, and Selection

Instructions
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

1E-1. Using the drop-down menu, select the appropriate response(s) that demonstrate the process the CoC used to rank and select project applications in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition which included (1) the use of objective criteria; (2) at least one factor related to achieving positive housing outcomes; and (3) included a specific method for evaluating projects submitted by victim service providers.

Attachment Required: Public posting of documentation that supports the process the CoC used to rank and select project application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used Objective Criteria for Review, Rating, Ranking and Section</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Included at least one factor related to achieving positive housing outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included a specific method for evaluating projects submitted by victim service providers</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1E-2. Severity of Needs and Vulnerabilities
CoCs must provide the extent the CoC considered the severity of needs and vulnerabilities experienced by program participants in their project ranking and selection process. Describe: (1) the specific vulnerabilities the CoC considered; and (2) how the CoC takes these vulnerabilities into account during the ranking and selection process. (See the CoC Application Detailed Instructions for examples of severity of needs and vulnerabilities.)

CoC’s scoring tool & criteria took into account chronic homelessness during its ranking and selection process and Housing First and low barriers including current or past substance use, low or no income, criminal histories, and history of victimization/abuse. Projects serving those with highest needs barriers to obtaining and maintaining housing were factored into the review, ranking, and selection process. Projects were scored and those serving and new projects proposing to serve CH with longest history of homelessness and the most severe service needs were given weighted performance consideration & assigned. CoC prioritizes PSH projects that serve clients with the most severe needs and vulnerabilities including those with significant challenges requiring a higher level of support to maintain permanent housing. Projects serving persons coming from streets as well as using a HF approach & removal of low barriers were also weighted.
1E-3. Using the following checklist, select: (1) how the CoC made publicly available to potential project applicants an objective ranking and selection process that was used for all project (new and renewal) at least 2 days before the application submission deadline; and (2) all parts of the CoC Consolidated Application, the CoC Application attachments, Priority Listing that includes the reallocation forms and Project Listings that show all project applications submitted to the CoC were either accepted and ranked, or rejected and were made publicly available to project applicants, community members and key stakeholders.

Attachment Required: Documentation demonstrating the objective ranking and selections process and the final version of the completed CoC Consolidated Application, including the CoC Application with attachments, Priority Listing with reallocation forms and all project applications that were accepted and ranked, or rejected (new and renewal) was made publicly available. Attachments must clearly show the date the documents were publicly posted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Posting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoC or other Website</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising in Local Newspaper(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising on Radio or Television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1E-4. Reallocation: Applicants must demonstrate the ability to reallocate lower performing projects to create new, higher performing projects. CoC’s may choose from one of the following two options below to answer this question. You do not need to provide an answer for both.

Option 1: The CoC actively encourages new and existing providers to apply for new projects through reallocation.
Attachment Required - Option 1: Documentation that shows the CoC actively encouraged new and existing providers to apply for new projects through reallocation.

Option 2: The CoC has cumulatively reallocated at least 20 percent of the CoC’s ARD between FY 2013 and FY 2017 CoC Program Competitions.
No Attachment Required - HUD will calculate the cumulative amount based on the CoCs reallocation forms submitted with each fiscal years Priority Listing.

Reallocation: Option 1
Attachment Required - provide documentation that shows the CoC actively encouraged new and existing providers to apply for new projects through reallocation.

1E-5. If the CoC rejected or reduced project application(s), enter the date the CoC and Collaborative Applicant notified project applicants their project application(s) were being rejected or reduced in writing outside of e-snaps. 09/13/2017

Attachment Required: Copies of the written notification to project applicant(s) that their project application(s) were rejected. Where a project application is being rejected or reduced, the CoC must indicate the reason(s) for the rejection or reduction.

1E-5a. Provide the date the CoC notified applicant(s) their application(s) were accepted and ranked on the Priority Listing, in writing, outside of e-snaps. 09/13/2017

Attachment Required: Copies of the written notification to project applicant(s) their project application(s) were accepted and ranked on the Priority listing.
Reallocation Supporting Documentation

Attachment Required - provide documentation that shows the CoC actively encouraged new and existing providers to apply for new projects through reallocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Required?</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
<th>Date Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation Supporting Documentation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment Details

Document Description:
2A. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Implementation

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

2A-1. Does the CoC have in place a Governance Charter or other written documentation (e.g., MOU/MOA) that outlines the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and HMIS Lead? Yes

Attachment Required: If “Yes” is selected, a copy of the sections of the Governance Charter, or MOU/MOA addressing the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and HMIS Lead.

2A-1a. Provide the page number(s) where the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and HMIS Lead can be found in the attached document(s) referenced in 2A-1. In addition, indicate if the page number applies to the Governance Charter or MOU/MOA.

GC, 6; ALT(HMIS P&P: 7, 9, 10)


2A-3. What is the name of the HMIS software vendor? Adsystech

2A-4. Using the drop-down boxes, select the HMIS implementation Coverage area. Single CoC

2A-5. Per the 2017 HIC use the following chart to indicate the number of beds in the 2017 HIC and in HMIS for each project type within the CoC. If a particular project type does not exist in the CoC then enter "0" for all cells
in that project type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Total Beds in 2017 HIC</th>
<th>Total Beds in HIC Dedicated for DV</th>
<th>Total Beds in HMIS</th>
<th>HMIS Bed Coverage Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter (ESG) beds</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>57.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven (SH) beds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing (TH) beds</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>65.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) beds</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Permanent Housing (OPH) beds</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2A-5a. To receive partial credit, if the bed coverage rate is below 85 percent for any of the project types, the CoC must provide clear steps on how it intends to increase this percentage for each project type over the next 12 months. (limit 1000 characters)

The three ES and TH agencies with the largest amount of beds are not currently participating HMIS. Their combined number of beds not in HMIS are 523 ES beds and 283 TH beds. However, we have reached out to them and have a plan in place to incorporate them into HMIS in the coming year. 1.) We have reallocated dollars for an HMIS expansion Grant to help fund the data entry for these projects. 2.) We have recently awarded an RFP for a new HMIS vendor. The new system is tentatively scheduled to be in operation by February 2018. With a new vendor in place, we are planning on these agencies participating fully in HMIS, as well as additional smaller agencies that have not moved to HMIS previously due to the time commitment of the current vendor.

2A-6. Annual Housing Assessment Report (AHAR) Submission: How many Annual Housing Assessment Report (AHAR) tables were accepted and used in the 2016 AHAR?

12

2A-7. Enter the date the CoC submitted the 2017 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) data into the Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX). (mm/dd/yyyy)

04/28/2017
2B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Point-in-Time Count

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

2B-1. Indicate the date of the CoC's 2017 PIT count (mm/dd/yyyy). If the PIT count was conducted outside the last 10 days of January 2017, HUD will verify the CoC received a HUD-approved exception.

01/27/2017

2B-2. Enter the date the CoC submitted the PIT count data in HDX. (mm/dd/yyyy)

04/28/2017
2C. Continuum of Care (CoC) Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Methodologies

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

2C-1. Describe any change in the CoC’s sheltered PIT count implementation, including methodology and data quality changes from 2016 to 2017. Specifically, how those changes impacted the CoCs sheltered PIT count results.
(limit 1000 characters)
Not applicable.

2C-2. Did your CoC change its provider coverage in the 2017 sheltered count? Yes

2C-2a. If “Yes” was selected in 2C-2, enter the change in provider coverage in the 2017 sheltered PIT count, including the number of beds added or removed due to the change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beds Added:</th>
<th>519</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds Removed:</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2C-3. Did your CoC add or remove emergency shelter, transitional housing, or Safe-Haven inventory because of funding specific to a Presidentially declared disaster resulting in a change to the CoC’s 2017 sheltered PIT count? No

2C-3a. If "Yes" was selected in 2C-3, enter the number of beds that were added or removed in 2017 because of a Presidentially declared disaster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beds Added:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beds Removed:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2C-4. Did the CoC change its unsheltered PIT count implementation, including methodology and data quality changes from Yes
CoCs that did not conduct an unsheltered count in 2016 or did not report unsheltered PIT count data to HUD in 2016 should compare their efforts in 2017 to their efforts in 2015.

2C-4a. Describe any change in the CoC’s unsheltered PIT count implementation, including methodology and data quality changes from 2016 to 2017. Specify how those changes impacted the CoC’s unsheltered PIT count results. See Detailed Instructions for more information. (limit 1000 characters)

In conjunction with 211OC, the OC Commission to end homelessness convened an ad hoc committee to provide guidance on the 2017 PIT Count project. The ad hoc committee’s direction included a public places/known locations count with sampling methodology. This methodology was used in the 2015 count. During the 2017 PIT Count, 86 additional maps were counted and surveyed for a total of 270 maps in comparison to 184 maps in the 2015 PIT Count.

2C-5. Did the CoC implement specific measures to identify youth in their PIT count?

Yes

2C-5a. If "Yes" was selected in 2C-5, describe the specific measures the CoC; (1) took to identify homeless youth in the PIT count; (2) during the planning process, how stakeholders that serve homeless youth were engaged; (3) how homeless youth were engaged/involved; and (4) how the CoC worked with stakeholders to select locations where homeless youth are most likely to be identified. (limit 1000 characters)

CoC engaged stakeholders in the planning process including school district & youth homeless service providers and homeless & formerly homeless youth. This year’s Ad Hoc Planning Committee included representation from a local state university who informed the planning process as well as engaged students through incorporating the PIT count in semester curriculum which resulted in increased youth awareness, engagement, & participation on the day of the count. Additionally, the CoC expanded the data collection effort to include data gathering sessions with local colleges as well foster youth drop in centers to identify locations that resulted in expanded coverage by going beyond previously known hot spots where youth gather. Homeless & formerly homeless youth were engaged to participate in the mapping process & as members of the Point in Time day of count crew. Post-count debriefs occurred during which feedback from stakeholders was given & is being used to inform future counts.

2C-6. Describe any actions the CoC implemented in its 2017 PIT count to better count individuals and families experiencing chronic homelessness, families with children, and Veterans experiencing homelessness. (limit 1000 characters)
Several meetings prior to count with agencies that serve CH persons, families, & vets. Meetings involved coordination with VA Medical Center, VA Resource & Referral Ctrs, HUD-VASH & SSVF providers. Vet serving organizations participated on the morning of count to allow for targeted outreach. Homeless service providers & outreach workers pre-identified locations for counters & many were counters. Meetings involved connecting with public agencies such as Public Works & Vector Control, in addition to other outreach workers familiar with CH persons & where they live, to ensure inclusion of less visible places. Meetings involved agencies that serve families including school district. Stakeholders pre-identified areas where vehicles were parked overnight & known to include families. In an effort to collect additional data about families or youth sleeping in cars, RVs, or tents, a survey was administered during the week following the PIT at eight different service locations.
3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance

Instructions
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

3A-1. Performance Measure: Reduction in the Number of First-Time Homeless. Describe: (1) the numerical change the CoC experienced; (2) the process the CoC used to identify risk factors of becoming homeless for the first time; (3) the strategies in place to address individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless; and (4) the organization or position that is responsible for overseeing the CoC’s strategy to reduce or end the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness for the first time. (limit 1000 characters)

From 14/15 to 15/16, there have been 600 fewer clients that were reported as first time homeless on the SPM Report. A county-wide homeless prevention strategy led by HCD&HP has been implemented to identify specific risk factors that include loss of income, history of residential instability, sudden death or illness, utility shutoffs, etc., through CES. Strategic steps focus on personal safety, particularly for families fleeing DV, and if safe and fitting, focus on shelter diversion by stabilizing households in current housing or temporarily sharing housing with other family/friends until household is ready to obtain and maintain PH. Steps also include links to supports and case management if needed. Temporary support includes one-time or short-term rental and/or utility assistance and participation in employment services. Ongoing supports include mainstream resources and on-the-job training. Overall goal is to stabilize household and prepare a plan if another housing crisis occurs.

3A-2. Performance Measure: Length-of-Time Homeless. CoC’s must demonstrate how they reduce the length-of-time for individuals and families remaining homeless. Describe (1) the numerical change the CoC experienced; (2) the actions the CoC has implemented to reduce the length-of-time individuals and families remain homeless; (3) how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and families with the longest length-of-time homeless; and (4) identify the organization or position that is responsible for overseeing the CoC’s strategy to reduce the length-of-time individuals and families remain homeless. (limit 1000 characters)

From 14/15 to 15/16, the average LOT homeless for clients in ES, SH, or TH projects has decreased by 9 days as reported on the SPM Report. As part of the Coordinated Entry System, the CoC uses the VI-SPDAT to determine each client’s LOT homeless, adds them to a prioritization list, and those with the highest vulnerability and longest LOT homeless are prioritized highest. In order
to reduce the average LOT homeless, the CoC has implemented a strategy led by HCD&HP that includes implementing a Housing First and low barrier approach, incorporating shelter diversion practices when possible, and scaling permanent housing opportunities. Also, the CoC connects clients with Housing Navigators that serve as the primary point of contact for each client. There have been many accomplishments around this strategy, including recruiting private landlords, enhanced security deposits, set-aside funds for damages, conflict resolution assistance, and improved discharge planning from systems of care.

3A-3. Performance Measures: Successful Permanent Housing Placement and Retention
Describe: (1) the numerical change the CoC experienced; (2) the CoCs strategy to increase the rate of which individuals and families move to permanent housing destination or retain permanent housing; and (3) the organization or position responsible for overseeing the CoC’s strategy for retention of, or placement in permanent housing.
(limit 1000 characters)

From 14/15 to 15/16, successful exits decreased by 1% for SO projects, and increased by 2% for ES, SH, TH, and RRH projects. Successful exits/retention in PH has increased by 1% for PSH/OPH projects. The CoC strategy, led by HDC&HP, to improve PH placement/retention includes streamlining admissions/lowering barriers through a Housing First approach, providing housing navigation to secure PH, recruiting private landlords, leveraging mainstream resources to increase income, directing/reallocating resources to create and expand PH projects, housing-based case management using Housing First practices, and ensuring landlord-provider communication to resolve housing issues before they escalate. Strategy improvements include incorporating other proven landlord recruitment strategies, as well as strategies to leverage mainstream housing and services to scale PH interventions. The CoC will also continue to align all PH funding resources to create new PH and expand high performing PH projects.

