

## 1A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Identification

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**1A-1. CoC Name and Number:** CA-511 - Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC

**1A-2. Collaborative Applicant Name:** San Joaquin County

**1A-3. CoC Designation:** CA

**1A-4. HMIS Lead:** Central Valley Low Income Housing Corp.

## 1B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Engagement

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**1B-1. From the list below, select those organizations and persons that participate in CoC meetings. Then select "Yes" or "No" to indicate if CoC meeting participants are voting members or if they sit on the CoC Board. Only select "Not Applicable" if the organization or person does not exist in the CoC's geographic area.**

Organization/Person Categories	Participates in CoC Meetings	Votes, including electing CoC Board	Sits on CoC Board
Local Government Staff/Officials	Yes	Yes	Yes
CDBG/HOME/ESG Entitlement Jurisdiction	Yes	Yes	Yes
Law Enforcement	Yes	Yes	No
Local Jail(s)	Yes	Yes	No
Hospital(s)	Yes	Yes	No
EMT/Crisis Response Team(s)	Yes	Yes	No
Mental Health Service Organizations	Yes	Yes	No
Substance Abuse Service Organizations	Yes	Yes	Yes
Affordable Housing Developer(s)	Yes	Yes	No
Public Housing Authorities	Yes	Yes	No
CoC Funded Youth Homeless Organizations	Not Applicable	No	Not Applicable
Non-CoC Funded Youth Homeless Organizations	Yes	Yes	No
School Administrators/Homeless Liaisons	Yes	Yes	No
CoC Funded Victim Service Providers	Not Applicable	No	Not Applicable
Non-CoC Funded Victim Service Providers	Yes	Yes	No
Street Outreach Team(s)	Yes	Yes	No
Youth advocates	Yes	Yes	No
Agencies that serve survivors of human trafficking	Yes	Yes	No
Other homeless subpopulation advocates	Yes	Yes	No
Homeless or Formerly Homeless Persons	Yes	Yes	No
ES housing providers	Yes	Yes	No
TH & RRH housing providers	Yes	Yes	Yes
PSH housing providers	Yes	Yes	Yes

**1B-1a. Describe in detail how the CoC solicits and considers the full range of opinions from individuals or organizations with knowledge of homelessness or an interest in preventing and ending homelessness in the geographic area. Please provide two examples of organizations or individuals from the list in 1B-1 to answer this question.**

The CoC actively solicits and considers input from CoC members and other entities such as the local Emergency Food & Shelter Board, Campaign for Common Ground, private developers and rental property management firms, and Behavioral Health’s Housing Coalition. Central Valley Housing, a CoC funded provider, administers both PSH and TH projects, and regularly provides information on project accomplishments and needs as the lead HMIS agency. Terry Hull owns the largest property management firm in the CoC and participates as an expert on housing issues facing special needs populations. CARE-LINK provides street outreach and medical care to unsheltered homeless and contributes insights on unmet needs. San Joaquin County Behavioral Health contributes information and recommendations regarding street outreach, service delivery options, and consumer needs. Petra Stanton, working for a local nonprofit hospital, contributes information on health care delivery systems available through the ACA.

**1B-1b. List Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY)-funded and other youth homeless assistance providers (CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded) who operate within the CoC's geographic area. Then select "Yes" or "No" to indicate if each provider is a voting member or sits on the CoC Board.**

Youth Service Provider (up to 10)	RHY Funded?	Participated as a Voting Member in at least two CoC Meetings between July 1, 2015 and June 20, 2016.	Sat on CoC Board as active member or official at any point between July 1, 2015 and June 20, 2016.
Women's Center-Youth & Family Services	Yes	Yes	No

**1B-1c. List the victim service providers (CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded) who operate within the CoC's geographic area.**

**Then select "Yes" or "No" to indicate if each provider is a voting member or sits on the CoC Board.**

Victim Service Provider for Survivors of Domestic Violence (up to 10)	Participated as a Voting Member in at least two CoC Meetings between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016	Sat on CoC Board as active member or official at any point between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.
Women's Center-Youth & Family Services	Yes	No

**1B-2. Explain how the CoC is open to proposals from entities that have not previously received funds in prior CoC Program competitions, even if the CoC is not applying for new projects in 2016. (limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC posts the Notice of Funding Availability publically upon its release from HUD whether or not there are plans for new applications. The CoC also directly informs local homeless service providers of the NOFA when it is published. The CoC accepts any and all applications and suggestions for new projects that might benefit the homeless within the CoC's geographic boundaries whether the new projects would require re-allocation or would be funded under any available permanent housing bonus. Further, the CoC shares the unmet need findings linked to the Point-in-Time count and Housing Inventory Count each year with both homeless service providers and the general community.

**1B-3. How often does the CoC invite new members to join the CoC through a publicly available invitation?** Quarterly

## 1C. Continuum of Care (CoC) Coordination

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**1C-1. Does the CoC coordinate with Federal, State, Local, private and other entities serving homeless individuals and families and those at risk of homelessness in the planning, operation and funding of projects? Only select "Not Applicable" if the funding source does not exist within the CoC's geographic area.**

Funding or Program Source	Coordinates with Planning, Operation and Funding of Projects
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)	Yes
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	Yes
Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY)	Yes
Head Start Program	Yes
Housing and service programs funded through Federal, State and local government resources.	Yes

**1C-2. The McKinney-Vento Act, requires CoC's to participate in the Consolidated Plan(s) (Con Plan(s)) for the geographic area served by the CoC. The CoC Program Interim rule at 24 CFR 578.7 (c) (4) requires the CoC to provide information required to complete the Con Plan(s) within the CoC's geographic area, and 24 CFR 91.100(a)(2)(i) and 24 CFR 91.110 (b)(2) requires the State and local Con Plan jurisdiction(s) consult with the CoC. The following chart asks for the information about CoC and Con Plan jurisdiction coordination, as well as CoC and ESG recipient coordination.**

CoCs can use the CoCs and Consolidated Plan Jurisdiction Crosswalk to assist in answering this question.

