



**SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

CoC Advisory Board Agenda

Wednesday, October 10, 2018 || 8:10 AM - 9:40 AM

SETA, 925 Del Paso Boulevard, Sacramento, CA 95815 - Shasta Room

I. Welcome & Introductions: Sarah Bontrager, Vice Chair		
II. Review and Approval of Minutes: Sarah Bontrager		
III. Chair's Report		
IV. SSF CEO's Report: Anne Moore, Interim CEO		
V. New Business		
A. Item: HUD CoC NOFA Competitions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY2018 Competition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CoC Application (memo attached & application provided separately) - Report Back on Member Input Sessions on CoC & Planning Project Applications - Sacramento CoC's Tier 2 Historical Performance (memo attached) • FY2019 HUD CoC Kick Off <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft FY2019 Business Cycle (memo attached) - RFP for Consulting Services- ACTION (memo attached) <p>Recommendation to delegate responsibility for approval of RFP scope of work to the Performance Review Committee</p>	Michele Watts, SSF Chief Programs Officer - Presenter(s): Michele Watts; Sarah Bontrager, City of Elk Grove and Emily Halcon, City of Sacramento, Performance Review Committee Members	Time: 8:20 AM (30 minutes)
B. Item: 100-Day Challenge to End Youth Homelessness (handout attached)	Presenter(s): Suzi Dotson, Homeless Youth Task Force Co-Chair	Time: 8:50 AM (5 minutes)

C. Item: County No Place Like Home Strategic Plan	Presenter(s): Cindy Cavanaugh, County of Sacramento; Katherine Gale, Focus Strategies	Time: 8:55 AM (30 minutes)
D. Item: HEAP/CESH Update & Discussion (CESH application attached)	Presenter(s): Ben Avey, SSF Chief Public Affairs Officer	Time: 9:25 AM (10 minutes)
E. Item: November 2018 State Ballot Propositions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposition 1- Housing Programs and Veterans' Loan Bond • Proposition 2- Use Millionaires' Tax Revenue for Homeless Prevention Housing Bonds Measure 	Cathy Creswell, Member	Time: 9:35 AM (5 minutes)
VI. Announcements		
VII. Meeting Adjourned		

Next Meeting: November 14, 2018

Please note that today's meeting is being recorded and the digital file will be available at sacramentostepsforward.org under Continuum of Care, Agendas and Minutes.



Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board

Wednesday, September 12, 2018

925 Del Paso Boulevard, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95815 – Board Room

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jonathan Porteus, Sarah Bontrager, Alexis Bernard, Cathy Creswell, Cindy Cavanaugh, Alyson Collier, Dion Dwyer, Emily Halcon, Katie Freeny, Mike Jaske, John Foley, Stefan Heisler, Erin Johansen, Todd Henry, Noel Kammermann, Dan Monk, Sarah O’Daniel, Amani Sawires-Rapaski, John Krainitz

GUEST(S): Suzi Dotson, Bruce Kaban, DS Landsberg, Jameson Parker, John del Castillo, Angel Doney, Tanya Tran, Angela Marin, Frank T. Steve Watters, Cynthia Pimentel, Katherin Gale, Eduardo Ameneyro, Cheyenne Carraway, Lisa Culp, Janelle Harper Smalls, Angela Upshaw, C. Lee, Erica Plumb, Brian A. Jeffery Tardaguila, Londell Earls, Jate Hutchinson, Tiffani Synnott

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Emily Bender, Olivia Kasirye,

SSF STAFF: Michele Watts, Nick Lee, Desli Beckman, Ben Avey, Chris Weare, Kate Casarino, Anne Moore, Tristina Stewart

Call to Order: Jonathan Porteus, 8:11 AM, Quorum met 8:11 AM

I Welcome and Introductions: Jonathan Porteus, Chair

II Review and Approval of Minutes: Sarah Bontrager

- **Motion to approve the August 8th and August 29th 2018 meeting minutes: 1st. John Foley, 2nd. Cindy Cavanaugh, MSC.**

III Chair’s Report: Jonathan Porteus

- Nothing to report at this time

IV SSF Interim CEO Report: Anne Moore

- A. Moore: This has been a very busy 4 to 6 weeks, there have been a number of public meetings that most of the people in this room have been so I want to thank everyone for their hard work on the initiatives that are before you today especially for the grant applications for HEAP and CESH. During the meeting last Thursday, we received additional comments from the community—staff, city, county, and SSF have been working really hard to put together the concept of the proposal that we would like to move forward on. We just got materials this morning; we apologize. We don’t like to provide materials this late, but we were literally working into the night on these documents.