Describe: (1) the numerical change the CoC experienced, (2) what strategies the CoC implemented to identify individuals and families who return to homelessness, (3) the strategies the CoC will use to reduce additional returns to homelessness, and (4) the organization or position responsible for overseeing the CoC’s efforts to reduce the rate of individuals and families’ returns to homelessness.
(limit 1000 characters)

From 14/15 to 15/16, the CoC experienced a 2% increase in clients that returned to homelessness. When a household is entered into HMIS, the user is able to see a list of the previous projects the household has participated in, and work with the previous provider to address obstacles. The CoC also targets households returning to homelessness by publishing aggregate HMIS reports online. Once published, the CoC analyzes them by looking for patterns that indicate that households served by certain providers or project types are more likely to return to homelessness. Strategies to reduce returns include adoption of housing First strategies, provision of wrap-around services w/ case management after households are placed in PH, and development of landlord
relationships to help address tenant issues and mediate as needed. Also, at monthly CES meetings, placements are discussed and reviewed to ensure optimal matches. Adjustments to placements are made as needed. The strategy is led by HCD&HP.

3A-5. Performance Measures: Job and Income Growth
Describe: (1) the strategies that have been implemented to increase access to employment and mainstream benefits; (2) how the CoC program-funded projects have been assisted to implement the strategies; (3) how the CoC is working with mainstream employment organizations to help individuals and families increase their cash income; and (4) the organization or position that is responsible for overseeing the CoC’s strategy to increase job and income growth from employment, non-employment including mainstream benefits. (limit 1000 characters)

Every homeless person entering into a residential project, including CoC funded projects, are assessed for employment as part of a housing first approach. A case manager helps secure the kind of services and skills that are needed for employable residents. Case managers help provide transportation when necessary, complete necessary paperwork, and assist residents with follow-up to ensure benefits are received and maintained for non-employment cash income such as SSDI and non-cash benefits. Residents that are not employable are helped with non-cash benefits through the Orange County Social Services Agency which provides a wide-range of mainstream benefits including CalWorks, CalFresh, and Medi-Cal. There are numerous office locations throughout the county. If denied benefits, providers refer participants to law firms and organizations that specialize in appealing such decisions. The effort is led by HCD&HP.

3A-6. Did the CoC completely exclude a geographic area from the most recent PIT count (i.e. no one counted there, and for communities using samples in the area that was excluded from both the sample and extrapolation) where the CoC determined there were no unsheltered homeless people, including areas that are uninhabitable (deserts, forests).

Yes

3A.6a. If the response to 3A-6 was “Yes”, what was the criteria and decision-making process the CoC used to identify and exclude specific geographic areas from the CoCs unsheltered PIT count? (limit 1000 characters)

The Orange County unsheltered count implemented a “known locations” strategy combined with a “random sample of areas” count methodology and is the same methodology used in 2013 and 2015. This methodology uses local experts to define areas where people experiencing homelessness are likely to sleep, enumerates visibly homeless people in those areas at the time of the count, and applies a statistical formula to account for the people who would be
found in any geography unable to be visited during the count. Additionally, the CoC did exclude geographic areas that included uninhabitable areas such as mountains and gated communities after street outreach teams confirmed that there were no unsheltered homeless persons in those areas.

3A-7. Enter the date the CoC submitted the System Performance Measures data in HDX, which included the data quality section for FY 2016. (mm/dd/yyyy)

06/02/2017
3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

Instructions
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

3B-1. Compare the total number of PSH beds, CoC program and non CoC-program funded, that were identified as dedicated for yes by chronically homeless persons in the 2017 HIC, as compared to those identified in the 2016 HIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded PSH beds dedicated for use by chronically homelessness persons identified on the HIC.</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3B-1.1. In the box below: (1) "total number of Dedicated PLUS Beds" provide the total number of beds in the Project Allocation(s) that are designated ad Dedicated PLUS beds; and (2) in the box below "total number of beds dedicated to the chronically homeless" provide the total number of beds in the Project Application(s) that are designated for the chronically homeless. This does not include those that were identified in (1) above as Dedicated PLUS Beds.

| Total number of beds dedicated as Dedicated Plus | 0 |
| Total number of beds dedicated to individuals and families experiencing chronic homelessness | 641 |
| Total | 641 |

3B-1.2. Did the CoC adopt the Orders of Priority into their standards for all CoC Program funded PSH projects as described in Notice CPD-16-11: Prioritizing Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness and Other Vulnerable Homeless Persons in Permanent Supportive Housing.

Yes

3B-2.1. Using the following chart, check each box to indicate the factor(s) the CoC currently uses to prioritize households with children based on need during the FY 2017 Fiscal Year.

| History of or Vulnerability to Victimization | X |
| Number of previous homeless episodes | X |
3B-2.2. Describe: (1) the CoCs current strategy and timeframe for rapidly rehousing every household of families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless; and (2) the organization or position responsible for overseeing the CoC’s strategy to rapidly rehouse families with children within 30 days of becoming homeless. (limit 1000 characters)

Strategy to rapidly rehouse every family in 30 days includes 1) entering each family into the CES through a no wrong-door approach to identify the right intervention by assessing unique needs and characteristics of each member; 2) implement a housing first and low barrier approach; 3) provide supportive services and housing navigation to help ensure a stay of no more than 30 days; 4) provide RRH assistance to ensure that a stay in ES is no more than 30 days and is flexible so families with lower barriers receive modest financial assistance and those with higher barriers receive moderate assistance. In addition to the tactical strategy, the CoC participates in a family specific planning cohort with a focused goal on ending family homelessness. As a result of the work, newly launched family emergency shelters (Care Centers) recent will become CES access points. There were just 20 unsheltered families counted in 2017 in the entire county. Organization overseeing strategy is HCDHP.

3B-2.3. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve families from the 2016 and 2017 HIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded PSH units dedicated for use by chronically homelessness persons identified on the HIC.</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3B-2.4. Describe the actions the CoC is taking to ensure emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing (PSH and RRH) providers within the CoC adhere to anti-discrimination policies by not denying admission to, or separating any family members from other members of their family or caregivers based on age, sex, gender, LGBT status, marital status or disability when entering a shelter or Housing. (limit 1000 characters)

CoC has policies and procedures that prohibit involuntary family separation based on age, gender, LGBT status, marital status or disability that all CoC funded projects must comply by determining eligibility to projects regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, or nonconforming to gender
stereotypes; must provide equal access to projects consistent with household’s gender identity and family make-up; and take non-discriminatory steps to address privacy concerns raised by households. Projects provide written notice of any complaints and inform complainant. An investigation is made and corrective action is taken. All projects are required to keep records of all complaints, investigations, notices, and corrective actions consistent with its current record-keeping obligations for up to five years. Trainings are provided for all CoC projects and includes examples of project violations under the Equal Access Rule. Attendance is required.

3B-2.5. From the list below, select each of the following the CoC has strategies to address the unique needs of unaccompanied homeless youth.

| Human trafficking and other forms of exploitation? | Yes |
| LGBT youth homelessness? | Yes |
| Exits from foster care into homelessness? | Yes |
| Family reunification and community engagement? | Yes |
| Positive Youth Development, Trauma Informed Care, and the use of Risk and Protective Factors in assessing youth housing and service needs? | Yes |

3B-2.6. From the list below, select each of the following the CoC has a strategy for prioritization of unaccompanied youth based on need.

| History or Vulnerability to Victimization (e.g., domestic violence, sexual assault, childhood abuse) | X |
| Number of Previous Homeless Episodes | X |
| Unsheltered Homelessness | X |
| Criminal History | X |
| Bad Credit or Rental History | X |

3B-2.7. Describe: (1) the strategies used by the CoC, including securing additional funding to increase the availability of housing and services for youth experiencing homelessness, especially those experiencing unsheltered homelessness; (2) provide evidence the strategies that have been implemented are effective at ending youth homelessness; (3) the measure(s) the CoC is using to calculate the effectiveness of the strategies; and (4) why the CoC believes the measure(s) used is an appropriate way to determine the effectiveness of the CoC’s efforts. (limit 1500 characters)

Effective strategies used include using HF approach that helps entry into time-limited housing when needed and permanent housing. The CoC also uses a master list that is reviewed weekly in case conferencing meetings that includes a summary of persons including youth that lists total number of persons, persons currently housed, persons searching for housing. Information helps to
measure effectiveness and success of strategies being used and effective housing options that include various levels of services. HMIS data is used to track total number of unsheltered youth and compared over periods of time. Through the Data subcommittee HMIS and CES data can be used to determine effectiveness in revealing family problems, economic circumstances, involvement with public systems such as child welfare, criminal justice, foster care, and other situations that make youth particularly vulnerable to loss of housing and hinder obtaining and maintaining permanent housing. Homeless count data is used to determine underlying issues that hinder permanent housing placement. Effort also includes working with the County Social Services Agency on a collaborative effort to share data and optimize “Bringing Families Home” funding and participation in Foster Youth Outcomes meetings.

3B-2.8. Describe: (1) How the CoC collaborates with youth education providers, including McKinney-Vento local educational authorities and school districts; (2) the formal partnerships the CoC has with these entities; and (3) the policies and procedures, if any, that have been adopted to inform individuals and families who become homeless of their eligibility for educational services. (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC and school districts mutually participate in CoC and Homeless Liaison meetings. The Department of Education (OCDE) sits on the Commission to End Homelessness and stakeholders participate on committees involved in strategic planning regarding homeless children. There is joint process to identify homeless and/or at risk families, connect them to appropriate housing and education related resources in the community, and assist with the lack of, or inaccurate, paperwork in order to remove barriers to enrollment and ensure safeguards are in place to protect students from discrimination based on homeless status. Established relationships with ES and TH programs assist in identifying students in ways to not create barriers or embarrassment by conducting minimal investigation to verify living situation and conditions. In addition, OCDE recently launched a pilot program that links students who have been identified as homeless to housing providers through coordinated entry.

3B-2.9. Does the CoC have any written formal agreements, MOU/MOAs or partnerships with one or more providers of early childhood services and supports? Select “Yes” or “No”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Childhood Providers</th>
<th>MOU/MOA</th>
<th>Other Formal Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Head Start</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Fund</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Visiting Program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Start</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pre-K</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth to 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Home Visiting Program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (limit 50 characters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3B-3.1. Provide the actions the CoC has taken to identify, assess, and refer homeless Veterans who are eligible for Veterans Affairs services and housing to appropriate resources such as HUD-VASH and Supportive Services for Veterans Families (SSVF) program and Grant and Per Diem (GPD).

(limit 1000 characters)

Actions include: 1) having street outreach teams create a By-Name List of vets that includes CH and hardest-to-reach; 2) implementing a CES in which street outreach workers and other homeless services staff enter vets into the system, via the list, that helps match them to appropriate housing and services including VASH and SSVF 3) sharing the By-Name List of veterans across agencies that prioritize veterans eligible for VA housing programs; 4) coordinating an interagency group that meets monthly to implement action plans for veterans on the list who are eligible for VA services; 5) assigning vets to housing navigators that help identify housing, including bridge housing if needed, and obtain and maintain PH; 6) implementing a Housing First approach that moves veterans into PH as quickly as possible with right level of services; and 7) ensuring connections to employment and legal services if needed. Vets ineligible for VA services are assigned to housing navigators.

3B-3.2. Does the CoC use an active list or by name list to identify all Veterans experiencing homelessness in the CoC? Yes

3B-3.3. Is the CoC actively working with the VA and VA-funded programs to achieve the benchmarks and criteria for ending Veteran homelessness? Yes

3B-3.4. Does the CoC have sufficient resources to ensure each Veteran is assisted to quickly move into permanent housing using a Housing First approach? No
4A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Accessing Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies

Instructions:
For guidance on completing this application, please reference the FY 2017 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

4A-1. Select from the drop-down (1) each type of healthcare organization the CoC assists program participants with enrolling in health insurance, and (2) if the CoC provides assistance with the effective utilization of Medicaid and other benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Health Care</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Assist with Utilization of Benefits?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Care Benefits (State or Federal benefits, e.g. Medicaid, Indian Health Services)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Insurers:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit, Philanthropic:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (limit 50 characters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-Optima - System Navigators</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4A-1a. Mainstream Benefits

CoC program funded projects must be able to demonstrate they supplement CoC Program funds from other public and private resources, including: (1) how the CoC works with mainstream programs that assist homeless program participants in applying for and receiving mainstream benefits; (2) how the CoC systematically keeps program staff up-to-date regarding mainstream resources available for homeless program participants (e.g. Food Stamps, SSI, TANF, substance abuse programs); and (3) identify the organization or position that is responsible for overseeing the CoCs strategy for mainstream benefits. (limit 1000 characters)

CoC works with many mainstream programs that assist with resources which includes SSA regarding SSI and SSDI which provides income, access to health care coverage, and workforce connections; also works with SSA with TANF in regards to providing short-term housing assistance and adjusting benefit levels with variations in housing costs and food stamps; Covered California (ACA) regarding enrollment and payment for services for persons in PSH; Medi-Cal regarding eligibility and enrollment in specialty mental health and drug recovery services; local workforce system regarding education, training, and employment opportunities; Community Action Agency regarding utility assistance and child development programs; and early care and education through HEAD Start. CoC keeps program staff up to date through SOAR trainings and CES trainings that clarifies various roles of mainstream resource providers, prioritizing access to...
resources, and coordinating referrals. Organization responsible is HCDHP.

4A-2. Low Barrier: Based on the CoCs FY 2017 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH) and Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Transitional Housing (TH), Safe-Haven, and SSO (Supportive Services Only-non-coordinated entry) projects in the CoC are low-barrier?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of PH (PSH and RRH), TH, Safe-Haven and non-Coordinated Entry SSO project applications in the FY 2017 competition (new and renewal)</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of PH (PSH and RRH), TH, Safe-Haven and non-Coordinated Entry SSO renewal and new project applications that selected “low barrier” in the FY 2017 competition.</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of PH (PSH and RRH), TH, Safe-Haven and non-Coordinated Entry SSO renewal and new project applications in the FY 2017 competition that will be designated as “low barrier”</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4A-3. Housing First: What percentage of CoC Program Funded PSH, RRH, SSO (non-coordinated entry), safe-haven and Transitional Housing; FY 2017 projects have adopted the Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, Safe Haven and TH project applications in the FY 2017 competition (new and renewal).</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, Safe Haven and TH renewal and new project applications that selected Housing First in the FY 2017 competition.</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, Safe Haven and TH renewal and new project applications in the FY 2017 competition that will be designated as Housing First.</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4A-4. Street Outreach: Describe (1) the CoC’s outreach and if it covers 100 percent of the CoC’s geographic area; (2) how often street outreach is conducted; and (3) how the CoC has tailored its street outreach to those that are least likely to request assistance. (limit 1000 characters)

The 20+ access points (outreach & in-reach) provide 100% geographic coverage for the CoC. Referral connection to street outreach is also made available 24/7 through partnership with 211. Teams provide outreach 7 days a week & target areas within county that have visible or hidden encampments that include persons with longest history of homelessness & most severe service needs. Outreach teams begin immediate engagement (multiple contacts to develop rapport/trust) while also entering information into a by-name master list to help measure progress and make appropriate housing related decisions. Outreach also links to assistive resources that aid in obtaining permanent housing. Resources include assistance with benefit enrollment, identification cards, and tenant education programs to help with housing search and overcoming any barriers to obtain housing.