	Number
Number of Con Plan jurisdictions with whom the CoC geography overlaps	3
How many Con Plan jurisdictions did the CoC participate with in their Con Plan development process?	3
How many Con Plan jurisdictions did the CoC provide with Con Plan jurisdiction level PIT data?	3
How many of the Con Plan jurisdictions are also ESG recipients?	2
How many ESG recipients did the CoC participate with to make ESG funding decisions?	2
How many ESG recipients did the CoC consult with in the development of ESG performance standards and evaluation process for ESG funded activities?	2

**1C-2a. Based on the responses provided in 1C-2, describe in greater detail how the CoC participates with the Consolidated Plan jurisdiction(s) located in the CoC's geographic area and include the frequency and type of interactions between the CoC and the Consolidated Plan jurisdiction(s). (limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC collaborated with all 3 of the Con Plan jurisdictions in the CoC's geographic area. The CoC coordinates with the communities of Stockton and Lodi, as well as the County of San Joaquin. San Joaquin County Community Development Dept. serves as the CoC Collaborative Applicant and Lead Agency. There are weekly contacts either in the form of in-person meetings, phone and email between Community Development and providers regarding: HMIS, ESG, the 10 Year Plan, and reporting per the County's Annual Action Plan and CAPER. Regarding the cities of Stockton and Lodi, regular communication occurs several times per month in the form of in-person meetings, or via phone and email. This includes but is not limited to: conferring on the Annual Action Plan; discussion regarding existing homeless service outreach and local service provision; and evaluation of unmet community needs. All together, the CoC's overall ConPlan participation and outreach comprises at least 6 hours per month.

**1C-2b. Based on the response in 1C-2, describe how the CoC is working with ESG recipients to determine local ESG funding decisions and how the CoC assists in the development of performance standards and evaluation of outcomes for ESG-funded activities. (limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC Lead Agency, San Joaquin County Community Development, is also the recipient of allocated entitlement ESG funds and acts as the Administrative Entity on behalf of the CoC for ESG funds distributed through the State of California. Community Development provides technical assistance regarding ESG performance standards; designing and distributing the ESG funding application; convening a community grants review team meeting for scoring and evaluating submitted ESG applications; recommending ESG award amounts to County of San Joaquin; coordinating submission of HMIS data via the ESG CAPER; organizing the PiT; and sharing relevant info and data. Community Development, on behalf of the CoC, works strongly and closely with the City of Stockton regarding Stockton's entitlement ESG program through coordination of project goals and objectives, recommending funding awards, and agreement on program performance standards. The City of Lodi does not receive entitlement ESG funds.

**1C-3. Describe how the CoC coordinates with victim service providers and non-victim service providers (CoC Program funded and non-CoC funded) to ensure that survivors of domestic violence are provided housing and services that provide and maintain safety and security. Responses must address how the service providers ensure and maintain the safety and security of participants and how client choice is upheld.**

**(limit 1000 characters)**

The local victim services provider (VSP) is DoJ funded, and is connected to CoC and ESG projects through the CoC HMIS. A DV household seeking help will be directly referred to a VSP, and given a description of services offered. The decision to contact a VSP is left to the household. If seeking housing, coordinated entry that is part of the HMIS would direct households to CoC- and ESG-funded providers that best suit the household's immediate need for sanctuary and long-term need for housing.

Local outreach efforts that are HHS recipients are also connected via the HMIS. The CoC has regular contact with all agencies, and coordinates communication between various service providers.

A household's victim status would not be included in any shared profile to protect privacy. Information on DV victims entered into HMIS by non-victim service providers can be shielded from other users. Households would have to self-identify as victims to housing agencies to obtain priority placement.

**1C-4. List each of the Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) within the CoC's geographic area. If there are more than 5 PHAs within the CoC's geographic area, list the 5 largest PHAs. For each PHA, provide the percentage of new admissions that were homeless at the time of admission between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016 and indicate whether the PHA has a homeless admissions preference in its Public Housing and/or Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program.**

Public Housing Agency Name	% New Admissions into Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program from 7/1/15 to 6/30/16 who were homeless at entry	PHA has General or Limited Homeless Preference
Housing Authority of the County of San Joaquin	22.00%	No

**1C-5. Other than CoC, ESG, Housing Choice Voucher Programs and Public Housing, describe other subsidized or low-income housing opportunities that exist within the CoC that target persons experiencing homelessness.**

**(limit 1000 characters)**

The HUD-VASH program, administered by the Housing Authority, helps 200+ homeless veteran households find and maintain housing within the CoC. Two VA funded SSVF projects operate within the CoC and provided critical housing assistance to 130+ households in the past 12 months. San Joaquin Behavioral Health Services provides short and medium term rent assistance to 150+ homeless and at-risk mental health consumers through its CHOICE program. Existing and planned developments within the CoC, including NSP funded projects, target low and very low income households, although none prioritize units for the homeless. BHS is helping fund a new project that will make 10

units available to homeless households. Two projects under development with State funds will provide about 30 units for chronically homeless veterans. The Housing Authority has been urged by the CoC to adopt homeless preferences in the HCV program and make a number of HCV slots available to those in homeless housing programs.