V Item A: City-County-SSF Proposal for Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) & California Emergency Solutions and Housing (CESH) Program Funding

- Ben Avey (Chief of Public Affairs, SSF) PowerPoint Presentation
 - The reason that we’re here today is in the 2018 State Budget, Governor Brown signed SB 850 which created two new programs and three new funding sources including the Homeless Emergency Aid Program and the California Emergency Solutions and Housing Program which equal \$553 million in new funding in the state of California. Locally that is \$5.6 million to the City of Sacramento and \$12.7 million to the Continuum of Care in HEAP, and \$1.6 million to the Continuum of Care in CESH.
 - Within HEAP, one of the primary thresholds that we have to pass is that local jurisdictions must declare a shelter crisis, which is one of the reasons this evolution that we are going through is truly a partnership where we have to have buy-in from the Continuum of Care, the City of Sacramento, and the County of Sacramento, and potentially other cities.
 - When the state legislature developed these programs, they developed them to be very flexible. That was the idea. Those of us who are used to government programs are shocked at how open and what they allow you to do with this money. The idea, though, is that it is emergency funding.
 - Eligible uses are shown on the PowerPoint.

- HEAP is an emergency program. We have to spend every dollar by June 30th, 2021, and we have to implement the services. For government programs, this is a very, very short time. And the State in order to meet this requirement, they are moving very quickly on implementing this program. Remember, this was signed by the governor on June 30th, and the NOFA came out on September 5th.
- CESH is a little bit of a different program. CESH is also flexible; it allows you to do a lot of things. But the key thing about CESH is that it has an emphasis and focus on system change and system development. We believe that the state of California is going to continue funding Continuums of Care in some way in the future. CESH wants to make sure that you have coordinated entry systems in place, HMIS in place, other systems in place so that you can manage state funding. CoC's have traditionally been federal funding. CESH wants us to get in line for state programs by way of functioning systems.
- HEAP, they want us to move quickly. CESH, they want us to move deliberately.
- We don't include a lot of "building stuff" in our application, but there are a lot of other funding streams that do that, and we can look at that as a group. For now, we are looking at emergency aid and systems development.
- Our purpose today is 1) designate Sacramento Steps Forward as the administrative entity for HEAP and CESH, meaning we would be responsible for carrying this proposal forward and 2) wanted to endorse the concept forward for consideration by the City and the County because they are our partners.
- We are developing this in the vision of one program. While there is CESH, there is CoC HEAP, there is City HEAP, we are looking at this as one pot of money and dividing the money how we see fit. So when we discuss it, we discuss in terms of one program. We do, however, have one 3 proposals. While this money may go to the CoC, we have to get approval and engagement from the City of Sacramento and County of Sacramento at minimum, and hopefully we'll bring in the other cities as well. This is truly a collaborative process.
- Because the state is moving so quickly, they are still figuring out things as the move along.
- We cannot be all things to all people. \$19 million sounds like a lot, but if we are going to be effective, we are going to have to be deliberate. We are going to have to focus on the things that we are going to help the community with most urgently, and it's in this proposal, the area within sheltering and housing.
- What are we solving for? Systems that are long term and sustainable.
- Concept focuses on expanding shelter capacity, creating a new flexible housing pool, expanding and aligning case management, eliminating and/or mitigating legal barriers to housing for people experiencing homelessness, and improve the long term success of systems change.
 - Expanding Shelter: Standing up at least one more additional triage center for the people of Sacramento. Increasing capacity in existing shelters, increasing youth respite capacity at the drop-in center, increasing family shelter capacity, and standing up scattered-site shelter beds using the County scattered-site shelter model.
 - Flexible Housing Program: Creates new housing opportunities for unsheltered clients. This is being developed in the County's flexible housing supportive rehousing program. The County will administer it. It will provide flexible rent subsidies for 24 months. It will include whatever it takes case management, landlord and housing support services, and crisis intervention for housed participants. It will also include limited term individualized support services.
 - Criminal Justice Diversion Program (Homeless Court): Helps divert people from criminal justice system when they are going to court for misdemeanors that are related to homelessness and get to the root cause as to why they are homeless. We would also look to stand up an expungement plan where we would be able to expunge misdemeanors, and potentially reduce felonies into misdemeanors so that people are more easily housed.
 - System Development (CESH funding requires a certain amount be spent on this): The plan is to get the Coordinated Entry system working as the provider wants it, working as the community needs it, and comprehensive so that is not just limited to HUD programs. We want it to be the Coordinated Entry System for all homeless services. We also want to create community standards so that we are all operating under the same playbook. We want to figure out what metrics are and what we should be evaluating. We want to staff a funders collaborative so that we are all working together. We also want to continue work on a strategic plan.
- Emily Halcon (City of Sacramento) – Draft Budget Document – This is a working document as the program progresses.
 - We are modeling what to expect to see, but we know this is not what we will see. When we submit to the state, we fully expect to modify the budget as we go.