4A-5. Affirmative Outreach
Specific strategies the CoC has implemented that furthers fair housing as detailed in 24 CFR 578.93(c) used to market housing and supportive services to eligible persons regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identify, sexual orientation, age, familial status, or
disability; who are least likely to apply in the absence of special outreach.
Describe: (1) the specific strategies that have been implemented that
affirmatively further fair housing as detailed in 24 CFR 578.93(c); and (2)
what measures have been taken to provide effective communication to
persons with disabilities and those with limited English proficiency.
(limit 1000 characters)
The CoC has implemented minimum standards for accessibility in accordance
with the Rehabilitation Act, the Fair Housing Act & Title II of the Americans with
Disabilities Act. Each funded project must meet the regulatory requirements
relating to access, transportation, disability accommodations and linguistic
needs, as approved by the CoC. All CoC & ESG award recipients must provide
program participants with information on rights & remedies available under
federal, state and local fair housing and civil rights laws. Clients are provided
with materials noting the complaint process, fair housing & civil rights. The CoC
utilizes the OC Providers Forum for trainings to educate CoC and ESG award
recipients on best practices and HUD regulations. In addition, the Coordinated
Entry System has produced marketing materials, written at a broadly
understood level with translations in to Spanish, Vietnamese, & Korean. Multi-
lingual access to CES is also available through the local 211 partner.

4A-6. Compare the number of RRH beds available to serve populations
from the 2016 and 2017 HIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RRH beds available to serve all populations in the HIC</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>-136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4A-7. Are new proposed project applications requesting $200,000 or more in funding for housing rehabilitation or new construction? No

4A-8. Is the CoC requesting to designate one or more SSO or TH projects to serve homeless households with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statues who are unstably housed (paragraph 3 of the definition of homeless found at 24 CFR 578.3). No
4B. Attachments

**Instructions:**
Multiple files may be attached as a single .zip file. For instructions on how to use .zip files, a reference document is available on the e-snaps training site: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3118/creating-a-zip-file-and-capturing-a-screenshot-resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Required?</th>
<th>Document Description</th>
<th>Date Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Evidence of the CoC's communication to rejected participants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evidence of the C...</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Public Posting Evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2017 CoC Consolid...</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. CoC Rating and Review Procedure (e.g. RFP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CoC Rating and Re...</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. CoC's Rating and Review Procedure: Public Posting Evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CoC Rating and Re...</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. CoCs Process for Reallocating</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CoC's Process for...</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. CoC's Governance Charter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Governance Charter</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>HMIS Policies and...</td>
<td>09/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. Applicable Sections of Con Plan to Serving Persons Defined as Homeless Under Other Fed Statutes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. PHA Administration Plan (Applicable Section(s) Only)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PHA Homeless Pref...</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CoC-HMIS MOU (if referenced in the CoC's Governance Charter)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>CoC-HMIS MOU</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CoC Written Standards for Order of Priority</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Project List to Serve Persons Defined as Homeless under Other Federal Statutes (if applicable)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HDX-system Performance Measures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15/16 SPM Report</td>
<td>09/15/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment Details

Document Description: Evidence of the CoC's Communication

Attachment Details

Document Description: 2017 CoC Consolidated Application Public Posting

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC Rating and Review Procedure

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC Rating and Review: Public Posting

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC’s Process for Reallocation
Document Description: Governance Charter

Attachment Details

Document Description: HMIS Policies and Procedures

Attachment Details

Document Description: PHA Homeless Preference Policies

Attachment Details

Document Description: CoC-HMIS MOU

Attachment Details
Submission Summary

Ensure that the Project Priority List is complete prior to submitting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A. Identification</td>
<td>08/22/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B. Engagement</td>
<td>09/27/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C. Coordination</td>
<td>09/27/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D. Discharge Planning</td>
<td>08/22/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E. Project Review</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F. Reallocation Supporting Documentation</td>
<td>No Input Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A. HMIS Implementation</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B. PIT Count</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C. Sheltered Data - Methods</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A. System Performance</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B. Performance and Strategic Planning</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. Attachments</td>
<td>09/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>No Input Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 1

2017 CoC Consolidated Application: Evidence of the CoC’s Communication to Rejected Participants

Note: Please see Attachment 4 for the Public Posting of the Proposed Ranking and Review Procedure and Attachment 5 for the CoCs Process for Reallocation
Dear Orange County Housing Authority,

This email serves to notify you that your agency has agreed to voluntarily reallocate in whole or a portion of your project funding toward the expansion of existing projects. Below is the project and the reallocation amount.

- Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA) has agreed to reallocate $284,759
  - VOALA S+C - $204,002
  - Jackson Aisle - $15,087
  - Consolidated - $65,670

If you would like to view the reallocations along with the ranking, tiering, and permanent housing bonus recommendations approved by the Commission to End Homelessness, please click on the following link.


Should you have any questions, please send an email to Jim Wheeler at jim.wheeler@occr.ocgov.com.

Sent on behalf of,

JIM WHEELER
Continuum of Care Manager
County of Orange / Housing & Community Development & Homeless Prevention
1300 S. Grand Avenue, Building B (3rd Floor)
Santa Ana, CA 92705
EMAIL: jim.wheeler@occr.ocgov.com
PHONE 714.480.2804
Jocelyn Gaspar

From: Jocelyn Gaspar
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 2:08 PM
To: 'Laura Miller'; Teang Lim; 'lmiller@ocinterfaithshelter.org'
Cc: Jim.Wheeler@occr.ocgov.com; Erin DeRycke; Juanita.Preciado@occr.ocgov.com
Subject: 2017 CoC Project Reallocations - OCGH

Tracking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Laura Miller'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teang Lim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'<a href="mailto:lmiller@ocinterfaithshelter.org">lmiller@ocinterfaithshelter.org</a>'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Jim.Wheeler@occr.ocgov.com">Jim.Wheeler@occr.ocgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin DeRycke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Juanita.Preciado@occr.ocgov.com">Juanita.Preciado@occr.ocgov.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Gaspar</td>
<td>Read: 9/13/2017 2:08 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Orange County Gateway to Housing,

This email serves to notify you that your agency has agreed to voluntarily reallocate a portion of your project funding toward the expansion of existing projects. Below is the project and the reallocation amount.

- **Orange County Gateway to Housing (OCGH) RRH has agreed to reallocate $125,000.**

If you would like to view the reallocations along with the ranking, tiering, and permanent housing bonus recommendations approved by the Commission to End Homelessness, please click on the following link.


Should you have any questions, please reach out to Jim Wheeler at jim.wheeler@occr.ocgov.com.

Sent on behalf of,

**JIM WHEELER**
Continuum of Care Manager
County of Orange / Housing & Community Development & Homeless Prevention
1300 S. Grand Avenue, Building B (3rd Floor)
Santa Ana, CA 92705
EMAIL: jim.wheeler@occr.ocgov.com
PHONE 714.480.2804
Good Afternoon Mercy House,

On behalf of the Orange County Continuum of Care, I want to thank you for your application for the 2017 Request for Proposal (RFP) for New Permanent Housing. We greatly appreciate your continued commitment to ending homelessness for the neediest in our community.

If you recall, this year the Ad-Hoc committee recommended and the Commission to End Homelessness approved the delegation of the selection and ranking of Bonus Project(s) to the RFP Panel.

The RFP Panel met on Wednesday, September 6th and closely examined all proposals submitted. After reviewing and scoring each project the Panel recommended a different proposal for this year’s Bonus Project. Therefore, your project application is not recommended for inclusion in the 2017 CoC Funding Application.

If you wish to appeal, appeals must be submitted in writing to Jocelyn Gaspar (714 -589-2358) at 2-1-1 OC jgaspar@211oc.org no later than September 12, 2017. Appeals will be heard by the non-conflicted members of the CoC Ad Hoc Committee who did not serve on the review panel. The decision of the appeals panel is final.

If you would like to discuss, I would be glad to share your score and the feedback provided by the Panel.

Please Reply to this e-mail to confirm receipt.

JIM WHEELER
Continuum of Care Manager
County of Orange / Housing & Community Development & Homeless Prevention
1300 S. Grand Avenue, Building B (3rd Floor)
Santa Ana, CA 92705
EMAIL: jim.wheeler@occr.ocgov.com
PHONE 714.480.2804
CoC-602
Attachment 2
2017 CoC Consolidated Application Public Posting Evidence
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

2017 COC HUD COLLABORATIVE APPLICATION

FY2017 Orange County CoC Collaborative Application with Attachments
Posted 9/26/2017

FY2017 Orange County CoC Priority List-Final from e-snaps
Posted 9/26/2017

2017 PROJECT PRIORITY RANKING

2017 Final C2eH Project Priority Listing (Revised Final)
Posted 9/26/2017

2017 C2eH Project Priority Listing (Revised with Bonus Project)
Posted 9/13/2017

On Wednesday, August 23, 2017, the Orange County Commission to End Homelessness (C2eH) and Continuum of Care (CoC) Board approved the FY2017 Orange County CoC Project Priority List. Click below to view the final FY2017 Orange County CoC Project Priority List.

2017 Preliminary C2eH Approved Project Priority Listing (Revised)
Posted 9/13/2017

2017 PROJECT RANKING, TIERING, AND PERMANENT HOUSING RECOMMENDATIONS

On Wednesday, August 23, 2017, the Orange County Commission to End Homelessness (C2eH) and Continuum of Care (CoC) Board approved the FY2017 Orange County CoC reallocation, ranking, tiering, and permanent housing bonus recommendations. Click below to view the final FY2017 Orange County CoC
CoC-602

Attachment 3

CoC Rating and Review Procedure

**Attachment A:** 2017 CoC Funding Application Policy and Process Recommendations

**Attachment B:** 2017 Reallocation, Ranking, Tiering and Permanent Housing Bonus Recommendation

**Attachment C:** 2017 Performance Measures for Ranking

**Attachment D:** 2017 Scoring for New Projects
Ad-HOC Meeting Recommendations (May 9, 2017 Meeting)

Recommended Actions:

I. Letter of Intent (LOI) Renewal Process
   Recommend the LOI process as implemented in 2016: Two parts: 1) Agency Administrative Review and 2) Project Application Submission
   A. LOI Part I: Agency Administrative Review
      Part I will consist of a review of technical & presentation requirements (late submissions, incomplete), financial stability, HUD monitoring, CoC Participation, unspent funds, etc. Released May 1/Due May 15, 2017
      i. Outcome of failed Administrative Review will constitute forfeiture of funds for reallocation.
      ii. Those successful in Part I will move to Part II
   B. LOI Part II: Project Application Submission
      Part II will consist of a review of projects performance. Based on prior funding cycle, CoCs may elect to reallocate based on local priorities as aligned with HUD priorities. Local policies, if adopted prior to NOFA release and if in conflict with NOFA, are subject to revision.
      i. Project Performance – renewal or reallocation
      ii. Subject to local CoC policy
      iii. Subject to HUD guidelines

II. Performance Measures
   The Performance Measures by housing type were presented to the Executive Director’s meeting on Friday, April 14, 2017. Agencies were given until April 20 for feedback. However, they have asked for more time to review the measurements. An additional meeting with the EDs will be scheduled to discuss performance measures and overall CoC funding priorities.

   At the follow up ED meeting on May 5, 2017 the EDs along with 211 and County staff discussed the measures and points in detail. Per their recommendations the measures/points were revised. The revised measures were presented to the CoC Ad Hoc at the May 9, 2017 meeting.

   After vetting and discussion, the CoC Ad Hoc recommends the attachment performance measurements (Attachment 1). The attached is a draft list of performance measures by type, with target goals and allocated points. Upon approval, the results will be reviewed to determine renewal or reallocation.

III. Proposed Reallocation Policy Recommendations
   A. Reallocation from Agency Administrative Review – Projects that do not pass Part I Review
   B. Reallocation of Unspent funds (review 3 years of funding/expenditures with 10% or more unexpended)
   C. Reallocation of Low Performing Projects (PSH and RRH) to be considered when NOFA is released by HUD
   D. Other Reallocation Options in NOFA (pending Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] NOFA release)

IV. Timely and Incomplete Submission
   The following is a list of the possible reductions an Agency will receive.
   3 point reduction for late applications. There is once again a grace period.
   3 point reduction for not meeting the Technical Requirements.
   3 point reduction for not meeting the Document Presentation Requirements.
   3 point reduction for each incomplete or missing exhibit.

V. Approvals for 2017 CoC Funding Cycle
   Recommend that either Commission to End Homelessness or Executive Committee have authority to approve necessary actions for timely submittal of 2017 CoC funding application.
CoC Ad Hoc Meeting
August 11, 2017


Ad-Hoc Committee Recommendations

1. Background

On April 10, 2017 HUD released the FY 2017 CoC Program Registration Notice. On page 11 of the notice it stated, “In the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition, HUD anticipates allowing CoCs to use the reallocation process to create, at a minimum, the following new projects.

- new permanent supportive housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families; including unaccompanied youth;
- new rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied you, 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;
- new joint component projects, which will combine TH and PH-RRH into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness;
- new dedicated HMIS projects; or
- new Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects for a centralized or coordinated assessment systems.

CoCs may choose to eliminate or reduce one or more eligible renewal projects to create one or more reallocated projects.”

Having received this direction from HUD, the Ad-Hoc Committee met on April 17, 2017 to discuss the performance measures to be used (by housing type) in the analysis for potential reallocation and ranking of projects. These recommendations were presented to the CoC Executive Directors on May 5, 2017 who then provided feedback to the Ad-Hoc Committee. On May 9, 2017, the Ad-Hoc Committee met to finalize the performance measures. These measures were then sent to the Commission to End Homelessness (C2eH) for approval. Along with the Preliminary CoC Funding Application Policy and Process Recommendations document, the performance measures were approved at the May 12, 2017 C2eH meeting. Subsequently, these measures were used to review project performance for reallocation analysis and recommendations. This year’s goal has been to align the performance measures as closely as possible with the System Performance Measures (SPM) submitted to HUD in the Homeless Data Exchange (HDX).

On July 14, 2017 the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA was released. The NOFA further expounded on the reallocation process and the importance of using performance measures by stating on page 10 that:

- CoCs cannot receive grants for new projects, other than through reallocation, unless the CoC competitively ranks projects based on how they improve system performance;
- HUD is increasing the share of the CoC score that is based on performance criteria; and
- HUD will prioritize funding for CoCs that have demonstrated the ability to reallocate resources to higher performing projects.
The NOFA also stated that CoCs may create new projects by making funds available through reallocation or by using amounts available through the permanent housing bonus.

New in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition (NOFA page 12), HUD allow project applicants to apply for a *new expansion project* under the reallocation process or permanent housing bonus in order to expand existing eligible renewal projects that will increase the number of units in the project, or allow the recipient to serve additional persons.