**1C-6. Select the specific strategies implemented by the CoC to ensure that homelessness is not criminalized in the CoC's geographic area. Select all that apply.**

Engaged/educated local policymakers:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Engaged/educated law enforcement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implemented communitywide plans:	<input type="checkbox"/>
No strategies have been implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:(limit 1000 characters)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
The CoC also conducts ongoing engagement with various community groups, the faith community, and non-governmental charities and nonprofits in all major cities within the CoC geographic area. This engagement has the goal of providing education regarding homelessness and to generate grassroots pressure on local officials and law enforcement to not criminalize homelessness and develop communitywide strategies to address homelessness. The CoC has successfully partnered with law enforcement agencies in all cities within the CoC geographic area to conduct comprehensive outreach to the homeless instead of resorting to criminal punishment as a response to homelessness.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



## 1D. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning

### Instructions:

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**1D-1. Select the system(s) of care within the CoC's geographic area for which there is a discharge policy in place that is mandated by the State, the CoC, or another entity for the following institutions? Check all that apply.**

Foster Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Health Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Correctional Facilities:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**1D-2. Select the system(s) of care within the CoC's geographic area with which the CoC actively coordinates with to ensure institutionalized persons that have resided in each system of care for longer than 90 days are not discharged into homelessness. Check all that apply.**

Foster Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Health Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Correctional Facilities:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**1D-2a. If the applicant did not check all boxes in 1D-2, explain why there is no coordination with the institution(s) that were not selected and explain how the CoC plans to coordinate with the institution(s) to ensure persons**

**discharged are not discharged into homelessness.  
(limit 1000 characters)**

## **1E. Centralized or Coordinated Assessment (Coordinated Entry)**

### **Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**The CoC Program Interim Rule requires CoCs to establish a Centralized or Coordinated Assessment System which HUD refers to as the Coordinated Entry Process. Based on the recent Coordinated Entry Policy Brief, HUD's primary goals for the coordinated entry process are that assistance be allocated as effectively as possible and that it be easily accessible no matter where or how people present for assistance.**

**1E-1. Explain how the CoC's coordinated entry process is designed to identify, engage, and assist homeless individuals and families that will ensure those who request or need assistance are connected to proper housing and services.  
(limit 1000 characters)**

Coordinated Entry (CE) outreach is conducted collaboratively across the CoC. Street Outreach efforts by multiple agencies reach persons unlikely to present for services; Street Outreach projects enter contact information in HMIS; ESG programs, including shelters, enter information in HMIS; government/mainstream services not connected to HMIS maintain communication and referral systems to CoC projects. A common assessment tool (VI-SPDAT) is integrated in HMIS. Assessment data is entered into HMIS, referrals are made through HMIS to appropriate projects, and consumers are placed on priority lists for housing and related services. Within the CoC there is one permanent supportive housing provider, utilizing a single wait list; all referrals have a project level assessment conducted and the wait list is maintained based on need and vulnerability. Applicants not eligible for PSH are returned to the list for a new referral. The PSH wait list is continuously updated as new referrals are made.

**1E-2. CoC Program and ESG Program funded projects are required to participate in the coordinated entry process, but there are many other organizations and individuals who may participate but are not required to do so. From the following list, for each type of organization or individual, select all of the applicable checkboxes that indicate how that organization or individual participates in the CoC's coordinated entry process. If there are other organizations or persons who participate but are not on this list,**

**enter the information in the blank text box, click "Save" at the bottom of the screen, and then select the applicable checkboxes.**

Organization/Person Categories	Participate s in Ongoing Planning and Evaluation	Makes Referrals to the Coordinate d Entry Process	Receives Referrals from the Coordinate d Entry Process	Operates Access Point for Coordinate d Entry Process	Participate s in Case Conferenci ng	Does not Participate	Does not Exist
Local Government Staff/Officials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CDBG/HOME/Entitlement Jurisdiction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law Enforcement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Jail(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hospital(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EMT/Crisis Response Team(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health Service Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Substance Abuse Service Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Affordable Housing Developer(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Housing Authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-CoC Funded Youth Homeless Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School Administrators/Homeless Liaisons	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-CoC Funded Victim Service Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Street Outreach Team(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Homeless or Formerly Homeless Persons	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CoC funded housing projects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Emergency shelter providers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 1F. Continuum of Care (CoC) Project Review, Ranking, and Selection

### Instructions

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

### 1F-1. For all renewal project applications submitted in the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition complete the chart below regarding the CoC's review of the Annual Performance Report(s).

How many renewal project applications were submitted in the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition?	12
How many of the renewal project applications are first time renewals for which the first operating year has not expired yet?	1
How many renewal project application APRs were reviewed by the CoC as part of the local CoC competition project review, ranking, and selection process for the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition?	12
Percentage of APRs submitted by renewing projects within the CoC that were reviewed by the CoC in the 2016 CoC Competition?	109.09%

**The number of Project Application APRs reviewed cannot exceed the number available for review.**

### 1F-2 - In the sections below, check the appropriate box(es) for each selection to indicate how project applications were reviewed and ranked for the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition. Written documentation of the CoC's publicly announced Rating and Review procedure must be attached.

<b>Performance outcomes from APR reports/HMIS:</b>	
% permanent housing exit destinations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
% increases in income	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Monitoring criteria:</b>	
Utilization rates	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drawdown rates	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Frequency or Amount of Funds Recaptured by HUD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Need for specialized population services:</b>	
Youth	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Victims of Domestic Violence	<input type="checkbox"/>
Families with Children	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Veterans	<input type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**1F-2a. Describe how the CoC considered the severity of needs and vulnerabilities of participants that are, or will be, served by the project applications when determining project application priority. (limit 1000 characters)**

All CoC projects focus on serving households that face numerous factors that add to their vulnerability. CoC-funded projects utilize vulnerability indices and assessment tools to determine which households face the most barriers to self-sufficiency and give them priority placement into housing and other programs as part of the coordinated entry process. Factors include chronic homelessness, mental health issues, substance abuse issues, other chronic health issues, history of homelessness, low income, lack of or poor rental history, criminal victimhood, and history of domestic violence. Projects with an explicit mandate to serve households highest on the vulnerability index are given bonus points during the process in which the CoC ranks applications for funding priority. Projects that serve the chronically homeless households and other populations deemed at highest vulnerability are also given priority.