- Three different categories: CoC HEAP (SSF will apply for), City HEAP (City will be applying for), CESH funds. They are intended to operate as one program. There is a minimum of 5% of the budget that we must spend on youth funding. It is a floor, and not a ceiling.
- Program component proposal
 - Flexible Housing Pool: Heart of the program. Locally driven flexible housing program aim to move people through the system in a way that is efficient and effective and is responsive to those people’s circumstances and not responsive to what HUD has told us. Modeled after the county’s SFRP. Lives between RRH and PSH. This money has to be spent in 18 to 24 months. We have an estimated maximum point into time capacity of 305 individuals. We have to account for ramp up and ramp down. We want to have the flexibility to divert dollars if it’s not successful.
 - Shelter Activities:
 - (a) New shelter activities: standing up of new or expanded triage shelter in the city. The big thing is finding a site and capital costs.
 - (b) New Safe Place Host Homes: Youth most likely won’t want to access an adult shelter. It’s not safe, or comfortable, or welcoming. Youth providers believe we don’t need to build fixed unit beds, but have crisis respite response in the context of existing programs, mostly the drop in center. Youth providers have been working on a Host Home model for a while.
 - (i) Suzi Dotson (Wind Youth Services): We are proposing a volunteer host home model program. We’ve piloted it a little bit. Volunteers in the community who are willing to take in TAY (18-24). TAY will stay with the volunteers with the support from youth providers. A stipend would be given to the volunteers who are providing a safe space.
 - (c) New Scattered-Site: The county has been successful in small scattered-site shelters in the community using leased homes. We would like to expand this. Here we will be able to target subpopulations.
 - (d) Existing Shelters: Shelters that are not up to capacity or not providing the services that are needed to exit people successful. We want to address those needs and make these shelters successful.
 - System Development: Primarily funded through CESH.
 - Administration: 5% cap
- J. Krantz: Has anything been set aside for aggressive advertising/campaign for the general public to accept these shelters?
 - B. Avey: This has come up. I absolutely think this is important.
 - J. Porteus: When the City and County declare shelter crisis, that will be a bold statement.
 - E. Halcon: The smaller scattered-site shelters have not been a problem, but we expect to see some push back for the larger triage shelter.
- D. Dwyer: Does the budget provided allow for mitigation of shelter or large shelter?
 - E. Halcon: Some of the operations for triage shelters will pay for mitigation, but it cannot pay for city staff, but it could pay for something like street outreach.
- A. Collier: I want to emphasize support for the small scattered-site shelters. It places people a more typical community environment that makes it more easy to integrate.
- Several Advisory Board members recognize the collaborative work done. It’s clear that voices were heard and changes were made to the plan.
- C. Creswell: Money is coming to the CoC. I want to continue our role as the body who is making decisions on this. I’m unclear and uncomfortable with how the proposed action is described. The Board is the decision maker. Do we still have that decision-making in this model?
 - Yes and no. The City and County also need to approve.
 - It is not a straight forward, singular. It’s a collaboration. Everyone has their own buy-in.
 - C. Creswell: I would like to see an explicit commitment that decision making about moving forward and next steps. We deserve a commitment that decision making will come back to this body.
- A. Sawires-Rapaski: Say there is no funding in the future, is that a conversation going to take place when the funding is here.
 - Built into these assumptions is a ramp down.

- Move to approve the proposal for CoC HEAP and CoC CESH: Alyson Collier, 1st. Sarah O'Daniel, 2nd. Emily Halcon, Cindy Cavanaugh, Todd Henry, Dan Monk. Abstain. MSC.
- Move to designate SSF the Administrative Entity for the CoC HEAP and CoC CESH with continuing engagement with the CoC and commitment of staff to bring back recommendation and process to the CoC Advisory Board. Cathy Creswell, 1st. Alexis Bernard, 2nd. Emily Halcon, Cindy Cavanaugh, Todd Henry, Dan Monk, abstain. MSC.

Item E: No Place Like Home (NPLH) County Homeless Plan

- Katherine Gale (Focus Strategies) presents a PowerPoint.
 - Sacramento County needs to prepare a homeless plan, which is a requirement for another pot of state funding. Having this plan leverages the No Place Like Home funding.
 - The plan has to include 4 elements: 1.) Describe what is going on in Sacramento in terms of populations, who is experiencing homelessness, what kinds of conditions, where, etc. 2.) What is currently happening, who are the partners engaged, and what is already underway. 3.) Current resources, and identify gaps. 4.) Lay out what the plan looks like.
 - Completing data collection and input at the end of September. The selection of key strategies and plan drafting will occur in October/November with the plan adoption and submission to the State in early December.
 - We've collected a lot of data with the help of HMIS from SSF. We've also collected data from various county programs and others around utilization and who is participating in those programs, the 2018 Housing Inventory Count and the 2017 Point in Time count.
 - Key needs that have been mentioned:
 - Expanding Permanent Housing resources
 - Increasing and building connections to mainstream services
 - Attention to criminal justice
 - Coordinating leadership to align approaches and work toward creating and measuring joint impact; expand and improve data and shared measurement
 - Next steps
 - Analyze all data received and prepare summary
 - Prepare detailed and high level summary of current activities underway
 - Develop a list of opportunities and gaps and areas for building upon.
 - Build on current work being done for new State resources with current activities
 - Gather additional community feedback and input on strategies to include in plan.
- Katherine will come back during the October Advisory Board to go into further detail and to provide updates.