As in year’s past, CoCs will be required to rank all new and renewal project applications submitted by project applicants in e-snaps. HUD will also continue the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding process. HUD has established each CoC’s Tier 1 and Tier 2 amounts based on the total amount of funds requested by eligible renewal project applications. This is referred to as the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). This year HUD has determined that Tier 1 is equal to 94% of a CoC’s ARD. Projects in this tier are conditionally selected from the highest scoring CoC to the lowest scoring CoC, provided the project applications pass both eligibility and threshold review. Any type of new or renewal project application can be placed in Tier 1.

Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the CoC’s ARD plus any amount available for the permanent housing bonus. This does not include the amounts available for CoC planning grants. Project applications that are in Tier 2 will be selected for FY 2017 CoC Program funding using a process/formula described in the NOFA. Projects placed in Tier 2 will be assessed for eligibility and threshold requirements, and funding will be determined using the CoC’s overall score, CoC project ranking order, and a project’s commitment to Housing First.

If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 1 as stated above; and then, using the CoC score and other factors described in the NOFA, HUD may fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

This year the funding available for the CA-602 Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC is as follows:

- **Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) -** $21,703,735
- **Tier 1 (94% of ARD) –** $20,401,511
- **Tier 2 (6% of ARD) –** $1,302,224
- **Permanent Housing Bonus (6% of ARD) -** $1,302,224
- **Planning Grant -** $651,112

Based on the instructions given in the NOFA and the performance measures approved by the C2eH, the Ad-Hoc Committee met on August 4, 2017 to analyze the final performance results for each project and to determine a possible strategy for reallocating, ranking and tiering of each project. Immediately following, the Ad-Hoc Committee met with the CoC Executive Directors and had a comprehensive discussion about reallocation of funds and what projects should receive them, how projects should be ranked, what Tier 1 and Tier 2 should look like and what kind of projects should be emphasized in the bonus project Request for Proposal (RFP). The Ad-Hoc was given instructions to meet once more and to make final recommendations regarding these items. With the understanding that these recommendations would go before the C2eH at the next meeting. The Ad-Hoc Committee met again on August 11, 2017 and these are their recommendations:

Commission to End Homelessness Meeting – Approved August 23, 2017
2. **Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1 – Reallocation**

Four projects agreed to reallocate in whole or in part funds toward the expansion of existing projects.

- Orange County Gateway to Housing (OCGH) RRH - $125,000
- Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA) - $284,759
  - VOALA S+C - $204,002
  - Jackson Aisle - $15,087
  - Consolidated - $65,670

**TOTAL Available for Reallocation:** $409,759

The Ad-Hoc recommends that the total reallocated amount of $409,759 should be divide evenly amongst the two top performing PSH projects (Mercy House – OC PSH Collaboration Project II and Illumination Foundation – Street2Home) for the expansion of their projects. This recommendation was previously discussed at the ED meeting where there was concurrence with this direction. This funding is to be used for increasing direct housing placement assistance proportionate to each projects current serving capacity.

**Recommendation 2 – Ranking and Tiering**

**Ranking:** Project rankings are to be based solely on performance weighted score. Previously the C2eH had approved a two-part scoring rubric that included possible points from the LOI Part I. However, it was determined by consensus at the ED Meeting along with the Ad Hoc Committee that the LOI Part 1 scores would not be used for ranking purposes but as a tie breaker if necessary.

**Tiering:** Because of where the funding line fell this year, one project by necessity would be required to straddle Tier 1 and Tier 2. Fullerton Interfaith Emergency Services (Pathways of Hope) was chosen to straddle this year based on two factors. 1) Poor performance and 2) History of unspent funds. The portion of their project placed in Tier 2 aligns with their historic unspent funds amount. The strategic decision was also made to place a higher performing OCHA project (2003 Shelter Plus Care) in Tier 2 in lieu of multiple small projects. This was also done ensure Service Planning Area (SPA) coverage. Finally, the Ad-Hoc determined that the Bonus Project(s) should be placed higher than lowest performing project from OC Gateway to Housing. The Ad Hoc also agrees to delegate the ranking of Bonus Projects, if more than one is to be recommended for funding.

**Recommendation 3 – Request for Proposal (RFP)**

The RFP has been issued to solicit proposals for the Bonus Project(s). These proposals are required to target PSH for chronically Homeless (individuals, family, and youth experiencing homelessness). The Bonus Project(s) may be one large project or two smaller projects. The RFP process may include a question and answer session at the discretion of the RFP review panel.

**Recommendation 4 – DedicatedPLUS Projects**

Commission to End Homelessness Meeting – Approved August 23, 2017
In the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA, HUD created the DedicatedPLUS concept to provide more flexibility to communities, particularly those that have already dedicated 100 percent of the PSH resources to chronic homelessness, to expand their eligibility to serve persons with long histories of homelessness and severe service needs who would not meet the definition of chronic homelessness at project entry. The DedicatedPLUS concept applies at the project level. All new PSH projects are required to either be (1) 100 percent dedicated to chronic homelessness or (2) DedicatedPLUS. Renewal PSH projects are given the option in the electronic HUD application choose to change their classification to DedicatedPLUS as part of their project application.

Since the 2017 Point-in-Time Count revealed a 60% increase in the chronic homeless population in Orange County, the Ad-Hoc recommends that no projects be allowed to reclassify as DedicatedPLUS and that all new and current projects dedicated to 100% chronic homeless continue to be so classified.

The Ad-Hoc Committee ask that the C2eH approve all recommendations and this document as presented.
### Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>% Returns to Homelessness</th>
<th>PSH Only: % Enrollments Maintained/Exit to PH</th>
<th>% of Entries from Homelessness (includes TH)</th>
<th>Unit Utilization</th>
<th>% Stayers (3+ years) with Increased Income</th>
<th>% Leavers with Increased Income</th>
<th>Average UDE Data Quality</th>
<th>Average PSDE Entrance Data Quality</th>
<th>Average PSDE Exit Data Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Threshold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Source</td>
<td>NAEH</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Point Allocations

| Met Threshold | 11 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <10% from Threshold | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| >10% from Threshold | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### Notes on Measure

*Time period is CY 2015 – 2016; includes clients that exited to a PH destination and returned to any homeless project in HMIS/comparable database (excludes returns to prevention projects)*

*Includes active HTMs in 2016*  
*TH is considered an entry from homelessness*

*Only projects that have been active at least one year are included in the measure.*

*Threshold is based on draft average PSH percentage + 2%*

*Threshold is based on draft average PSH percentage + 2%*

*Data will be from most recent report cards completed (most likely Q1 2017)*

*Data will be from most recent report cards completed (most likely Q1 2017)*

*Data will be from most recent report cards completed (most likely Q1 2017)
# Attachment C: Performance Measures for NOFA Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>% Returns to Homelessness</th>
<th>RRH Only: Average Days to PH Placement</th>
<th>RRH Only: % Successful Exits</th>
<th>% of Entries from Homelessness (Includes TH)</th>
<th>% Stayers (1+ years) with Increased Income</th>
<th>% Leavers with Increased Income</th>
<th>Average UDE Data Quality</th>
<th>Average PSDE Exit Data Quality</th>
<th>Average PSDE Entry Data Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Threshold</td>
<td>&lt;15%</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td>&gt;85%</td>
<td>&gt;27%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Source</td>
<td>NAEH</td>
<td>NAEH</td>
<td>NAEH</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
<td>Orange County CoC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Point Allocations | 10 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Notes on Measure | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

* Time period is CY 2015 – 2016; includes clients that exited to a PH destination and returned to any homeless project in HMIS/comparable database (excludes returns to prevention projects)  
* DV projects will have fewer returns  
* Asked RH providers if they are entering program entry dates correctly; did not receive responses from a few providers, and averages for a few projects still seem low  
* If an agency is incorrectly entering program entry date, it can be a benefit to them not to fix the issue  
* Includes active HoHs in 2016  
* TH is considered an entry from homelessness  
* Threshold is based on draft average RRH percentage + 2%  
* Data will be from most recent report cards completed (most likely Q1 2017)  
* Data will be from most recent report cards completed (most likely Q1 2017)  
* Data will be from most recent report cards completed (most likely Q1 2017)
### Scoring Factor
#### 1. Capacity of Grantee and Partners
- Applicant and any subrecipients have recent relevant experience providing housing to homeless people; administering leasing or rental assistance funds; delivering services; and entering HMIS data;
- If application has subrecipients, applicant organizations have experience working together;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Section in Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eSnaps Application (2nd Tab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2A: Project Subrecipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2B: Experience of Applicant (Q1 - Q4a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit 3: Financial Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Tabs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Housing Location and Navigation
- Applicant has described experience in searching for housing units with a client centered approach for individuals and families with high barriers such as, but not limited to eviction histories, poor credit histories, felonies
- Applicant has developing relationships with landlords & property managers;
- Applicant inspects housing units using HUD’s habitability standards;
- And support & contact to property managers/landlords.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Section in Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eSnaps Application (2nd Tab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3B: Project Description (Q1 - Q7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4A: Supportive Services (Q2 - Q4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5A: Project Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5B: Subpopulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Green Tabs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Stabilization Process Plan
- Type, scale, and location of the housing fit the needs of the program participants such as ADA units for people with disabilities experiencing homelessness.
- Participants are assisted to secure housing as quickly as possible.
- Programs and activities are offered in a setting that enables homeless people with disabilities to interact with others without disabilities to the fullest extent possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Section in Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eSnaps Application (2nd Tab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3B: Project Description (Q1, Q7-Q9b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4A: Support Services for Participants (Q2-Q3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4B: Housing Type and Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon Yellow Tabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Service Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type, scale, location of the supportive services fit the needs of the program participants and are readily accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a specific plan to ensure participants are assisted to obtain the benefits of the mainstream health, social, and employment programs for which they are eligible (including, for bonus PSH, Medi-Cal funded non-emergency services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a specific plan to ensure participants are assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a specific plan to ensure participants are assisted to increase their incomes and live independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a specific plan to implement a client-centered approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a specific and measurable plan to improve system performance that benefits the local CoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Housing First Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant will offer housing assistance without preconditions (such as sobriety or a minimum income threshold) or service participation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant Rapid placement and stabilization in permanent housing are primary program objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicant has committed to participation in CoC’s Coordinated Assessment-Centralized Intake Process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Timing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project has a clear plan to begin operations within one year of award (six months for bonus PSH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Budget and Match</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Budget is reasonable for type of project and clearly articulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required match of at least 25% is included and documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project is cost effective compared to other similar new permanent housing applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Participation in CoC meetings, PIT, HIC, HMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Completeness and Clarity of Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewer Comments
CoC 602
Attachment 4
CoC Rating and Review Procedure – Public Posting Evidence
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

2017 PROJECT RANKING, TIERING, AND PERMANENT HOUSING RECOMMENDATIONS

On Wednesday, August 23, 2017, the Orange County Commission to End Homelessness (C2EH) and Continuum of Care (CoC) Board approved the FY2017 Orange County CoC reallotment, ranking, tiering, and permanent housing bonus recommendations. Click below to view the final FY2017 Orange County CoC project ranking, tiering, and permanent housing recommendations.

Posted 9/13/2017

2017 C2EH Approved Reallotment, Ranking, Tiering, and Permanent Housing Bonus Recommendations

On Wednesday, August 23, 2017, the Orange County Commission to End Homelessness (C2EH) and Continuum of Care (CoC) Board approved the FY2017 Orange County CoC Project Priority List. Click below to view the final FY2017 Orange County CoC Project Priority List.

Posted 9/13/2017

2017 C2EH Approved Project Priority Listing (Completed)

2017 C2EH Approved Project Priority Listing (Secured with Project Focus)

2017 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR NEW PERMANENT HOUSING (PH) PROJECTS

2017 REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)

C2EH Agendas and Minutes - 2017

- January 27th, 2017: Cancelled
- February 24th, 2017: Agenda (Executive Committee)
- March 31st, 2017: Agenda (Special Meeting) and Minutes
- April 28th, 2017: Executive Committee Meeting Cancelled
- May 12th, 2017: Agenda (Special Meeting) and Minutes
  - Notice
- June 23rd, 2017: Executive Committee Meeting Cancelled
- July 12th, 2017: Agenda (Special Meeting) and Minutes
  - Notice
  - MMIS Request For Proposals Summary
  - MMIS Request For Proposals Scoring Summary
  - MMIS Request For Proposals Financial Review
  - Family Assessment Week Results
  - Point-In-Time Results Presentation
  - CES Dependency Preference and Preference of Prioritization Criteria
- August 23rd, 2017: Agenda (Special Commission Meeting)
  - 2017 Preliminary Project Priority Listing
  - August 11th, 2017 C2EH Ad Hoc Reallotment, Ranking, Tiering, and Permanent Housing Bonus Recommendations
  - C2EH CES Statistics Handout
CoC-602
Attachment 5
CoC’s Process for Reallocation
CoC Ad Hoc Meeting
August 11, 2017


Ad-Hoc Committee Recommendations

1. Background

On April 10, 2017 HUD released the FY 2017 CoC Program Registration Notice. On page 11 of the notice it stated, “In the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition, HUD anticipates allowing CoCs to use the reallocation process to create, at a minimum, the following new projects.

- new permanent supportive housing projects that will primarily serve chronically homeless individuals and families; including unaccompanied youth;
- new rapid rehousing projects for homeless individuals and families, including unaccompanied you, 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;
- new joint component projects, which will combine TH and PH-RRH into a single project to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness;
- new dedicated HMIS projects; or
- new Supportive Services Only (SSO) projects for a centralized or coordinated assessment systems.

CoCs may choose to eliminate or reduce one or more eligible renewal projects to create one or more reallocated projects.”

Having received this direction from HUD, the Ad-Hoc Committee met on April 17, 2017 to discuss the performance measures to be used (by housing type) in the analysis for potential reallocation and ranking of projects. These recommendations were presented to the CoC Executive Directors on May 5, 2017 who then provided feedback to the Ad-Hoc Committee. On May 9, 2017, the Ad-Hoc Committee met to finalize the performance measures. These measures were then sent to the Commission to End Homelessness (C2eH) for approval. Along with the Preliminary CoC Funding Application Policy and Process Recommendations document, these measures were approved at the May 12, 2017 C2eH meeting. Subsequently, these measures were used to review project performance for reallocation analysis and recommendations. This year’s goal has been to align the performance measures as closely as possible with the System Performance Measures (SPM) submitted to HUD in the Homeless Data Exchange (HDX).

On July 14, 2017 the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA was released. The NOFA further expounded on the reallocation process and the importance of using performance measures by stating on page 10 that:

- CoCs cannot receive grants for new projects, other than through reallocation, unless the CoC competitively ranks projects based on how they improve system performance;
- HUD is increasing the share of the CoC score that is based on performance criteria; and
- HUD will prioritize funding for CoCs that have demonstrated the ability to reallocate resources to higher performing projects.
The NOFA also stated that CoCs may create new projects by making funds available through reallocation or by using amounts available through the permanent housing bonus.