**1F-3. Describe how the CoC made the local competition review, ranking, and selection criteria publicly available, and identify the public medium(s) used and the date(s) of posting. Evidence of the public posting must be attached. (limit 750 characters)**

The CoC distributed the NOFA and ranking criteria to all service providers in the CoC area via email June 28; NOFA information was also posted on the Community Development website; a press release on the NOFA was sent to print media sources in the CoC. A public meeting with stakeholders was held July 13. Materials were also shared with local government and public agencies that have a reach that extends beyond active CoC participants. The NOFA and

ranking/selection criteria were posted on the Collaborative Applicant's website. CoC applicants were notified of which projects were accepted August 31, 2016. Project rankings were posted September 6. A draft of the CoC application was posted for comment September 6.

**1F-4. On what date did the CoC and Collaborative Applicant publicly post all parts of the FY 2016 CoC Consolidated Application that included the final project application ranking? (Written documentation of the public posting, with the date of the posting clearly visible, must be attached. In addition, evidence of communicating decisions to the CoC's full membership must be attached).** 09/06/2016

**1F-5. Did the CoC use the reallocation process in the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition to reduce or reject projects for the creation of new projects? (If the CoC utilized the reallocation process, evidence of the public posting of the reallocation process must be attached.)** No

**1F-5a. If the CoC rejected project application(s), on what date did the CoC and Collaborative Applicant notify those project applicants that their project application was rejected? (If project applications were rejected, a copy of the written notification to each project applicant must be attached.)** 08/31/2016

**1F-6. In the Annual Renewal Demand (ARD) is the CoC's FY 2016 CoC's FY 2016 Priority Listing equal to or less than the ARD on the final HUD-approved FY2016 GIW?** Yes

# 1G. Continuum of Care (CoC) Addressing Project Capacity

## Instructions

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

### 1G-1. Describe how the CoC monitors the performance of CoC Program recipients. (limit 1000 characters)

The CoC reviews HUD APRs for performance results in conjunction with HMIS reports on system performance measures. Sub-recipients are required to provide on-time reporting, including the requirement of an independent external audit process and reviews independent audit results. The Collaborative Applicant conducts periodic site visits to all CoC and ESG funded projects and reviews financial records and client files. Applications for projects are assessed for organizational capacity and experience, evaluated project readiness for new projects. All CoC and ESG projects are assessed for cost effectiveness. The Collaborative Applicant also routinely reviews CoC membership involvement, HMIS participation, HMIS data quality, match documentation, and ensures HUD funding is properly and fully spent.

**1G-2. Did the Collaborative Applicant include accurately completed and appropriately signed form HUD-2991(s) for all project applications submitted on the CoC Priority Listing?** Yes



## **2A. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Implementation**

**Intructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2A-1. Does the CoC have a Governance Charter that outlines the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and the HMIS Lead, either within the Charter itself or by reference to a separate document like an MOU/MOA? In all cases, the CoC's Governance Charter must be attached to receive credit, In addition, if applicable, any separate document, like an MOU/MOA, must also be attached to receive credit.** Yes

**2A-1a. Include the page number where the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and HMIS Lead can be found in the attached document referenced in 2A-1. In addition, in the textbox indicate if the page number applies to the CoC's attached governance charter or attached MOU/MOA.** 6,7

**2A-2. Does the CoC have a HMIS Policies and Procedures Manual? If yes, in order to receive credit the HMIS Policies and Procedures Manual must be attached to the CoC Application.** Yes

**2A-3. Are there agreements in place that outline roles and responsibilities between the HMIS Lead and the Contributing HMIS Organization (CHOs)?** Yes

**2A-4. What is the name of the HMIS software** Clarity

**used by the CoC (e.g., ABC Software)?**

**2A-5. What is the name of the HMIS software vendor (e.g., ABC Systems)?** BitFocus

## 2B. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Funding Sources

### Instructions

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2B-1. Select the HMIS implementation coverage area:** Single CoC

**\* 2B-2. In the charts below, enter the amount of funding from each funding source that contributes to the total HMIS budget for the CoC.**

### 2B-2.1 Funding Type: Federal - HUD

Funding Source	Funding
CoC	\$92,094
ESG	\$16,000
CDBG	\$0
HOME	\$0
HOPWA	\$0
<b>Federal - HUD - Total Amount</b>	<b>\$108,094</b>

### 2B-2.2 Funding Type: Other Federal

Funding Source	Funding
Department of Education	\$0
Department of Health and Human Services	\$0
Department of Labor	\$0
Department of Agriculture	\$0
Department of Veterans Affairs	\$0
Other Federal	\$0
<b>Other Federal - Total Amount</b>	<b>\$0</b>

### 2B-2.3 Funding Type: State and Local

Funding Source	Funding
----------------	---------

City	\$0
County	\$0
State	\$0
<b>State and Local - Total Amount</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**2B-2.4 Funding Type: Private**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Funding</b>
Individual	\$0
Organization	\$0
<b>Private - Total Amount</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**2B-2.5 Funding Type: Other**

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Funding</b>
Participation Fees	\$0
<b>Other - Total Amount</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>2B-2.6 Total Budget for Operating Year</b>	<b>\$108,094</b>
---	------------------

## 2C. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Bed Coverage

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2C-1. Enter the date the CoC submitted the 2016 HIC data in HDX, (mm/dd/yyyy):** 04/15/2016

**2C-2. Per the 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) Indicate the number of beds in the 2016 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.**

Project Type	Total Beds in 2016 HIC	Total Beds in HIC Dedicated for DV	Total Beds in HMIS	HMIS Bed Coverage Rate
Emergency Shelter (ESG) beds	693	54	605	94.68%
Safe Haven (SH) beds	0	0	0	
Transitional Housing (TH) beds	797	0	707	88.71%
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) beds	28	0	25	89.29%
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds	731	0	399	54.58%
Other Permanent Housing (OPH) beds	20	0	20	100.00%

**2C-2a. If the bed coverage rate for any project type is below 85 percent, describe how the CoC plans to increase the bed coverage rate for each of these project types in the next 12 months. (limit 1000 characters)**

The HMIS bed coverage rate for permanent supportive housing is below 85 percent because households using VASH vouchers are not being reported in HMIS. If VASH vouchers were recorded in HMIS, the coverage rate for this category would be 100 percent. The CoC has initiated conversations with the Housing Authority of the County of San Joaquin to encourage voluntary participation in HMIS.