VI Item: NOFA Updates

- M. Watts: The NOFA and all its parts are due on September 18th. The Priority Listing, as approved by this Board, is posted on the website. The CoC application will be posted on the website at the end of this week as well. We attempted to convene weekly meetings so that staff can share parts of the application and to gather input from folks but it turned out to be too heavy of a lift, especially with the State funding opportunity. We held a few sessions, and canceled a few sessions. One of the things we'll do after this competition is talk about how we can have a more meaningful approach getting that input in a year-round process.

VII Announcements:

- In addition to the No Place Like Home request a partner has been issued through SHRA to solicited project proposals.
- SHRA is issuing RFP for project-based vouchers for new construction and rehab units in the next week.
- October 15th, Sacramento Housing Alliance Regional Affordable Housing Summit will be held at the Sheraton

VIII Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned 9:34 AM



SACRAMENTO STEPS FORWARD

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

TO: Sacramento CoC Advisory Board Members

FROM: Michele Watts, Sacramento Steps Forward Chief Programs Officer

DATE: October 3, 2018

RE: FY2018 CoC Application Overview

This memo provides an overview of the FY2018 CoC Application content in an effort to help you better understand and digest it. The FY2018 CoC Application is comprised of four parts including attachments. Narrative responses without attachments consist of 45 pages; adding attachments increases the application length to 290 pages. To help members better navigate this document, SSF has provided it in four parts, as follows:

➤ Part 1. CoC Governance and Structure

Part 1, CoC Governance and Structure, covers the description of the CoC Advisory Board itself and its membership; member recruitment and appointment processes; coordination with Consolidated Plan jurisdictions, Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) administration for shelter and rapid rehousing, and public housing authorities; implementation of coordinated entry; hospital, mental health, jail, and foster care discharge coordination; and detailed description of all aspects of the review and rank process.

- 1A. Identification
- 1B. Engagement
- 1C. Coordination
- 1D. Discharge Planning
- 1E. Project Review
- Part 1 Attachments:
 - 1C-5. PHA Administration Plan- Homeless Preference
 - 1C-8. Centralized of Coordinated Assessment Tool
 - 1E-1. Objective Criteria- Rate, Rank, Review, and Selection Criteria
 - 1E-3. Public Posting- Local Competition Rate, Rank, Review, and Selection
 - 1E-3. Public Posting- CoC Consolidated Application
 - 1E-4. CoC's Reallocation Process
 - 1E-5. Public Posting- Local Competition Deadline
 - 1E-5. Notification Outside of e-snaps- Projects Rejected or Reduced
 - 1E-5. Notification Outside of e-snaps- Projects Accepted

➤ Part 2. Data Collection and Quality

Part 2, Data Collection and Quality, covers all aspects of SSF's role as the HMIS Lead Agency; description of the CoC's HMIS implementation including the vendor and software system, HMIS coverage, and policies and procedures; as well as the CoC's most recent sheltered and unsheltered PIT methodology.

- 2A. HMIS Implementation
- 2B. PIT Count
- 2C. Sheltered Data- Methods

- Part 2 Attachments:
 - 2A-1. CoC and HMIS Lead Governance
 - 2A-2. HMIS- Policies and Procedures Manual
- Part 3. CoC Performance and Strategic Planning

Part 3, CoC Performance and Strategic Planning, covers the CoC's performance on the HUD System Performance Measures, as well as the strategies to improve performance on those measures; and planning efforts to address the need of subpopulations including people experiencing chronic homelessness, family homelessness, youth homelessness and veteran homelessness.

 - 3A. System Performance
 - 3B. Performance and Strategic Planning
 - Part 3 Attachments:
 - 3A-6. HDX 2018 Competition Report
- Part 4. Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies

Part 4, Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies, covers the CoC's efforts to connect people experiencing homelessness to mainstream benefits and additional policies including street outreach efforts and practices; implementation of Housing First and low barrier program models; and other policies.

 - 4A. Mainstream Benefits and Additional Policies
 - Part 4 Attachments: NONE

The October CoC Advisory Board meeting agenda and packet will include additional information related to the 2018 NOFA and upcoming 2019 NOFA, including a draft CoC Business Cycle Calendar that incorporates the opportunity for year-round Advisory Board engagement in preparing the community's responses to the CoC Application. This year-round process begins with members familiarizing themselves with the most recently submitted application. Further discussion of this approach will take place at the October and November CoC Advisory Board meetings. Additionally, formal written Advisory Board comment on the FY2018 CoC Application is invited between now and October 31, 2018. Members' comments should be submitted to contracts@sacstepsforward.org and will be summarized for everyone's review and will inform the particulars of the input process for the FY2019 NOFA competition as well.



**SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

TO: Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board
FROM: Michele Watts, Sacramento Steps Forward Chief Programs Officer
DATE: October 10, 2018
SUBJECT: Draft CoC Advisory Board 2018/19 Annual Business Cycle

As you know, there are certain activities and projects that the Sacramento CoC Advisory Board must complete annually. These responsibilities are outlined in the HEARTH Act and many of them appear in the CoC's Governance Charter. Additionally, the CoC Advisory Board has requested the opportunity for increased in engagement in the HUD NOFA competition CoC Consolidated Application beyond the Project Priority List ranking of new and renewal Rapid Rehousing, Permanent Supportive Housing, and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) projects, specifically the CoC Application and Planning Project Application.

The table below lists these recurring duties and increased engagement opportunities and the approximate point in the calendar year in which they should occur. All HUD CoC NOFA-related dates are estimates based on a June NOFA release date and a September NOFA due date.

Draft CoC Advisory Board 2018/19 Annual Business Cycle

CoC Advisory Board Responsibility	Description	Month(s)
CoC Governance Charter		
Governance Charter Annual Renewal- <i>Action Item</i>	Ad hoc Governance Committee charged with annual review, revision, and renewal of Governance Charter	Schedule is pending- need to prioritize renewal before FY2019 NOFA competition
Membership		
Annual Membership Recruitment	The HEARTH Act requires that a public, widely circulated new member recruitment process occurs annually.	December-January
Annual Approval of Executive Committee Slate- <i>Action Item</i>	Executive Committee membership terms are one-year terms that can be renewed. Bylaws and Charter do not specify a limit on the number of Executive Committee terms a member can serve.	February
Annual Membership Appointment- <i>Action Item</i>	The annual recruitment process culminates in a formal vote on a slate of new and renewing members.	February
Year-round Recruitment & Appointment	The Governance Charter also outlines a process of adding new	Year-round

	members outside of the annual slate as needed.	
HMIS Requirements		
HMIS Data Quality Plan Approval- <i>Action Item</i>	Annual renewal recommended by HMIS & Data Committee	November 2018
HMIS Privacy and Security Plan Approval- <i>Action Item</i>	Annual renewal recommended by HMIS & Data Committee	November 2018
Data		
Annual Gaps Analysis	Stakeholder engagement plan and schedule to be developed by December 2018.	
PIT Count	Sheltered count occurs every January. Sheltered and unsheltered counts occur every other January.	January 2019
NOFA- Projects Competition		
Pre-NOFA Preparations, including Approval of Review Tools & Policies- <i>Action Item</i>	Review tools and policies are developed by the Performance Review Committee and presented to the Advisory Board for approval in the first half of the calendar year, prior to the release of the NOFA.	January – March
NOFA-Related Adjustments to Review Tools & Policies (as needed)- <i>Action Item</i>	Upon release of the NOFA, amendments to tools and policies may be needed to adjust to unexpected requirements.	June
Project Priority List Developed	The Review and Ranking Panel convenes to review and score applications and develop the Project Priority List.	August
Project Priority List Approved- <i>Action Item</i>	The CoC Advisory Board reviews and approves the Project Priority List.	August
NOFA- CoC Application & Planning Grant		
CoC & Planning Project Applications Input	CoC Advisory Board members review and provide input on the CoC and Planning Project Applications. <u>SSF Staff Proposal: Creation of (1) CoC Application Task Force and (2) Planning Project Task Force to meet between now and the next NOFA cycle to develop these applications.</u>	October 2018 – August 2019

Process

This draft CoC Advisory Board 2018/19 Business Cycle calendar is being presented in October for member review and input and staff will return in November with an updated version. Once activities are agreed upon, committee timelines will be added and a second version of the calendar in chronological order will be produced.



**SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

TO: Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board

FROM: Michele Watts, Sacramento Steps Forward Chief Programs Officer

DATE: October 10, 2018

SUBJECT: HUD CoC NOFA Competition Historical Comparison of the Funding of Tier 2 Projects in the Sacramento CoC

Starting with the FY2012 NOFA (coinciding with the first year that Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) took on responsibility for the entirety of the Sacramento CoC), HUD introduced “tiering” into the project ranking process in its annual CoC Program funding competition. Prior to FY2012, CoCs scored and ranked projects, but there was no tiering. This new concept required CoCs split their ranked list into two parts, placing projects identified as higher performing based on local scoring criteria into Tier1 and lower performing projects into Tier 2. Tier 1 projects are nearly guaranteed to be funded while Tier 2 projects must compete nationally with all other CoCs for the funds remaining after all Tier 1 projects are funded. While all projects regardless of tier have to pass HUD threshold criteria, Tier 1 projects are otherwise assured of funding; no Sacramento CoC projects proposed in Tier 1 have ever been denied funding by HUD.