New in the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition (NOFA page 12), HUD allow project applicants to apply for a new expansion project under the reallocation process or permanent housing bonus in order to expand existing eligible renewal projects that will increase the number of units in the project, or allow the recipient to serve additional persons.

As in year’s past, CoCs will be required to rank all new and renewal project applications submitted by project applicants in e-snaps. HUD will also continue the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding process. HUD has established each CoC’s Tier 1 and Tier 2 amounts based on the total amount of funds requested by eligible renewal project applications. This is referred to as the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD). This year HUD has determined that Tier 1 is equal to 94% of a CoC’s ARD. Projects in this tier are conditionally selected from the highest scoring CoC to the lowest scoring CoC, provided the project applications pass both eligibility and threshold review. Any type of new or renewal project application can be placed in Tier 1.

Tier 2 is the difference between Tier 1 and the CoC’s ARD plus any amount available for the permanent housing bonus. This does not include the amounts available for CoC planning grants. Project applications that are in Tier 2 will be selected for FY 2017 CoC Program funding using a process/formula described in the NOFA. Projects placed in Tier 2 will be assessed for eligibility and threshold requirements, and funding will be determined using the CoC’s overall score, CoC project ranking order, and a project’s commitment to Housing First.

If a project application straddles the Tier 1 and Tier 2 funding line, HUD will conditionally select the project up to the amount of funding that falls within Tier 1 as stated above; and then, using the CoC score and other factors described in the NOFA, HUD may fund the Tier 2 portion of the project. If HUD does not fund the Tier 2 portion of the project, HUD may award the project at the reduced amount, provided the project is still feasible with the reduced funding (e.g., is able to continue serving homeless program participants effectively).

This year the funding available for the CA-602 Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC is as follows:

- Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) - $ 21,703,735
- Tier 1 (94% of ARD) – $20,401,511
- Tier 2 (6% of ARD) – $1,302,224
- Permanent Housing Bonus (6% of ARD) - $1,302,224
- Planning Grant - $ 651,112

Based on the instructions given in the NOFA and the performance measures approved by the C2eH, the Ad-Hoc Committee met on August 4, 2017 to analyze the final performance results for each project and to determine a possible strategy for reallocating, ranking and tiering of each project. Immediately following, the Ad-Hoc Committee met with the CoC Executive Directors and had a comprehensive discussion about reallocation of funds and what projects should receive them, how projects should be ranked, what Tier 1 and Tier 2 should look like and what kind of projects should be emphasized in the bonus project Request for Proposal (RFP). The Ad-Hoc was given instructions to meet once more and to make final recommendations regarding these items. With the understanding that these recommendations would go before the C2eH at the next meeting. The Ad-Hoc Committee met again on August 11, 2017 and these are their recommendations:
2. **Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1 – Reallocation**

Four projects agreed to reallocate in whole or in part funds toward the expansion of existing projects.

- Orange County Gateway to Housing (OCGH) RRH - $125,000
- Orange County Housing Authority (OCHA) - $284,759
  - VOALA S+C - $204,002
  - Jackson Aisle - $15,087
  - Consolidated - $65,670

TOTAL Available for Reallocation: $409,759

The Ad-Hoc recommends that the total reallocated amount of $409,759 should be divide evenly amongst the two top performing PSH projects (Mercy House – OC PSH Collaboration Project II and Illumination Foundation – Street2Home) for the expansion of their projects. This recommendation was previously discussed at the ED meeting where there was concurrence with this direction. This funding is to be used for increasing direct housing placement assistance proportionate to each projects current serving capacity.

**Recommendation 2 – Ranking and Tiering**

**Ranking:** Project rankings are to be based solely on performance weighted score. Previously the C2eH had approved a two-part scoring rubric that included possible points from the LOI Part I. However, it was determined by consensus at the ED Meeting along with the Ad Hoc Committee that the LOI Part 1 scores would not be used for ranking purposes but as a tie breaker if necessary.

**Tiering:** Because of where the funding line fell this year, one project by necessity would be required to straddle Tier 1 and Tier 2. Fullerton Interfaith Emergency Services (Pathways of Hope) was chosen to straddle this year based on two factors. 1) Poor performance and 2) History of unspent funds. The portion of their project placed in Tier 2 aligns with their historic unspent funds amount. The strategic decision was also made to place a higher performing OCHA project (2003 Shelter Plus Care) in Tier 2 in lieu of multiple small projects. This was also done ensure Service Planning Area (SPA) coverage. Finally, the Ad-Hoc determined that the Bonus Project(s) should be placed higher than lowest performing project from OC Gateway to Housing. The Ad Hoc also agrees to delegate the ranking of Bonus Projects, if more than one is to be recommended for funding.

**Recommendation 3 – Request for Proposal (RFP)**

The RFP has been issued to solicit proposals for the Bonus Project(s). These proposals are required to target PSH for chronically Homeless (individuals, family, and youth experiencing homelessness). The Bonus Project(s) may be one large project or two smaller projects. The RFP process may include a question and answer session at the discretion of the RFP review panel.

**Recommendation 4 – DedicatedPLUS Projects**

Commission to End Homelessness Meeting – August 23, 2017
In the FY 2017 CoC Program Competition NOFA, HUD created the DedicatedPLUS concept to provide more flexibility to communities, particularly those that have already dedicated 100 percent of the PSH resources to chronic homelessness, to expand their eligibility to serve persons with long histories of homelessness and severe service needs who would not meet the definition of chronic homelessness at project entry. The DedicatedPLUS concept applies at the project level. All new PSH projects are required to either be (1) 100 percent dedicated to chronic homelessness or (2) DedicatedPLUS. Renewal PSH projects are given the option in the electronic HUD application choose to change their classification to DedicatedPLUS as part of their project application.

Since the 2017 Point-in-Time Count revealed a 60% increase in the chronic homeless population in Orange County, the Ad-Hoc recommends that no projects be allowed to reclassify as DedicatedPLUS and that all new and current projects dedicated to 100% chronic homeless continue to be so classified.

The Ad-Hoc Committee ask that the C2eH approve all recommendations and this document as presented.
CoC-602
Attachment 6
CoCs Governance Charter
In accordance with the Interim Rule of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (the “HEARTH Act”) which was enacted into law on May 20, 2009, the Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC (the “Orange County CoC”) in consultation with the collaborative applicant (as described below in Section 578.9) and the Homeless Management Information System (“HMIS”) Lead Agency (as described below in Section 578.7b) as required by the Interim Rule, has developed, followed, and will “update annually a governance charter, which will include all procedures and policies needed to comply with subpart B of this part and with HMIS requirements as prescribed by HUD; and a code of conduct and recusal process for the board, its chair(s), and any person acting on behalf of the board” as described in § 578.7(5) Responsibilities of the Continuum of Care. *Subpart B of the Interim Rule is contained in Appendix A*

I. **Name:**
The name of the organization is Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC (hereinafter referred to as the “Orange County CoC”).

II. **Geographic Boundaries**
The Orange County CoC is responsible for the area that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has designated for CA-602 Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC which is the boundaries of the County of Orange (hereinafter referred to as the “Geographic Area”).

III. **Purpose:**
The Orange County CoC serves as the HUD-designated primary decision-making group whose primary purpose and scope is to implement the Continuum of Care program (the “CoC”) which is authorized by subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381-11389). As noted in § 578.1 Purpose and scope of the Interim Rule of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act), the program is designed to:

a. Promote communitywide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness;

b. Provide funding for efforts by nonprofit providers, States, and local governments to quickly rehouse homeless individuals (including unaccompanied youth) and families, while minimizing the trauma and dislocation caused to homeless individuals, families, and communities by homelessness;

c. Promote access to and effective utilization of mainstream programs by homeless individuals and families; and

d. Optimize self-sufficiency among individuals and families experiencing homelessness.
IV. **Continuum of Care Meetings**  
The Orange County CoC will hold meetings of the full membership with published agendas at least twice a year.

V. **Continuum of Care Membership:**  
Membership is based upon organizations participating in the responsibilities of the Orange County CoC by having organizational representatives actively participate in CoC board, committees, and working groups.

Organizational Members  
- May designate up to (3) persons annually who are authorized to represent the organization  
- Each organization holds only one vote  
- An organizational representative may represent only one organization

Individual Members  
- May not designate additional persons to represent them  
- Individuals who have a recognized role in a member organization (such as employees, board members, consultants or current service recipients) may become individual members but may not vote  
- Individuals with formal organizational affiliations such as those noted above may be selected to represent the organization with which they are affiliated  
- These provisions create an opportunity for individual stakeholders to participate without duplicating organizational representation.

Representatives from active organizations within the Geographic Area will be members of the Orange County CoC. Such organizations will be required to fill out a membership form prior to recognition as an active organization. Within the Geographic Area is defined as being located and/or providing relevant services within the Geographic Area. As noted in § 578.5 Establishing the Continuum of Care of the Interim Rule. Relevant organizations will include:

“nonprofit homeless assistance providers, victim service providers, faith-based organizations, governments, businesses, advocates, public housing agencies, school districts, social service providers, mental health agencies, hospitals, universities, affordable housing developers, law enforcement, and organizations that serve veterans and homeless and formerly homeless individuals.”
• The list of organizational groups noted above is expanded to include entities that provide: Substance abuse recovery;
• Youth services;
• Employment services;
• Mainstream resources.

a. Nominations for Orange County CoC Membership

A public invitation within the Geographic Area for new members to join will be extended at least annually in accordance with the Interim Rule of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act) as described in § 578.7 Responsibilities of the Continuum of Care.

Membership is achieved through a request to be added to the Orange County CoC and a commitment to actively participate in the responsibilities of the Orange County CoC.

b. Membership Terms

There is no term limit. Membership, however, may be terminated by the Orange County CoC in accordance with subsection g Removal below.

c. Quorum

A number equal to a majority of those belonging to the Orange County CoC will constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting.

d. Voting

At all meetings, business items may be decided by arriving at a consensus. If a vote is necessary, all votes will be by voice or ballot at the will of the majority in attendance. Each active organization will have one vote given by one representative even when more than one organizational representative is present. No active organization may vote on any item which presents a real or perceived conflict-of-interest.

e. Conflict of Interest

Members must comply with the conflict of interest and recusal process found in the Appendix B: Conflict of Interest which is §578.95 Conflicts of interest in the Interim Rule of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act).
f. **Proxies**

The use of proxies is not allowed for members.

g. **Removal**

Any member of the Orange County CoC may be removed by a two-thirds majority of all organizations present during a scheduled meeting.

**VI. Orange County CoC Officers**

The Orange County CoC will have three officers: Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary. Their nomination, election and term will be as outlined in the Bylaws of the Commission to End Homelessness.

**VII. Responsibilities of the Orange County CoC**

As noted in §578.5(b) of the HEARTH Act Interim Rule, “The Continuum of Care must establish a board to act on behalf of the Continuum using the process established as a requirement by §578.7(a)(3) and must comply with the conflict-of-interest requirements at §578.95(b).”

**VIII. Continuum of Care Board (Commission to End Homelessness)**

The Continuum of Care Board (the “Commission”) will carry out the four major responsibilities of the Orange County CoC which consists of operating the Continuum of Care, designating and operating an HMIS for the Continuum of Care, planning for the Continuum of Care, and preparing an application for funds which is in accordance with §578.7 Responsibilities of the Continuum of Care and in the Interim Rule and §578.79 Preparing an Application for Funds and are as follows:

a. **Operating the Continuum of Care.** On behalf of the Orange County CoC, the CoC Board will:

1. Hold meetings of the full membership, with published agendas, at least semi-annually as noted above in Section IV Meetings;
2. Make an invitation for new members to join publicly available within the geographic at least annually as noted above in Section V Membership;
3. Adopt and follow a written process to select a board to act on behalf of the Continuum of Care. The process must be reviewed, updated, and approved by the Continuum at least once every 5 years as noted in introduction;
4. Appoint additional committees, subcommittees, or workgroups;
5. In consultation with the collaborative applicant and the HMIS Lead, develop, follow, and update annually a governance charter, which will include all procedures and policies needed to comply with subpart B of this part and with HMIS requirements as prescribed by HUD; and a code of conduct and recusal process for the board, its chair(s), and any person acting on behalf of the board;

6. Consult with recipients and subrecipients to establish performance targets appropriate for population and program type, monitor recipient and subrecipient performance, evaluate outcomes, and take action against poor performers;

7. Evaluate outcomes of projects funded under the Emergency Solutions Grants program and the Continuum of Care program, and report to HUD;

8. In consultation with recipients of Emergency Solutions Grants program funds within the geographic area, establish and operate either a centralized or coordinated assessment system that provides an initial, comprehensive assessment of the needs of individuals and families for housing and services. The Continuum must develop a specific policy to guide the operation of the centralized or coordinated assessment system on how its system will address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, but who are seeking shelter or services from nonvictim service providers. This system must comply with any requirements established by HUD by Notice;

9. In consultation with recipients of Emergency Solutions Grants program funds within the geographic area, establish and consistently follow written standards for providing Continuum of Care assistance. At a minimum, these written standards must include:

   a. Policies and procedures for evaluating individuals’ and families’ eligibility for assistance under this part;
   b. Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive transitional housing assistance;
   c. Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive rapid rehousing assistance;
   d. Standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent each program participant must pay while receiving rapid rehousing assistance;
   e. Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive permanent supportive housing assistance; and
   f. Where the Continuum is designated a high-performing community, as described in Subpart G, policies and procedures set forth in 24 CFR 576.400(e)(vi), (e)(vii), (e)(viii), and (e)(ix).

b. **Designating and operating an HMIS.** On behalf of the Orange County CoC, the CoC Board will:

   1. Designate a single Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) for the geographic area;
2. Designate an eligible applicant to manage the Continuum’s HMIS, which will be known as the HMIS Lead;

3. Review, revise, and approve a privacy plan, security plan, and data quality plan for the HMIS;

4. Ensure consistent participation of recipients and subrecipients in the HMIS; and

5. Ensure the HMIS is administered in compliance with requirements prescribed by HUD.

Orange County CoC is part of the Los Angeles/Orange County Collaborative which is made up of the Orange County CoC, Los Angeles County CoC, Pasadena CoC and Glendale CoC. The Collaborative shares an HMIS Governance Charter and HMIS Policies and Procedures.

c. **Continuum of Care planning.** On behalf of the Orange County CoC, the CoC Board will develop a plan that includes:

1. Coordinating the implementation of a housing and service system within its geographic area that meets the needs of the homeless individuals (including unaccompanied youth) and families. At a minimum, such system encompasses the following:
   
   a. Outreach, engagement, and assessment;
   b. Shelter, housing, and supportive services;
   c. Prevention strategies.