**2C-3. If any of the project types listed in question 2C-2 above have a coverage rate below 85 percent, and some or all of these rates can be attributed to beds covered by one of the following program types, please indicate that here by selecting all that apply from the list below.**

VA Grant per diem (VA GPD):	
FY2016 CoC Application	Page 21 09/06/2016

	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>VASH:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Faith-Based projects/Rescue mission:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Youth focused projects:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Voucher beds (non-permanent housing):</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>HOPWA projects:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Not Applicable:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2C-4. How often does the CoC review or assess its HMIS bed coverage?** Monthly

## 2D. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Data Quality

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2D-1. Indicate the percentage of unduplicated client records with null or missing values and the percentage of "Client Doesn't Know" or "Client Refused" within the last 10 days of January 2016.**

Universal Data Element	Percentage Null or Missing	Percentage Client Doesn't Know or Refused
3.1 Name	0%	0%
3.2 Social Security Number	5%	2%
3.3 Date of birth	0%	0%
3.4 Race	1%	1%
3.5 Ethnicity	0%	1%
3.6 Gender	0%	0%
3.7 Veteran status	0%	1%
3.8 Disabling condition	0%	15%
3.9 Residence prior to project entry	2%	5%
3.10 Project Entry Date	0%	0%
3.11 Project Exit Date	0%	0%
3.12 Destination	2%	18%
3.15 Relationship to Head of Household	0%	4%
3.16 Client Location	0%	0%
3.17 Length of time on street, in an emergency shelter, or safe haven	2%	25%

**2D-2. Identify which of the following reports your HMIS generates. Select all that apply:**

CoC Annual Performance Report (APR):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ESG Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) table shells:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------

**2D-3. If you submitted the 2016 AHAR, how many AHAR tables (i.e., ES-ind, ES-family, etc) were accepted and used in the last AHAR?**

12

**2D-4. How frequently does the CoC review data quality in the HMIS?**

Quarterly

**2D-5. Select from the dropdown to indicate if standardized HMIS data quality reports are generated to review data quality at the CoC level, project level, or both.**

Both Project and CoC

**2D-6. From the following list of federal partner programs, select the ones that are currently using the CoC's HMIS.**

VA Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VA Grant and Per Diem (GPD):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2D-6a. If any of the Federal partner programs listed in 2D-6 are not currently entering data in the CoC's HMIS and intend to begin entering data in the next 12 months, indicate the Federal partner program and the anticipated start date. (limit 750 characters)**



## 2E. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count

### Instructions:

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**The data collected during the PIT count is vital for both CoC's and HUD. HUD needs accurate data to understand the context and nature of homelessness throughout the country, and to provide Congress and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) with information regarding services provided, gaps in service, and performance. Accurate, high quality data is vital to inform Congress' funding decisions.**

**2E-1. Did the CoC approve the final sheltered PIT count methodology for the 2016 sheltered PIT count?** Yes

**2E-2. Indicate the date of the most recent sheltered PIT count: (mm/dd/yyyy)** 01/28/2016

**2E-2a. If the CoC conducted the sheltered PIT count outside of the last 10 days of January 2016, was an exception granted by HUD?** Not Applicable

**2E-3. Enter the date the CoC submitted the sheltered PIT count data in HDX: (mm/dd/yyyy)** 04/15/2016

## 2F. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Methods

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2F-1. Indicate the method(s) used to count sheltered homeless persons during the 2016 PIT count:**

Complete Census Count:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Random sample and extrapolation:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-random sample and extrapolation:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2F-2. Indicate the methods used to gather and calculate subpopulation data for sheltered homeless persons:**

HMIS:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HMIS plus extrapolation:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interview of sheltered persons:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sample of PIT interviews plus extrapolation:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2F-3. Provide a brief description of your CoC's sheltered PIT count methodology and describe why your CoC selected its sheltered PIT count methodology. (limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC PIT Planning Committee determined that the "complete census" methodology would be used for the CoC's sheltered PIT count. This determination was made

based on over 90% HMIS coverage for shelter providers and the strong cooperative relationships with non-HMIS reporting programs providing shelter in the CoC. The demonstrated experience of the HMIS Lead staff in providing data through the HMIS network and securing detailed shelter survey results from all CoC providers assured for a complete and comprehensive count. A complete census count was completed for the shelter count. Each shelter and transitional housing project was able to collect the necessary data for each individual staying in their project the night of the PIT and provide an unduplicated count of individuals served. Prior to the PIT count, trainings were conducted on how to conduct the PIT count and how to run the report, and PIT count reminders were sent to providers.

**2F-4. Describe any change in methodology from your sheltered PIT count in 2015 to 2016, including any change in sampling or extrapolation method, if applicable. Do not include information on changes to the implementation of your sheltered PIT count methodology (e.g., enhanced training or change in partners participating in the PIT count). (limit 1000 characters)**

There were no substantial changes to the sheltered count methodology.