Although HUD has consistently applied the tiering policy over the last seven NOFA competitions, the relative size of each tier changes from one cycle to the next. HUD bases its definition of tiers on a percentage of a CoC’s Annual Renewal Demand (ARD), the total amount of funding required to support all existing projects for one year. A percent of the total ARD is designated for Tier 1 and the balance of this percentage and amount is placed in Tier 2. In the early years of tiering, defining Tiers 1 and 2 was only based on the ARD, with new permanent housing (PH) bonus projects and planning projects funded separately. More recently, CoCs are required to rank new bonus projects, renewals, and new projects through reallocation together in one list, letting the tier cut point fall where it may. Planning projects continue to be funded separately. The table below summarizes the tiering details of the HUD CoC Program NOFAs, FY2012 – FY 2018, as well as the performance of the Sacramento CoC’s Tier 2 projects as a percentage of Tier 2 projects funded.

HUD CoC Program NOFA Competition Tiering Summary, FY2012 – FY2018

NOFA Cycle	Tier 2 %*	New PH bonus projects tiered* (Yes or No)	Percent of Sacramento CoC Tier 2 Funded	Notes
FY2012	3.5% ARD	No	100%	Renewals and new projects through reallocation are tiered, PH bonus funded separately, planning project funded separately
FY2013	5% ARD	No	100%	Renewals and new projects through reallocation are tiered, PH bonus funded separately, planning funded separately

FY2014	5% ARD	No	100%	Renewals and new projects through reallocation are tiered, PH bonus funded separately, planning funded separately
FY2015	15% ARD plus PH bonus amount	Yes	56% (4 / 12 projects)	Renewals, new projects through reallocation, and PH bonus tiered together/treated the same, planning project funded separately
FY2016	7% ARD plus PH bonus amount	Yes	64% (5 / 7 projects)	Renewals, new projects through reallocation, and PH bonus tiered together/treated the same, planning project funded separately
FY2017	6% ARD plus PH bonus amount	Yes	55% (4 / 8 projects)	Renewals, new projects through reallocation, and PH bonus tiered together/treated the same, planning project funded separately
FY2018	6% ARD plus PH bonus amount	Yes		Renewals, new projections through reallocation, and PH bonus tiered together/treated the same, planning project funded separately, DV funds funded separately

* Further Defining Tier 2- Technically, HUD considers all projects not funded in Tier 1 to be part of Tier 2. For the FY2012, FY2013, and FY2014 NOFAs, language referring to Tier 2 states that Tier 2 consists of the total ARD minus Tier 1 plus PH bonus and planning project funds; however, from a **ranking** perspective, PH bonus and planning projects are treated separately from the renewals and new projects through reallocation and **not ranked** alongside them in those three cycles. For the FY2015, FY2016, and FY2017 NOFAs, Tier 2 is described in the same way, however, instructions elsewhere in the NOFA specify that from a **ranking** perspective, PH bonus projects are treated the same as renewals and new projects through reallocation, with all projects ranked in one list in those three cycles; however, planning projects are still funded separately. In the FY2018 NOFA, all the FY2015-FY2017 conditions apply, while projects proposed for the new DV funding are considered separately.



**SACRAMENTO
STEPS FORWARD**

Ending Homelessness. Starting Fresh.

TO: Sacramento Continuum of Care Advisory Board

FROM: Michele Watts, Sacramento Steps Forward Chief Programs Officer

DATE: October 10, 2018

SUBJECT: HUD CoC NOFA Competition Consultant Services- Input on Qualifications and Services and Delegation of Responsibility for Approval of RFP Scope of Work to the Performance Review Committee

The Sacramento CoC relies upon the services on an independent consultant to support the Advisory Board's work in developing the annual HUD CoC NOFA competition scoring criteria and policies and to facilitate the annual review and rank process that produces the Project Priority List for the Board's approval. The consultant also provides training and technical assistance to the agencies participating in the competition, via a Kick Off Conference and one-on-one consultation on the preparation of application materials. When the Advisory Board shifted to a year-round process to prepare for the annual NOFA competition, the consultant assumed responsibility for facilitating the monthly Performance Review Committee (PRC) meetings as well. When Sacramento Steps Forward (SSF) assumed responsibility for the NOFA competition in 2012, we continued the County's practice of contracting with HomeBase, a nonprofit public interest law firm dedicated to the social problem of homelessness and a recognized expert in HUD CoC Program regulations and requirements. After seven years of contracting with the same entity, SSF recognizes the need to conduct a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) procurement process for these services. In conducting an RFP this year, we seek to ensure that the CoC is receiving the type of support it needs to fulfill its responsibilities to HUD and to the community from the most qualified provider.

In preparation for releasing an RFP, SSF sought input regarding the qualifications of and services to be provided by the ideal consultant from HUD CoC Program providers at the July Executive Directors meeting and the Performance Review Committee at its September meeting. This input is sorted into categories and summarized at the end of this memo. Additionally, Advisory Board input is being requested at the October meeting and in writing via email to contracts@sacstepsforward.org through October 17, 2018.