2. Planning for and conducting, at least biennially, a point-in-time count of homeless persons within the geographic area that meets the following requirements:

   a. Homeless persons who are living in a place not designed or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for humans must be counted as unsheltered homeless persons;

   b. Persons living in emergency shelters and transitional housing projects must be counted as sheltered homeless persons;

   c. Other requirements established by HUD by Notice.

3. Conducting an annual gaps analysis of the homeless needs and services available within the geographic area;

4. Providing information required to complete the Consolidated Plan(s) within the Continuum’s geographic area;

5. Consulting with State and local government Emergency Solutions Grants program recipients within the Continuum’s geographic area on the plan for allocating Emergency Solutions Grants program funds and reporting on and evaluating the performance of Emergency Solutions Grants program recipients and subrecipients. Emergency Solutions Grants recipients include:

   - County of Orange
   - Santa Ana
   - Anaheim
   - Garden Grove
d. **Preparing an application for funds.** On behalf of the Orange County CoC, the CoC Board will

1. Design, operate, and follow a collaborative process for the development of applications and approve the submission of applications in response to a NOFA published by HUD under § 578.19 of this subpart;

2. Establish priorities for funding projects in the geographic area;

3. Determine if one application for funding will be submitted for all projects within the geographic area or if more than one application will be submitted for the projects within the geographic area;
   a. If more than one application will be submitted, designate an eligible applicant to be the collaborative applicant that will collect and combine the required application information from all applicants and for all projects within the geographic area that the Continuum has selected funding. The collaborative applicant will also apply for Continuum of Care planning activities. If the Continuum is an eligible applicant, it may designate itself;
   b. If only one application will be submitted, that applicant will be the collaborative applicant and will collect and combine the required application information from all projects within the geographic area that the Continuum has selected for funding and apply for Continuum of Care planning activities;

The Continuum retains all of its responsibilities, even if it designates one or more eligible applicants other than itself to apply for funds on behalf of the Continuum. This includes approving the Continuum of Care application.

e. **CoC Board Members**

The Orange County CoC will establish a board to act on its behalf using the process established as a requirement by § 578.7(a)(3)\(^1\) and must comply with the conflict-of-interest requirements at § 578.95(b)\(^2\).

The Commission to End Homelessness will act as the CoC Board as appointed by the Orange County Board of Supervisors and governed by the Commission Bylaws which may be amended from time to time. The structure, responsibilities, etc. are all per the Commission Bylaws.

Additionally, the CoC Board will be in compliance with the HEARTH Act and other HUD mandates and guidance, at all times.

Per the HEARTH Act, the Board must:

\(^1\) Adopt and follow a written process to select a board to act on behalf of the Continuum of Care. The process must be reviewed, updated, and approved by the Continuum at least once every 5 years.

\(^2\) No Continuum of Care board member may participate in or influence discussions or resulting decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefits to the organization that the member represents.
• Be representative of the relevant organizations and of projects serving homeless subpopulations; and
• Include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual.

Subpopulations will include all the subpopulations that HUD requires a CoC to address in terms of ending homelessness which are:

• Chronic Substance Abusers;
• Chronically Homeless Individuals;
• Chronically Homeless Families;
• Families;
• Persons with HIV/AIDS;
• Seriously Mentally Ill;
• Veterans;
• Veterans – Females;
• Victims of Domestic Violence;
• Unaccompanied Youth Under Age 18;
• Youth Age 18 – 24.

14. Conflict of Interest

Members must comply with the conflict of interest and recusal process found in the Appendix B: Conflict of Interest which is §578.95 Conflicts of interest in the Interim Rule of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act) and County of Orange Conflict of Interest Policy and additional requirements per the Commission Bylaws

1. Conflict of Interest – Members of the Commission and any of its committees or subcommittees shall abstain from voting on any issue in which they may be personally interested to avoid a conflict of interest in accordance with County, State and Federal laws, regulations and ordinances and shall refrain from engaging in any behavior that conflicts with the best interest of County.

(a) Members of the Commission shall not vote nor attempt to influence any other Board member on a matter under consideration by the Board or any of its committees or subcommittees as follows:

(1) Regarding the provision of services by such member (or by an entity that such member represents); or

(2) By providing direct financial benefit to such member or the immediate family of such member; or
(3) Engaging in any other activity determined by County, State or Federal law, regulations and ordinances to constitute a conflict of interest.

(b) If a question arises as to whether a conflict exists that may prevent a member from voting, the Chairperson or designee may consult with designated County Staff to assist them in making that determination.

(c) In order to avoid a conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict, all nominees to become members of the Commission shall disclose on forms provided by the County information regarding their private economic interests and shall fully comply with County, State or Federal laws, regulations and ordinances, as applicable.

(d) Neither Commission nor any of its members shall promote, directly or indirectly, any political party, political candidate or political activity using the name, emblem or any other identifier of Commission.

(e) No assets or assistance provided by County to Commission shall be used for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization, except as otherwise permitted by law.

IX. Continuum of Care Legal Entity

The Orange County CoC is a Collaborative Applicant as designated by HUD. The County of Orange is the legal applicant who will submit grants to HUD on behalf of the Orange County CoC. Submission will be in compliance with § 578.9 Preparing an application for funds which states that a CoC must:

- Design, operate, and follow a collaborative process for the development of applications and approve the submission of applications in response to a NOFA published by HUD under § 578.19 of this subpart;
- Establish priorities for funding projects in the geographic area;
- Determine if one application for funding will be submitted for all projects within the Geographic Area or if more than one application will be submitted for the projects within the geographic area;
- If more than one application will be submitted, designate an eligible applicant to be the collaborative applicant that will collect and combine the required application information from all applicants and for all projects within the geographic area that the Continuum has selected funding. The collaborative applicant will also apply for Continuum of Care planning activities. If the Continuum is an eligible applicant, it may designate itself;
• If only one application will be submitted, that applicant will be the collaborative applicant and will collect and combine the required application information from all projects within the Geographic Area that the Continuum has selected for funding and apply for Continuum of Care planning activities.

X. Commission to End Homelessness Committees

Per the Commission Bylaws, the Commission Committees will be formed around developing a system of care to end homeless with consideration of the Ten-Year Plan goals, HUD direction, evidence-based best practices and best practices. Membership, meetings, responsibilities, and voting shall all be as outlined in the Bylaws of the Commission to End Homelessness.

XI. Provisions to Amend Governance Charter

Adoption – Affirmative vote of at least fifty percent + 1 of those voting, a quorum being present, shall be required to propose changes to these Bylaws.

A. Amendments

1. Any member of the CoC Board may propose amendments to these Bylaws.
2. Proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing and made available to each member of the Commission no less than five (5) days prior to consideration before a vote can be taken.
Appendix A: Subpart B of the Interim Rule

Subpart B – Establishing and Operating a Continuum of Care

§ 578.5 Establishing the Continuum of Care.
(a) The Continuum of Care. Representatives from relevant organizations within a geographic area shall establish a Continuum of Care for the geographic area to carry out the duties of this part. Relevant organizations include nonprofit homeless assistance providers, victim service providers, faith-based organizations, governments, businesses, advocates, public housing agencies, school districts, social service providers, mental health agencies, hospitals, universities, affordable housing developers, law enforcement, and organizations that serve veterans and homeless and formerly homeless individuals.
(b) The board. The Continuum of Care must establish a board to act on behalf of the Continuum using the process established as a requirement by § 578.7(a)(3) and must comply with the conflict-of-interest requirements at § 578.95(b). The board must:
   (1) Be representative of the relevant organizations and of projects serving homeless subpopulations; and
   (2) Include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual.
(c) Transition. Continuums of Care shall have 2 years [insert effective date of interim rule] to comply with the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section.

§ 578.7 Responsibilities of the Continuum of Care.
(a) Operate the Continuum of Care. The Continuum of Care must:
   (1) Hold meetings of the full membership, with published agendas, at least semi-annually;
   (2) Make an invitation for new members to join publicly available within the geographic at least annually;
   (3) Adopt and follow a written process to select a board to act on behalf of the Continuum of Care. The process must be reviewed, updated, and approved by the Continuum at least once every 5 years;
   (4) Appoint additional committees, subcommittees, or workgroups;
   (5) In consultation with the collaborative applicant and the HMIS Lead, develop, follow, and update annually a governance charter, which will include all procedures and policies needed to comply with subpart B of this part and with HMIS requirements as prescribed by HUD; and a code of conduct and recusal process for the board, its chair(s), and any person acting on behalf of the board;
   (6) Consult with recipients and subrecipients to establish performance targets appropriate for population and program type, monitor recipient and subrecipient performance, evaluate outcomes, and take action against poor performers;
   (7) Evaluate outcomes of projects funded under the Emergency Solutions Grants program and the Continuum of Care program, and report to HUD;
   (8) In consultation with recipients of Emergency Solutions Grants program funds within the geographic area, establish and operate either a centralized or coordinated assessment system.
that provides an initial, comprehensive assessment of the needs of individuals and families for housing and services. The Continuum must develop a specific policy to guide the operation of the centralized or coordinated assessment system on how its system will address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, but who are seeking shelter or services from nonvictim service providers. This system must comply with any requirements established by HUD by Notice.

(9) In consultation with recipients of Emergency Solutions Grants program funds within the geographic area, establish and consistently follow written standards for providing Continuum of Care assistance. At a minimum, these written standards must include:

(i) Policies and procedures for evaluating individuals’ and families’ eligibility for assistance under this part;

(ii) Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive transitional housing assistance;

(iii) Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive rapid rehousing assistance;

(iv) Standards for determining what percentage or amount of rent each program participant must pay while receiving rapid rehousing assistance;

(v) Policies and procedures for determining and prioritizing which eligible individuals and families will receive permanent supportive housing assistance; and

(vi) Where the Continuum is designated a high-performing community, as described in Subpart G, policies and procedures set forth in 24 CFR 576.400(e)(vi), (e)(vii), (e)(viii), and (e)(ix).

(b) Designating and operating an HMIS. The Continuum of Care must:

(1) Designate a single Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) for the geographic area;

(2) Designate an eligible applicant to manage the Continuum’s HMIS, which will be known as the HMIS Lead;

(3) Review, revise, and approve a privacy plan, security plan, and data quality plan for the HMIS.

(4) Ensure consistent participation of recipients and subrecipients in the HMIS; and

(5) Ensure the HMIS is administered in compliance with requirements prescribed by HUD.

(c) Continuum of Care planning. The Continuum must develop a plan that includes:

(1) Coordinating the implementation of a housing and service system within its geographic area that meets the needs of the homeless individuals (including unaccompanied youth) and families. At a minimum, such system encompasses the following:

(i) Outreach, engagement, and assessment;

(ii) Shelter, housing, and supportive services;

(iii) Prevention strategies.
(2) Planning for and conducting, at least biennially, a point-in-time count of homeless persons within the geographic area that meets the following requirements:

(i) Homeless persons who are living in a place not designed or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for humans must be counted as unsheltered homeless persons.

(ii) Persons living in emergency shelters and transitional housing projects must be counted as sheltered homeless persons.

(iii) Other requirements established by HUD by Notice.

(3) Conducting an annual gaps analysis of the homeless needs and services available within the geographic area;

(4) Providing information required to complete the Consolidated Plan(s) within the Continuum’s geographic area;

(5) Consulting with State and local government Emergency Solutions Grants program recipients within the Continuum’s geographic area on the plan for allocating Emergency Solutions Grants program funds and reporting on and evaluating the performance of Emergency Solutions Grants program recipients and subrecipients.

§ 578.9 Preparing an application for funds.
(a) The Continuum must:

(1) Design, operate, and follow a collaborative process for the development of applications and approve the submission of applications in response to a NOFA published by HUD under § 578.19 of this subpart;

(2) Establish priorities for funding projects in the geographic area;

(3) Determine if one application for funding will be submitted for all projects within the geographic area or if more than one application will be submitted for the projects within the geographic area;

(i) If more than one application will be submitted, designate an eligible applicant to be the collaborative applicant that will collect and combine the required application information from all applicants and for all projects within the geographic area that the Continuum has selected funding. The collaborative applicant will also apply for Continuum of Care planning activities. If the Continuum is an eligible applicant, it may designate itself;

(ii) If only one application will be submitted, that applicant will be the collaborative applicant and will collect and combine the required application information from all projects within the geographic area that the Continuum has selected for funding and apply for Continuum of Care planning activities;

(b) The Continuum retains all of its responsibilities, even if it designates one or more eligible applicants other than itself to apply for funds on behalf of the Continuum. This includes approving the Continuum of Care application.
§ 578.11 Unified Funding Agency.
(a) Becoming a Unified Funding Agency. To become designated as the Unified Funding Agency (UFA) for a Continuum, a collaborative applicant must be selected by the Continuum to apply to HUD to be designated as the UFA for the Continuum.
(b) Criteria for designating a UFA. HUD will consider these criteria when deciding whether to designate a collaborative applicant a UFA:
(1) The Continuum of Care it represents meets the requirements in § 578.7;
(2) The collaborative applicant has financial management systems that meet the standards set forth in 24 CFR part 84.21 (for nonprofit organizations) and 24 CFR part 85.20 (for States);
(3) The collaborative applicant demonstrates the ability to monitor subrecipients; and
(4) Such other criteria as HUD may establish by NOFA.
(c) Requirements. HUD-designated UFAs shall:
(1) Apply to HUD for funding for all of the projects within the geographic area and enter into a grant agreement with HUD for the entire geographic area.
(2) Enter into legally binding agreements with subrecipients, and receive and distribute funds to subrecipients for all projects within the geographic area.
(3) Require subrecipients to establish fiscal control and accounting procedures as necessary to assure the proper disbursal of and accounting for federal funds in accordance with the requirements of 24 CFR parts 84 and 85 and corresponding OMB circulars.
(4) Obtain approval of any proposed grant agreement amendments by the Continuum of Care before submitting a request for an amendment to HUD.

§ 578.13 Remedial action.
(a) If HUD finds that the Continuum of Care for a geographic area does not meet the requirements the Act or its implementing regulations, or that there is no Continuum for a geographic area, HUD may take remedial action to ensure fair distribution of grant funds within the geographic area. Such measures may include:
(1) Designating a replacement Continuum of Care for the geographic area;
(2) Designating a replacement collaborative applicant for the Continuum’s geographic area; and
(3) Accepting applications from other eligible applicants within the Continuum’s geographic area.
(b) HUD must provide a 30-day prior written notice to the Continuum and its collaborative applicant and give them an opportunity to respond.
Appendix B: Conflict of Interest

§ 578.95 Conflicts of interest (of the Interim Rule of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act).