**2F-5. Did your CoC change its provider coverage in the 2016 sheltered count? No**

**2F-5a. If "Yes" in 2F-5, then describe the change in provider coverage in the 2016 sheltered count. (limit 750 characters)**

There were no substantial changes to the implementation of the sheltered PIT count.

## 2G. Continuum of Care (CoC) Sheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Data Quality

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2G-1. Indicate the methods used to ensure the quality of the data collected during the sheltered PIT count:**

Training:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Follow-up:	<input type="checkbox"/>
HMIS:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Non-HMIS de-duplication techniques:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2G-2. Describe any change to the way your CoC implemented its sheltered PIT count from 2015 to 2016 that would change data quality, including changes to training volunteers and inclusion of any partner agencies in the sheltered PIT count planning and implementation, if applicable. Do not include information on changes to actual sheltered PIT count methodology (e.g. change in sampling or extrapolation methods). (limit 1000 characters)**

There were no substantive changes in implementing the sheltered count; the CoC has used the HMIS for several years in reporting sheltered homeless.

## **2H. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count**

### **Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**HUD requires CoCs to conduct an unsheltered PIT count every 2 years (biennially) during the last 10 days in January; however, HUD also strongly encourages CoCs to conduct the unsheltered PIT count annually at the same time that they conduct annual sheltered PIT counts. HUD required CoCs to conduct the last biennial PIT count during the last 10 days in January 2015.**

**2H-1. Did the CoC approve the final unsheltered PIT count methodology for the most recent unsheltered PIT count?** Yes

**2H-2. Indicate the date of the most recent unsheltered PIT count (mm/dd/yyyy):** 01/29/2015

**2H-2a. If the CoC conducted the unsheltered PIT count outside of the last 10 days of January 2016, or most recent count, was an exception granted by HUD?** Not Applicable

**2H-3. Enter the date the CoC submitted the unsheltered PIT count data in HDX (mm/dd/yyyy):** 05/14/2015

## 2I. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Methods

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2I-1. Indicate the methods used to count unsheltered homeless persons during the 2016 or most recent PIT count:**

Night of the count - complete census:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Night of the count - known locations:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Night of the count - random sample:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service-based count:	<input type="checkbox"/>
HMIS:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2I-2. Provide a brief description of your CoC's unsheltered PIT count methodology and describe why your CoC selected this unsheltered PIT count methodology. (limit 1000 characters)**

The last unsheltered PIT count occurred in 2015 due to lack of local resources to conduct an annual unsheltered count. A combination of “night of count” and service providers methodology was used because of the urban/rural mix in the CoC. Extensive outreach to unsheltered families and individuals prior to the count was to ensure as many people as possible were aware of Homeless Connection events hosted throughout the CoC; teams consisting of outreach workers from a variety of agencies canvassed known encampments and areas of homeless activity and collect survey information. Surveys were only conducted for those who self-identified as meeting the definition of unsheltered homeless. All identified unsheltered homeless were interviewed seeking basic personal and demographic information. Organizations that have regular contact with the homeless during the time of the count were also provided surveys to administer to homeless households, ensuring coverage was as complete as possible.

**2I-3. Describe any change in methodology from your unsheltered PIT count in 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015) to 2016, including any change in sampling or extrapolation method, if applicable. Do not include information on changes to implementation of your sheltered PIT count methodology (e.g., enhanced training or change in partners participating in the count). (limit 1000 characters)**

There were no substantial changes in the methodology between the last two unsheltered counts.

**2I-4. Has the CoC taken extra measures to identify unaccompanied homeless youth in the PIT count?** Yes

**2I-4a. If the response in 2I-4 was "no" describe any extra measures that are being taken to identify youth and what the CoC is doing for homeless youth. (limit 1000 characters)**

## 2J. Continuum of Care (CoC) Unsheltered Point-in-Time (PIT) Count: Data Quality

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**2J-1. Indicate the steps taken by the CoC to ensure the quality of the data collected for the 2016 unsheltered PIT count:**

Training:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
"Blitz" count:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unique identifier:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Survey questions:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Enumerator observation:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2J-2. Describe any change to the way the CoC implemented the unsheltered PIT count from 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015) to 2016 that would affect data quality. This includes changes to training volunteers and inclusion of any partner agencies in the unsheltered PIT count planning and implementation, if applicable. Do not include information on changes in actual methodology (e.g. change in sampling or extrapolation method). (limit 1000 characters)**

Utilizing past experience, the CoC improved efforts to engage community organizations, including law enforcement agencies, faith organizations, and other non-CoC service providers to implement the 2015 unsheltered PIT count. More volunteers were able to engage in "blitz"-style census taking in places where the homeless were known to congregate and seek assistance, more non-CoC agencies that offer support services were able to participate, and more outreach was conducted to alert homeless families and individuals to attend connection-style events at various locations throughout the CoC. This increased



coordination and a concurrent emphasis on training of volunteers led to a significant increase in the number of unsheltered homeless counted in 2015 compared to 2013.

## 3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance

### Instructions

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

### 3A-1. Performance Measure: Number of Persons Homeless - Point-in-Time Count.

#### \* 3A-1a. Change in PIT Counts of Sheltered and Unsheltered Homeless Persons

Using the table below, indicate the number of persons who were homeless at a Point-in-Time (PIT) based on the 2015 and 2016 PIT counts as recorded in the Homelessness Data Exchange (HDX).

	2015 PIT (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016 PIT	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons	1,436	1,780	344
Emergency Shelter Total	628	609	-19
Safe Haven Total	0	0	0
Transitional Housing Total	545	636	91
Total Sheltered Count	1,173	1,245	72
Total Unsheltered Count	263	535	272

#### 3A-1b. Number of Sheltered Persons Homeless - HMIS.

Using HMIS data, enter the number of homeless persons who were served in a sheltered environment between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015 for each category provided.