Because preparing for and conducting the annual NOFA competition is a year-round process, SSF seeks to release the RFP for consultant services as soon as possible, with a target release date of November 1, 2018. In order to meet this goal and ensure CoC engagement in the process, SSF requests that the Advisory Board assign responsibility for approval of the RFP scope of work to the Performance Review Committee. All input received through October 17, 2018 will be transmitted to the PRC by October 19, 2018, along with the draft scope of work based on this input, in preparation for the October 23, 2018 committee meeting. Staff will present the draft scope of work to the committee for approval, making revisions as needed. Once approved, staff will proceed with the release of the RFP.

ACTION: The CoC Advisory Board delegates responsibility for approval of the scope of work for the RFP for HUD CoC NOFA Competition Consultant Services to the Performance Review Committee.

CoC Program Providers and Performance Review Committee Input on NOFA Consultant Qualifications and Services

- Essential Skills & Qualifications
 - HUD CoC Program expertise
 - Strong facilitation skills
 - Professionalism
 - Neutrality
 - Ability to communicate clearly with a variety of stakeholders
 - Excellent customer service

- CoC Program Provider Training and Technical Assistance
 - Provide clear and accurate guidance on project requirements set forth in the CoC Program NOFA and in regulations
 - Ability to work with providers in a collaborative fashion
 - Provide transparent and easily understood information about the NOFA competition process
 - Timely annual training as soon as possible after the release of the NOFA to allow maximum time for preparing applications
 - Include published FAQs as a component of the technical assistance process
 - Provide opportunity for providers to prepare sufficiently for review and rank panel interviews
 - Debrief the NOFA competition process with CoC Program Providers as soon as possible after the close of each competition

- Support to the Performance Review Committee and Advisory Board
 - Support the PRC Co-Chairs with the research, information, and expertise required to lead the committee in its work to develop competition scoring criteria and policies
 - Provide clear and accurate guidance on project review and ranking requirements set forth in the CoC Program NOFA and in regulations
 - Serve as the expert on HUD expectations as gleaned from sources supplemental to NOFAs and formal regulations, such as webinars, conferences, FAQs, trainings, etc.
 - Provide examples of best practices for performance review from other CoCs, especially high performing CoCs
 - Provide meeting materials far enough in advance for thoughtful review
 - Debrief the NOFA competition process with the PRC and Advisory Board as soon as possible after the completion of each competition

- Support to the Review and Rank Panel/ Project Priority List Development
 - Facilitation of the review and rank process by an independent party
 - Provide the panel with application materials and tools far enough in advance to allow sufficient time for thoughtful review

THE RAPID RESULTS INSTITUTE (RRI) is an international non-profit organization that pioneered the 100-Day Challenge choreography for social development in diverse settings worldwide. RRI designs the 100-Day journey, facilitates the key convenings, supports team discussions, and coaches leaders and teams throughout the journey.



WHAT IS IT?

The Rapid Results 100-Day Challenge is a methodology that brings together local stakeholders to achieve ambitious results in a short period of time. Systems leaders identify a key area where they would like to see progress, aka “a challenge”, and they build a cross organizational team of individuals involved in direct service delivery to work on this challenge for 100 days. The team sets their own ambitious 100-Day Goal and then must experiment and innovate throughout the 100 days in order to achieve unprecedented results. 100-Day Challenges require courage, commitment, a willingness to experiment and fail, an openness to evolve and change, and a hunger for results.

WHY 100 DAYS?

The act of setting a goal that feels almost impossible elevates teams to new ways of working and intense levels of collaboration. 100-Day Challenges are intended to liberate frontline teams to unleash entrepreneurial energy to innovate, experiment, and execute. This innovation and experimentation generates new insights and important learnings that can build the foundation for long-term systemic change.

WHAT'S THE TIMELINE?

A full cycle of the 100-Day Challenge, including the pre- and post- 100-day work, takes about six months. There are initial scoping conversations followed by five key workshops:

- **System Leader Design Session:** Onsite convening with relevant system leaders to agree on a challenge, identify members for the 100-Day Team, and elect two or three “Sponsors” from the system leaders to work more closely with the team.
- **Launch Workshop:** Two-day workshop where teams set ambitious 100-Day Goals, build action-oriented workplans, and elect Team Leaders. Day 1 of the challenge begins immediately afterward. If teams are working in a cohort together, all teams will travel to one single location to launch.
- **Mid-Point Review Workshop:** Half-day workshop held locally to reflect on what has happened in the first 50 days and adjust plans for what needs to happen in the next 50 days to ensure success.
- **Sustainability Review Workshop:** Two-day workshop after Day 100 for teams to celebrate accomplishments, consider how to sustain and scale results, and discuss next steps. In a cohort, all teams will travel to one location.
- **What's Next Workshop:** Half-day workshop held locally where system leaders hear from the 100-Day Team and determine what is next to ensure the sustainability and scaling of results.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER?