(a) Procurement. For the procurement of property (goods, supplies, or equipment) and services, the recipient and its subrecipients must comply with the codes of conduct and conflict-of-interest requirements under 24 CFR 85.36 (for governments) and 24 CFR 84.42 (for private nonprofit organizations).

(b) Continuum of Care board members. No Continuum of Care board member may participate in or influence discussions or resulting decisions concerning the award of a grant or other financial benefits to the organization that the member represents.

(c) Organizational conflict. An organizational conflict of interest arises when, because of activities or relationships with other persons or organizations, the recipient or subrecipient is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance in the provision of any type or amount of assistance under this part, or when a covered person’s, as in paragraph (d)(1) of this section, objectivity in performing work with respect to any activity assisted under this part is or might be otherwise impaired. Such an organizational conflict would arise when a board member of an applicant participates in decision of the applicant concerning the award of a grant, or provision of other financial benefits, to the organization that such member represents. It would also arise when an employee of a recipient or subrecipient participates in making rent reasonableness determinations under §578.49(b)(2) and §578.51(g) and housing quality inspections of property under §578.75(b) that the recipient, subrecipient, or related entity owns.

(d) Other conflicts. For all other transactions and activities, the following restrictions apply:

(1) No covered person, meaning a person who is an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected or appointed official of the recipient or its subrecipients and who exercises or has exercised any functions or responsibilities with respect to activities assisted under this part, or who is in a position to participate in a decision-making process or gain inside information with regard to activities assisted under this part, may obtain a financial interest or benefit from an assisted activity, have a financial interest in any contract, subcontract, or agreement with respect to an assisted activity, or have a financial interest in the proceeds derived from an assisted activity, either for him or herself or for those with whom he or she has immediate family or business ties, during his or her tenure or during the one-year period following his or her tenure.

(2) Exceptions. Upon the written request of the recipient, HUD may grant an exception to the provisions of this section on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the cumulative effects of the criteria in paragraph (d)(2)(ii) of this section, provided that the recipient has satisfactorily met the threshold requirements of paragraph (d)(2)(ii) of this section.

(i) Threshold requirements. HUD will consider an exception only after the recipient has provided the following documentation:
(A) Disclosure of the nature of the conflict, accompanied by a written assurance, if the recipient is a government, that there has been public disclosure of the conflict and a description of how the public disclosure was made; and if the recipient is a private nonprofit organization, that the conflict has been disclosed in accordance with their written code of conduct or other conflict-of-interest policy; and

(B) An opinion of the recipient's attorney that the interest for which the exception is sought would not violate State or local law, or if the subrecipient is a private nonprofit organization, the exception would not violate the organization’s internal policies.

(ii) Factors to be considered for exceptions. In determining whether to grant a requested exception after the recipient has satisfactorily met the threshold requirements under paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this section, HUD must conclude that the exception will serve to further the purposes of the Continuum of Care program and the effective and efficient administration of the recipient’s or subrecipient’s project, taking into account the cumulative effect of the following factors, as applicable:

(A) Whether the exception would provide a significant cost benefit or an essential degree of expertise to the program or project that would otherwise not be available;

(B) Whether an opportunity was provided for open competitive bidding or negotiation;

(C) Whether the affected person has withdrawn from his or her functions, responsibilities, or the decision-making process with respect to the specific activity in question;

(D) Whether the interest or benefit was present before the affected person was in the position described in paragraph (c)(1) of this section;

(E) Whether undue hardship will result to the recipient, the subrecipient, or the person affected, when weighed against the public interest served by avoiding the prohibited conflict;

(F) Whether the person affected is a member of a group or class of persons intended to be the beneficiaries of the assisted activity, and the exception will permit such person to receive generally the same interests or benefits as are being made available or provided to the group or class; and

(G) Any other relevant considerations.
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PART III: SELECTION FOR HCV ASSISTANCE

4-III.A. OVERVIEW
As vouchers become available, families will be selected for assistance in accordance with the policies described in this part.

OCHA will maintain a clear record of all information required to verify that the family is selected for Special Admission or from the waiting list according to OCHA's selection policies [24 CFR 982.203, 24 CFR 982.204(b) and 982.207(e)].

4-III.B. SELECTION AND HCV FUNDING SOURCES

Special Admissions [24 CFR 982.203]
HUD may award funding for specifically-named families living in specified types of units. In these cases, OCHA may admit families that are not on the waiting list, or without considering the family's position on the waiting list. OCHA will maintain records showing that such families were admitted with special program funding.

Conversion of Multifamily Apartment Complex (OPT-OUT):
HUD may allocate funding to provide Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenant-based rental assistance for families residing in a HUD project-based subsidized multifamily apartment complex to coincide with the expiration of HUD's Subsidy Contract with the owner. Participants are admitted under targeted funding provisions and must meet applicable verification and eligibility requirements. This may also include families residing in a project covered by a project-based Section 8 HAP contract at or near the end of the HAP contract term.

Targeted Funding [24 CFR 982.204(e)]
HUD may award funding for programs that target a specified category of families on the waiting list including populations who have special needs. Eligible applicants must meet specifically defined program requirements and must also be income-eligible for the HCV program. Eligible applicants will first be selected from OCHA’s wait list, regardless of their current placement. If there are an insufficient number of qualifying applicants on the waiting list, OCHA will open the wait list to only those families who meet the eligibility requirements of the specific program. To date, OCHA administers the following special programs that have targeted funding:

Rental Assistance for Non-Elderly Disabled Persons (NED)
HUD has partnered with California Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) to provide funding for rental assistance for non-elderly disabled persons to successfully transition out of a nursing home or other health care institution, into the community and receive the supportive services needed to maintain independent living within a safe environment. HHS has designated the Dayle MacIntosh Center (DMC) of Orange County, as the lead supportive service provider, who will be responsible for the selection and referral of eligible candidates.

DMC will refer eligible candidates to OCHA to be admitted to the NED HCV Program under the provision of targeted funding. Participants must meet applicable verification and eligibility requirements.
Family Unification Program: (FUP)

HUD allocated funding to provide Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenant-based rental assistance for families for whom the lack of adequate housing is the primary factor in the separation of children from their family and for eligible emancipated youths 18 to 21 years old. Eligible FUP participants are referred to OCHA through the Orange County Social Services Agency (SSA) and are admitted under targeted funding provisions. Participants must meet applicable verification and eligibility requirements.

Disaster Housing Assistance Program: (DHAP)

Resident and nonresident families displaced by a federally declared disaster requiring mandatory evacuation: OCHA may designate Housing Choice Vouchers to be made available for eligible displaced households if funding permits. If the disaster area includes southern California, priority may be given to disaster victims who were residing in OCHA’s jurisdiction. OCHA will accept and prioritize the processing of eligibility for households referred through the responsible disaster agency, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Participants are admitted under targeted funding provisions and must meet applicable verification and eligibility requirements.

Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH):

HUD allocated funding to provide Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenant-based rental assistance for qualifying homeless veterans referred by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Participants are admitted under targeted funding provisions and must meet applicable verification and eligibility requirements.

Regular HCV Funding

Regular HCV funding may be used to assist any eligible family on the waiting list. Families are selected from the waiting list according to the policies provided in Section 4-II.C.

4-II.C. SELECTION METHOD

This section describes the method for selecting applicant families from the waiting list, including the system of admission preferences that OCHA will use [24 CFR 982.202(d)].

Local Preferences [24 CFR 982.207; HCV p. 4-16]

OCHA is permitted to establish local preferences, and to give priority to serving families that meet those criteria. OCHA has therefore established local preferences, at its discretion to address local housing needs and objectives. Local preferences established in this Administrative Plan are consistent with the OCHA PHA Plan.

OCHA will apply the following preferences to all pre-applicants, weighted in descending order:

Members

(living or working in OCHA’s jurisdiction)
1. Homeless Individuals and Families who meet specific eligibility criteria (defined on the following page)
2. U.S. Veterans – All
3. Non-Veterans - Elderly, Disabled, or Working Families
4. Non-Working Families

**Non-Members**
(not living or working in OCHA’s jurisdiction)
5. U.S. Veterans – All
6. Non-Veterans - Elderly, Disabled, or Working Families
7. Non-Working Families

The following is an explanation of OCHA’s preference requirements and the priority order for issuance of Housing Choice Vouchers:

**Members:**

Applicants who live, work, have been hired to work in, or report to an office located in OCHA’s jurisdiction.

Non-member applicants who move into or begin working in OCHA’s jurisdiction. Applicants in this category will receive member preference status on the date their change report is received in writing.

A member applicant will retain their preference for 60 days from the date they leave OCHA’s jurisdiction.

Members placed or admitted to transitional living facilities outside of OCHA’s jurisdiction for reasons of health or safety and under the administration of governmental case management will retain their member preference.

**Homeless Individuals and Families who meet specific eligibility criteria**

In addition to targeted programs to assist over 600 homeless veterans (VASH) and more than 600 disabled homeless households (Shelter Plus Care), OCHA has created a preference to assist homeless persons using regular HCV funding. Under this preference category, OCHA may issue up to 35% of turnover Housing Choice Vouchers annually (currently 210) to households and applicants that qualify under one of the following three categories:

- **Families Transitioning (moving-up) From Shelter + Care:**
  
  Up to 50 applicants that are current participants in good standing in OCHA’s Shelter + Care Program who are no longer in need of this level of supportive services and have been referred by the O.C. Health Care Agency (OCHCA) or other S+C partner agencies.
• Up to 100 homeless persons and families and/or other persons with special needs, who require supportive services that will be provided in units designated for Project-based Vouchers. These Vouchers will be dedicated to the property for ten to 15 years.

• Up to 60 homeless persons and families who are referred through the County of Orange Coordinated Entry system. The number of families who can qualify for this preference will be limited to a number as annually determined by the Housing Authority. To qualify for this preference, homeless families must be referred by County agencies with a contract or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with the Housing Authority, or by Community Based Organizations (CBO’s) contracted with the Housing Authority. The referring agency must provide a certification of the family’s homeless status. Additionally, families already registered on the waiting list who declare themselves as homeless, but are not referred by CBO must provide a certification of their homeless status from a government organization or other organization that is qualified to determine their homelessness.

This action is in conformance with recommendations from HUD and local Continuums of Care. In addition, the percentage of Housing Choice Vouchers committed for the homeless is comparable to other Public Housing Authorities in Southern California.

The aforementioned strategy equates to an annual 35% homeless preference percentage. The percentage is based upon the annual turnover of vouchers from households that exit the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Turn over vouchers must be the basis for the methodology since HUD has not issued new Housing Choice Vouchers since the early 2000s. This percentage will provide up to 210 Housing Choice Vouchers per year for permanent housing resources to address homelessness in Orange County.

The OC Housing Authority will also request approval to increase this percentage to 50% if funding availability and program performance support an increase. 50% could equate to approximately 300 vouchers per year. OCHA reserves the right to readjust the targeted number of Vouchers dedicated to each of the above categories based on turnover, funding, business or community needs, not to exceed 50% of all annual turnover Vouchers.

OCHA reserves the right to readjust the targeted number of Vouchers dedicated to each of the above categories based on turnover, funding, business or community needs, not to exceed 35% of all annual turnover Vouchers.

Veterans:
Applicants who are currently serving, or have served in the U. S. armed forces, veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable and are eligible to receive veteran benefits or surviving spouses of veterans who have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable and were eligible to receive veterans benefits. “Surviving spouse” means not divorced from, or not remarried prior to or after the death of the veteran.

Working:
Applicants with earned income from recent employment who meet the following criteria:
Chapter 6

ESTABLISHING PREFERENCES AND MAINTAINING THE WAITING LIST

INTRODUCTION

It is the GGHA's objective to ensure that families are placed in the proper order on the Waiting List and selected from the Waiting List for admissions in accordance with the policies in this Administrative Plan.

This chapter explains the preferences that the GGHA has adopted to meet local housing needs, defines the eligibility criteria for the preferences, and explains the GGHA's system of applying them.

By maintaining an accurate Waiting List, the GGHA will be able to perform the activities that ensure an adequate pool of qualified applicants will be available so that program funds are used in a timely manner.

A. WAITING LIST

The GGHA uses a single Waiting List for admission to its HCV program.

Except for Special Admissions, applicants will be selected from the GGHA Waiting List in accordance with policies and preferences and income targeting requirements (required by HUD) defined in this Administrative Plan.

The GGHA will maintain information that permits proper selection from the Waiting List.

The Waiting List contains the following information for each applicant listed:

- Applicant Name
- Date and time of application
- Qualification for any local preference
- Racial or ethnic designation of the head of household
- Targeted program qualifications

B. SPECIAL ADMISSIONS

Special Admissions families will be admitted outside of the regular Waiting List process. They do not have to qualify for any preferences, nor are they required to be on the program Waiting List. The GGHA maintains separate records of these admissions.
Provided there is sufficient funding, the GGHA may allow special admissions for families in the following situations:

- A family residing in a project covered by a project-based Section 8 HAP contract at or near the end of the HAP contract term;
- Mainstream for Persons with Disabilities;
- Displaced by an activity carried out by federal, state or local governmental body;
- Displaced by natural disaster, such as flood or fire and referred by a local, state, or federal agency;
- Displaced by a human-made disaster, such as a terrorist attack and referred by a local, state, or federal agency;
- Living in and referred from a homeless shelter with which the GGHA has an agreement;
- Living in a structure that has been deemed unsafe by the City’s Building Department and referred by that agency.

C. LOCAL PREFERENCES

The GGHA will offer public notice when changing its preference system and the notice will be publicized using the same guidelines as those for opening and closing the Waiting List.

Order of Selection

The GGHA’s method for selecting applicants from a preference category leaves a clear audit trail that can be used to verify that each applicant has been selected in accordance with the method specified in the Administrative Plan. Local preferences will be used to select families from the Waiting List. Among applicants with equal preference status, the Waiting List will be organized by date and time.

The GGHA uses the following Local Preference priority system:

First Preference - Residency

Residents of the City of Garden Grove will be assisted prior to those families that are not residents. All families living or working in the City of Garden Grove, either at any time of a pre-application or during the time they are on the Waiting List, will be considered as residents. If a family has to move to another city, they will not lose their resident status.
4-III.C. SELECTION METHOD

PHAs must describe the method for selecting applicant families from the waiting list, including the system of admission preferences that the PHA will use [24 CFR 982.202(d)].

Local Preferences [24 CFR 982.207; HCV p. 4-16]

PHAs are permitted to establish local preferences, and to give priority to serving families that meet those criteria. HUD specifically authorizes and places restrictions on certain types of local preferences. HUD also permits the PHA to establish other local preferences, at its discretion. Any local preferences established must be consistent with the PHA plan and the consolidated plan, and must be based on local housing needs and priorities that can be documented by generally accepted data sources.