	Between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015
Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons	4,097
Emergency Shelter Total	3,349
Safe Haven Total	0
Transitional Housing Total	748

### 3A-2. Performance Measure: First Time Homeless.

Describe the CoC's efforts to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless for the first time. Specifically, describe what the CoC is doing to identify risk factors of becoming homeless.

**(limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC collaborates with CoC subrecipients and other homeless service providers to identify risk factors for homelessness using HMIS data, interviews with providers, client surveys, and qualitative client feedback. Organizations providing homelessness prevention share data regarding their clients' situations and needs, and are also extensively interviewed to determine prevalent risk factors. The CoC committee on prevention & diversion has been reviewing best practices for preventing first-time homelessness. The CoC has established diversion and prevention programs through the coordinated entry system with emergency shelters and other point-of-contact service providers, wherein households meeting the criteria for less-intensive assistance are directed to homeless prevention. The CoC also works with agencies that provide services to homeless and services to at-risk-of-becoming-homeless households to identify appropriate resources to prevent homelessness.

**3A-3. Performance Measure: Length of Time Homeless.**

**Describe the CoC's efforts to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless. Specifically, describe how your CoC has reduced the average length of time homeless, including how the CoC identifies and houses individuals and families with the longest lengths of time homeless.**

**(limit 1000 characters)**

Strategies for reducing time households are homeless include using coordinated entry to reduce time between contact with households and providing assistance, assessing client needs in a timely manner, improving case management at shelters, establishing multiple points of entry for homeless households throughout the CoC, having outreach workers connect homeless to housing providers, implementing housing first policies for all projects and converting transitional housing projects to rapid re-housing. CoC subrecipients and other service providers collaborate to enact strategies and achieve system-wide performance goals related to time spent homeless. The CoC HMIS tracks all identified homeless households, providing data on frequency and length of time homeless. Specific HMIS reports also track recidivism. The CoC also prioritizes assistance for chronically homeless households and households with recurrent homelessness, multiple homeless incidents, and long periods of homelessness.

**\* 3A-4. Performance Measure: Successful Permanent Housing Placement or Retention.**

**In the next two questions, CoCs must indicate the success of its projects in placing persons from its projects into permanent housing.**

**3A-4a. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations:  
Fill in the chart to indicate the extent to which projects exit program**

FY2016 CoC Application	Page 35	09/06/2016
------------------------	---------	------------

**participants into permanent housing (subsidized or non-subsidized) or the retention of program participants in CoC Program-funded permanent supportive housing.**

	Between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015
Universe: Persons in SSO, TH and PH-RRH who exited	936
Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those exited to permanent destinations?	474
% Successful Exits	50.64%

**3A-4b. Exit To or Retention Of Permanent Housing:**  
**In the chart below, CoCs must indicate the number of persons who exited from any CoC funded permanent housing project, except rapid re-housing projects, to permanent housing destinations or retained their permanent housing between October 1, 2014 and September 31, 2015.**

	Between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015
Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH	474
Of the persons in the Universe above, indicate how many of those remained in applicable PH projects and how many of those exited to permanent destinations?	460
% Successful Retentions/Exits	97.05%

**3A-5. Performance Measure: Returns to Homelessness: Describe the CoCs efforts to reduce the rate of individuals and families who return to homelessness. Specifically, describe strategies your CoC has implemented to identify and minimize returns to homelessness, and demonstrate the use of HMIS or a comparable database to monitor and record returns to homelessness. (limit 1000 characters)**

Of the 935 persons exiting homelessness to permanent housing, based on HMIS data, 12 percent had another episode of homelessness within 24 months. All ES providers enter data into HMIS. If a household returns to homelessness, that household is identified by HMIS as a repeat homeless household and is prioritized for assistance by appropriate housing and services. The CoC also has designed reports to track overall recidivism rates of participant households. The CoC minimizes returns to homelessness by: utilizing extended case management for rapid re-housing and homelessness prevention clients after financial assistance has ended; working with transitional housing clients to establish household budgets, including savings accounts, and plans to increase income before program discharge; linking permanent supportive housing clients with mainstream support (mental health counseling, substance abuse counseling, SSI) that contribute to household stability even if households leave a project.

**3A-6. Performance Measure: Job and Income Growth. Performance Measure: Job and Income Growth. Describe the CoC's**

**specific strategies to assist CoC Program-funded projects to increase program participants' cash income from employment and non-employment non-cash sources.  
(limit 1000 characters)**

CoC-funded TH and RRH programs have a focus on increasing earned income and primarily partner with WorkNet as part of the CalWORKS program and the state run Employment Development Department. CoC-funded programs also partner with private staffing and temporary employment agencies that can help find suitable employment for clients of CoC housing assistance programs. These organizations work with clients to build resumes, enhance job skills, and place them with employers. All CoC programs (100%) have relationships with organizations that work with CoC clients to increase their earned income or provide employment readiness services as part of their case management strategies.

**3A-6a. Describe how the CoC is working with mainstream employment organizations to aid homeless individuals and families in increasing their income.  
(limit 1000 characters)**

CoC-funded TH and RRH programs have a focus on increasing earned income and primarily partner with WorkNet as part of the CalWORKS program and the state run Employment Development Department. CoC-funded programs also partner with private staffing and temporary employment agencies that can help find suitable employment for clients of CoC housing assistance programs. These organizations work with clients to build resumes, enhance job skills, and place them with employers. All CoC programs have relationships with organizations that work with CoC clients to increase their earned income or provide employment readiness services as part of their case management strategies.