With support from RRI, system leaders are responsible for ensuring the sustainability and scaling of impact achieved during the 100-Day Challenge. The insights and experiences that emerge from the 100-Day Challenge will position your community to assess the design, key strategies, and resources of your system in order to make informed plans for future action. The momentum, clarity, and collaboration created by the 100-Day Challenge should serve as a catalyst for tangible, sustained progress towards long-term systemic changes in your community.

Estimated Budget and Goals §50490.3(a)(5)											CoC Service Area Allocation requested §50490.2:		\$1,619,424				
Activity #1 Rental assistance, housing relocation & stabilization services to ensure housing affordability to individuals experiencing homelessness or who are at risk of homelessness.											Projected administrative costs §50490.2(b):		\$80,971				
Activity #2 Operating subsidies in the form of 15-year capitalized operating reserves for new and existing affordable permanent housing units for homeless individuals and/or families.											Instructions: Complete the following chart by listing the anticipated estimated amounts to be used for the specific eligible activities the AE and/or local partner will carry out with the allocation requested above. Describe each activity and the experience the AE or local partner has administering it. Identify numerical goals and performance measures to be used to evaluate success in implementing each eligible activity. Certify that each activity will be administered consistent with Housing First as described in §II.G of the NOFA.						
Activity #3 Flexible housing subsidy funds for local programs that establish or support the provision of rental subsidies in permanent housing to assist homeless individuals & families.																	
Activity #4 Operating support for emergency housing interventions including but not limited to: navigation centers, street outreach, and shelter diversion.																	
Activity #5 Systems support for activities necessary to maintain a comprehensive homeless services and housing delivery system, including Coordinated Entry System (CES) data, and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) reporting, and homelessness planning activities.																	
Activity #6a Develop or update a CES, if the CoC does not have a system in place that meets the applicable HUD requirements, as set forth in Section II.E.3.A of the NOFA.																	
Activity #6b Development of a plan addressing actions to be taken within the CoC service area if no such plan exists.																	
Eligible Activities §50490.4(a)			Prior Experience §50490.3(a)(2)(A&B)			Projected Performance Measures §50490.3(a)(5)							Housing First §50490.4(d,e)				
Activity	Estimated amount for eligible activity	Activity as a % of Allocation amount requested	Describe Activity and prior AE experience administering Activity			(A) Number of homeless persons served	(B1) Number of unsheltered homeless persons served	(B2) Average length of time spent as homeless before entry into program or project	(C) Number of homeless persons exiting the program or project into permanent housing	(D) Number of persons that return to homelessness after exiting the program or project	Other applicant identified performance measure #1	Numerical goal (#)	Other applicant identified performance measure #2	Numerical goal (#)	Other applicant identified performance measure #3	Numerical goal (#)	AE or subrecipient will administer activity consistent with Housing First NOFA §II.G?
Activity #4	\$538,453	33.2%	The Full Service Re-Housing Shelter (FSRS) program, which may also be referred to as a Navigation Center, will provide 24-hour emergency shelter services in leased single family homes throughout the County. In addition to providing low-barrier sheltering services that can accommodate pets, partners and possessions, participants will receive housing-focused supportive services including individualized case management and re-housing assistance.			80	80	12 months	68	12	Percent of clients engaged in case management and rehousing services	90%	Length of Time in Shelter (months)	3	Clients Served	80	Yes
Activity #5	\$575,000	35.5%	System level staffing support for initial implementation of updated coordinated entry system and improved system access. Fully develop transparent written policies and procedures. Develop operating and reporting standards for Outreach/Navigation programs and Shelters. Develop and update community standards for Re-housing programs (RRH standards, Flexible Fund Manual). Facilitate learning communities and ongoing training. Coordinate and improve outcomes of homeless investments (e.g., through performance based contracting). Improve outcome evaluation, using common metrics. Sacramento Steps Forward is the designated agency lead for CES and HMIS in Sacramento.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes
Activity #6a	\$325,000	20.1%	Evaluate and modify current system functioning, including access, assessment, prioritization, and matching/referral. Integrate CES system to other parts of homeless system to ensure client flow. Expand CES to emergency shelter, e.g., bed reservation system. Integrate diverse entry systems: general pop, veterans, youth, families, behavioral health. Standardize CES reporting, accountability, and evaluation. Increase housing and program resources connected to CES. Align with HMIS. Staff for system level coordination, implementation, and oversight. Sacramento Steps Forward is the designated agency lead for CES and HMIS in Sacramento.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes
Activity #6b	\$100,000	6.2%	Integrate Continuum of Care planning with County of Sacramento No Place Like Home Homeless Plan and develop process for dynamic strategic planning. Sacramento Steps Forward is the designated agency lead for Continuum of Care strategic planning.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Yes
Total:	\$1,619,424																