PHA Policy

The PHA will offer a preference to applicants in the following order:

1. **Homeless** – AHA will commit up to 25% of annual new admission vouchers to assist Anaheim-based homeless families who are either:
   a. Referred by an approved local service provider because they are participating in a local transitional housing program or are receiving other supportive and shelter services from that provider; or
   b. Participating in the Homeless Assistance Pilot Program (HAPP) and have been referred by the HAPP service agency.

   Applicant must meet all eligibility requirements. Admissions will be on a first come, first served basis and is subject to funding availability.

2. The PHA may issue vouchers to families who live or work in the City of Anaheim and are referred by Anaheim Police Department. These types of referrals will be limited to victims of a crime, the magnitude or impact of which requires rapid relocation.

   Referrals must be made in writing on Anaheim Police Department letterhead, and signed by the Chief or Deputy Chief of Police only. Eligibility, including background checks will be confirmed for all members. All referrals are subject to the approval of the Executive Director or designee.

3. Eligible families who are displaced as a result of a project sponsored by the City of Anaheim Community Development Department or other City of Anaheim Department.

4. Any family that has been terminated from the City of Anaheim HCV program due to insufficient program funding.

5. Families who live, work, or have been hired to work in Anaheim (Residency preference).

**State Required Priority:** Veterans (including surviving spouses of veterans) and current members of the armed services will have priority within the preference categories listed...
4-IIIC. SELECTION METHOD

PHAs must describe the method for selecting applicant families from the Waiting List, including the system of admission preferences that SAHA will use [24 CFR 982.202(d)].

Local Preferences [24 CFR 982.207; HCV p. 4-16]

PHAs are permitted to establish local preferences, and to give priority to serving families that meet those criteria. HUD specifically authorizes and places restrictions on certain types of local preferences. HUD also permits SAHA to establish other local preferences, at its discretion. Any local preferences established must be consistent with SAHA plan and the consolidated plan, and must be based on local housing needs and priorities that can be documented by generally accepted data sources.

SAHA Policy

Local preferences will be numerically ranked, with number 1 being the highest preference, in the following order:

1. **United States Military Veteran Preference**: United States military veterans or surviving spouses and dependent children of a United States military veteran, or active military personnel, their spouse and their dependent children who live or work in the City of Santa Ana at the time of application. The veteran must have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable and were/is eligible to receive veteran’s benefits. Form DD-214 with a discharge status of other than dishonorable, or equivalent verification, must be provided at their eligibility interview appointment. The individual must have served a minimum of 90 days to qualify for the preference. “Surviving spouse” means not divorced from, or not remarried prior to or after the death of the veteran. A marriage and death certificate will be required for a surviving spouse.

2. **Residency Preference**: Residency preference for families who live or work in the City of Santa Ana at the time of application. At least two pieces of evidence must be provided for families who live or work in the City of Santa Ana including but not limited to a lease, utility bills, bank statements, or paycheck stubs.

Additionally, SAHA will offer priority to any family that has been terminated from its HCV program due to insufficient program funding.

*Homeless Individuals and Families Set-Aside Preference*

In accordance with PIH Notice 2013-15, SAHA will accept direct referrals to the HCV Program for the following target population:

- **Homeless Individuals and Families**: The number of homeless individuals and families who can qualify for this preference and successfully lease a unit with their voucher will be limited to 50% of the total number of vouchers that become available through annual turnover in the previous calendar year. To qualify for this preference, homeless individuals and families must be referred by agencies with a contract or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with the Housing Authority, or by Community Based Organizations (CBO’s) contracted with the Housing Authority. The referring agency must provide a certification of the family’s homeless status. Additionally, families already registered on the
Waiting List who declare themselves as homeless, but are not referred by a CBO must provide a certification of their homeless status from an agency that has an MOU in place with the Housing Authority. This set-aside preference has been documented by SAHA using generally accepted data sources.

The term, “residence,” includes homeless shelters and other dwelling places where homeless people may be living, sleeping or receiving services in the City of Santa Ana. Therefore, homeless individuals and families who qualify for this preference will qualify as residents.

All preferences must be applicable and verifiable at the time of selection from the Waiting List.

Income Targeting Requirement [24 CFR 982.201(b)(2)]

HUD requires that extremely low-income (ELI) families make up at least 75 percent of the families admitted to the HCV program during SAHA’s fiscal year. ELI families are those with annual incomes at or below the federal poverty level or 30 percent of the area median income, whichever number is higher. To ensure this requirement is met, a PHA may skip non-ELI families on the Waiting List in order to select an ELI family.

Low-income families admitted to the program that are “continuously assisted” under the 1937 Housing Act [24 CFR 982.4(b)], as well as low-income or moderate-income families admitted to the program that are displaced as a result of the prepayment of the mortgage or voluntary termination of an insurance contract on eligible low-income housing, are not counted for income targeting purposes [24 CFR 982.201(b)(2)(v)].

SAHA Policy

SAHA will monitor progress in meeting the income targeting requirement throughout the fiscal year. Extremely low-income families will be selected ahead of other eligible families on an as-needed basis to ensure the income targeting requirement is met.

Order of Selection

SAHA system of preferences may select families based on local preferences according to the date and time of application or by a random selection process (lottery) [24 CFR 982.207(c)]. If a PHA does not have enough funding to assist the family at the top of the Waiting List, it is not permitted to skip down the Waiting List to a family that it can afford to subsidize when there are not sufficient funds to subsidize the family at the top of the Waiting List [24 CFR 982.204(d) and (e)].

SAHA Policy

Families will be selected from the Waiting List based on the local preference(s) for which they qualify, and in accordance with SAHA’s hierarchy of preferences. Within each preference category, families will be selected by assigned lottery number (score), if lottery was performed when placed on the Waiting List. Documentation will be maintained by SAHA as to whether families on the list qualify for and are interested in targeted funding. If a higher placed family on the Waiting List is not qualified or not interested in targeted funding, there will be a notation maintained so that SAHA does not have to ask higher placed families each time targeted selections are made.
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CoC-HMIS MOU
Southern California Regional HMIS Collaborative

Memorandum of Understanding

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) is made this FIRST day of April 2015, by and between the City of Glendale and the City of Pasadena, each a municipal corporation of the State of California, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, a Joint Powers Authority of the City and County of Los Angeles, and 2-1-1 Orange County, a non-profit organization.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States of America, in enacting H.R. 5462, the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, amended subsection (a) of SEC. 228, Section 423 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to include (7) Management Information System funding; and

WHEREAS, the United States Congress, in accepting Conference Report 103-988, indicated that "local jurisdictions should be collecting an array of data on homelessness in order to prevent duplicate counting of homeless persons and to analyze their patterns of use of assistance, including how they enter and exit the homeless-assistance system and the effectiveness of the systems. HUD is directed to take the lead in working with communities toward this end and to analyze jurisdictional data within three years"; and

WHEREAS, HUD has since directed the programs it funds to develop a local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to collect and report data on the usage of homeless services; and

WHEREAS, HUD further encouraged local communities to determine their own best way to implement such a system; and

WHEREAS, the entities responsible for Continuum of Care planning for homeless programs in the Cities of Pasadena, Glendale, and Los Angeles, the balance of the County of Los Angeles, and Orange County have together planned for this system since December, 2001;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS AGREED that the participants in this collaborative wish to affirm their commitment to continue to work together in this Memorandum of Understanding as follows:

I. Background

The Southern California Regional Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Collaborative (the "SCR Collaborative") is comprised of four HUD Continuum of Care grantees: the Cities of Glendale and Pasadena, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA), and 2-1-1 Orange County. The SCR Collaborative itself is not a legal entity, but refers to the commitments and expectations of its individual members, each of whom will be responsible for enforcing the terms and conditions herein. The SCR Collaborative has implemented a web-based Homeless Management Information System that will permit the sharing of client level
V. Vendor Contracts

A. Vendor Selection
   Having followed a community-based planning process to gather recommendations, the Participants released a Joint Request for Proposals to select an HMIS vendor. A review committee comprised of HMIS Steering Committee members reviewed and rated proposals, leading to a recommended vendor, Adsys tech, Inc. Participant representatives are responsible for obtaining the appropriate approvals from their respective decision-making bodies in order to maintain contracts with Adsys tech, Inc.

B. Vendor Contracts
   The Participants will maintain individual contracts with Adsys tech.

VI. Project Management and Oversight

A. All Participants agree to meet the following project management requirements:
   1. Designate a HMIS Collaborative Working Group Lead to contact regarding project management issues;
   2. Designate a HMIS Collaborative Working Group Lead to serve on the SCR HMIS Steering Committee for the term of the MCU;
   3. Meet their financial obligations to Adsys tech in accordance with their respective contracts;
   4. Ensure their participating agencies and users meet Collaborative-approved training standards prior to obtaining system access;
   5. Jointly create and manage HMIS policies and procedures;
   6. Maintain a process to hear and address issues from users under its domain;
   7. In situations where users operate programs in multiple Continuum of Care systems, the Participants responsible for those systems agree to work jointly to address problems and concerns.
   8. Requests for data for any regional or system-wide-reporting will be submitted via email to the HMIS Collaborative Working Group Lead. Requests must be approved or denied within (10) business days of receipt. Data used for such purpose will only be at the aggregate level and at no time will any confidential client information be disclosed.

B. Project Oversight
   The SCR HMIS Steering Committee will be responsible for overseeing the coordinated implementation of HMIS in Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The SCR HMIS Steering Committee will meet at least quarterly to review the progress of implementation, identify and resolve problems, update policies and procedures, and review reports from Participants, as needed.

The SCR HMIS Steering Committee will utilize Working Groups to advise the Committee on specific matters related to the implementation and operation of HMIS.

The Steering Committee may also establish ad hoc and other committees as needed.

Likely ad hoc steering committees may include a Program and Policy Committee to manage processes for regional reporting, compliance with revised HMIS Data and
LA/OC HMIS Collaborative

City of Glendale
Date: 11-5-2015
By: Just Rafter
Title: Community Snow Mountain
Print Name: [Signature]

2-1-1 Orange County
Date: 11-5-2015
By: Amber Killinger
Print Name: [Signature]

City of Pasadena
Date: [Signature]
By: [Signature]
Title: Project Planner
Print Name: Anneliese

Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority
Date: 11-6-15
By: Christopher T reach
Title: Executive Director
Print Name: [Signature]
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Summary Report for CA-602 - Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC

Measure 1: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

This measures the number of clients active in the report date range across ES, SH (Metric 1.1) and then ES, SH and TH (Metric 1.2) along with their average and median length of time homeless. This includes time homeless during the report date range as well as prior to the report start date, going back no further than October, 1, 2012.

**Metric 1.1:** Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES and SH projects.

**Metric 1.2:** Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES, SH, and TH projects.

a. This measure is of the client’s entry, exit, and bed night dates strictly as entered in the HMIS system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universe (Persons)</th>
<th>Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)</th>
<th>Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous FY</td>
<td>Current FY</td>
<td>Previous FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Persons in ES and SH</td>
<td>3391</td>
<td>3641</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH</td>
<td>5613</td>
<td>5266</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Due to changes in DS Element 3.17, metrics for measure (b) will not be reported in 2016.

This measure includes data from each client’s “Length of Time on Street, in an Emergency Shelter, or Safe Haven” (Data Standards element 3.17) response and prepends this answer to the client’s entry date effectively extending the client’s entry date backward in time. This “adjusted entry date” is then used in the calculations just as if it were the client’s actual entry date.

NOTE: Due to the data collection period for this year’s submission, the calculations for this metric are based on the data element 3.17 that was active in HMIS from 10/1/2015 to 9/30/2016. This measure and the calculation in the SPM specifications will be updated to reflect data element 3.917 in time for next year’s submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universe (Persons)</th>
<th>Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)</th>
<th>Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous FY</td>
<td>Current FY</td>
<td>Previous FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Persons in ES and SH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3441</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5131</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measure 2: The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness

This measures clients who exited SO, ES, TH, SH or PH to a permanent housing destination in the date range two years prior to the report date range. Of those clients, the measure reports on how many of them returned to homelessness as indicated in the HMIS for up to two years after their initial exit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total # of Persons whoExited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0 - 180 days)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181 - 365 days)</th>
<th>Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)</th>
<th>Number of Returns in 2 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Returns % of Returns</td>
<td># of Returns % of Returns</td>
<td># of Returns % of Returns</td>
<td># of Returns % of Returns</td>
<td># of Returns % of Returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from SO</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4 7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>5 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from ES</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>39 12%</td>
<td>32 10%</td>
<td>20 6%</td>
<td>91 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from TH</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>39 4%</td>
<td>14 1%</td>
<td>22 2%</td>
<td>75 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from SH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit was from PH</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>31 6%</td>
<td>22 4%</td>
<td>27 5%</td>
<td>80 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>113 6%</td>
<td>68 4%</td>
<td>70 4%</td>
<td>251 13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons

Metric 3.1 – Change in PIT Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY PIT Count</th>
<th>2015 PIT Count</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>4319</td>
<td>-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Total</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing Total</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sheltered Count</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>-133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered Count</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>2201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 3.2 – Change in Annual Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons</td>
<td>5676</td>
<td>5305</td>
<td>-371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Total</td>
<td>3566</td>
<td>3683</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing Total</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>-524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program-funded Projects

Metric 4.1 – Change in earned income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults with increased earned income</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who increased earned income</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Metric 4.2 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults with increased non-employment cash income</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 4.3 – Change in total income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults with increased total income</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who increased total income</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 4.4 – Change in earned income for adult system leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults who exited with increased earned income</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who increased earned income</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 4.5 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults who exited with increased non-employment cash income</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 4.6 – Change in total income for adult system leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults who exited with increased total income</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of adults who increased total income</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measure 5: Number of persons who become homeless for the 1st time

Metric 5.1 – Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, and TH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period.</td>
<td>4759</td>
<td>4414</td>
<td>-345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time)</td>
<td>3651</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>-171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 5.2 – Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, TH, and PH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH, TH or PH during the reporting period.</td>
<td>6610</td>
<td>5814</td>
<td>-796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>-196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.)</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>4534</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 6: Homeless Prevention and Housing Placement of Persons defined by category 3 of HUD’s Homeless Definition in CoC Program-funded Projects

This Measure is not applicable to CoCs in 2016.
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Measure 7: Successful Placement from Street Outreach and Successful Placement in or Retention of Permanent Housing

Metric 7a.1 – Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Persons who exit Street Outreach</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>3271</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of persons above, those who exited to temporary &amp; some institutional destinations</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Successful exits</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 7b.1 – Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Persons in ES, SH, TH and PH-RRH who exited</td>
<td>5633</td>
<td>5224</td>
<td>-409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Successful exits</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metric 7b.2 – Change in exit to or retention of permanent housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous FY</th>
<th>Current FY</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH</td>
<td>2514</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of persons above, those who remained in applicable PH projects and those who exited to permanent housing destinations</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Successful exits/retention</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>