**3A-7. What was the the criteria and decision-making process the CoC used to identify and exclude specific geographic areas from the CoC's unsheltered PIT count?  
(limit 1000 characters)**

Agencies with active outreach teams participate in CoC meetings and contribute data to the CoC-wide HMIS. This informal sharing of information and formal sharing of data via the HMIS form the foundation of the CoC's ability to track unsheltered homeless, and to track them in their locations as encountered by outreach teams and as they contact service providers and support services. Outreach teams that travel throughout the CoC, especially in areas identified as frequent sites of congregation for homeless, on a daily basis offer support services such as medical and mental health care. These outreach teams also connect individuals and families directly with housing services, including but not limited to emergency shelter, rapid re-housing, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing. Outreach workers directly put homeless households in contact with housing providers to expedite their placement into housing, and housing providers regularly participate directly in outreach.

**3A-7a. Did the CoC completely exclude** No

**geographic areas from the the most recent PIT count (i.e., no one counted there and, for communities using samples the area was excluded from both the sample and extrapolation) where the CoC determined that there were no unsheltered homeless people, including areas that are uninhabitable (e.g. disasters)?**

**3A-7b. Did the CoC completely exclude geographic areas from the the most recent PIT count (i.e., no one counted there and, for communities using samples the area was excluded from both the sample and extrapolation) where the CoC determined that there were no unsheltered homeless people, including areas that are uninhabitable (e.g. deserts, wilderness, etc.)?  
(limit 1000 characters)**

While the CoC extends PIT outreach to urban centers within the CoC, limited resources meant covering all areas of the CoC (including a vast river delta and farmland) was not feasible. Feedback from previous PITs — as well as input from homeless service providers, agencies with active outreach programs, mainstream resources, and law enforcement officials with a knowledge of the movement and living locations of homeless households — were used to set criteria for exclusion of certain areas from the unsheltered PIT count. It was determined that the following criteria were typical of places not inhabited by the homeless, and areas characterized by the criteria could be excluded from the most intensive part of the PIT: lack of land access, lack of food/water resources, lack of urban or suburban centers, lack of accessible transportation, lack of support services. Outreach teams active in these areas before the PIT were instructed to engage homeless households and include them in the PIT.

**3A-8. Enter the date the CoC submitted the system performance measure data into HDX. The System Performance Report generated by HDX must be attached.  
(mm/dd/yyyy)** 07/21/2016

**3A-8a. If the CoC was unable to submit their System Performance Measures data to HUD via the HDX by the deadline, explain why and describe what specific steps they are taking to ensure they meet the next HDX submission deadline for System Performance Measures data.  
(limit 1500 characters)**

not applicable

## 3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

### Objective 1: Ending Chronic Homelessness

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**To end chronic homelessness by 2017, HUD encourages three areas of focus through the implementation of Notice CPD 14-012: Prioritizing Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness in Permanent Supportive Housing and Recordkeeping Requirements for Documenting Chronic Homeless Status.**

1. Targeting persons with the highest needs and longest histories of homelessness for existing and new permanent supportive housing;
2. Prioritizing chronically homeless individuals, youth and families who have the longest histories of homelessness; and
3. The highest needs for new and turnover units.

**3B-1.1. Compare the total number of chronically homeless persons, which includes persons in families, in the CoC as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015).**

	2015 (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered chronically homeless persons	204	249	45
Sheltered Count of chronically homeless persons	137	39	-98
Unsheltered Count of chronically homeless persons	67	210	143

**3B-1.1a. Using the "Differences" calculated in question 3B-1.1 above, explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the overall TOTAL number of chronically homeless persons in the CoC, as well as the change in the unsheltered count, as reported in the PIT count in 2016 compared to 2015. (limit 1000 characters)**

The reduction of sheltered chronically homeless is due to coordinated entry and improved efforts to assess individual needs, identify CH individuals in shelters, and rapidly connect them to permanent housing. This rapid re-housing ability reduces the number of CH individuals in shelters at any one time. A loss of emergency shelter beds, reducing the community’s capacity to shelter homeless individuals has also minimally contributed to an increase in counted unsheltered CH individuals. The increase in unsheltered CH is primarily attributable to a more robust PIT count in 2015, which featured enhanced street outreach and improved coordination with non-CoC entities. It should be noted that the unsheltered CH count is only a best estimate based on answers from surveys of individuals, not from a verifiable timeline related to length and number of times homeless or clinical assessment of disability necessary to meet the definition of “chronically homeless.”

**3B-1.2. Compare the total number of PSH beds (CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded) that were identified as dedicated for use by chronically homeless persons on the 2016 Housing Inventory Count, as compared to those identified on the 2015 Housing Inventory Count.**

	2015	2016	Difference
Number of CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded PSH beds dedicated for use by chronically homelessness persons identified on the HIC.	211	278	67

**3B-1.2a. Explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the total number of PSH beds (CoC program funded or non-CoC Program funded) that were identified as dedicated for use by chronically homeless persons on the 2016 Housing Inventory Count compared to those identified on the 2015 Housing Inventory Count. (limit 1000 characters)**

CoC funded PSH projects have been giving priority, as specified in the written standards, to chronically homeless households.

**3B-1.3. Did the CoC adopt the Orders of Priority into their standards for all CoC Program funded PSH as described in Notice CPD-14-012: Prioritizing Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness in Permanent Supportive Housing and Recordkeeping Requirements for Documenting Chronic Homeless Status?** Yes

**3B-1.3a. If “Yes” was selected for question 3B-1.3, attach a copy of the CoC’s written standards or other evidence that clearly shows the incorporation of the Orders of Priority in Notice CPD 14-012 and indicate** 6,7



**the page(s) for all documents where the Orders of Priority are found.**

**3B-1.4. Is the CoC on track to meet the goal of ending chronic homelessness by 2017? No**

This question will not be scored.

**3B-1.4a. If the response to question 3B-1.4 was “Yes” what are the strategies that have been implemented by the CoC to maximize current resources to meet this goal? If “No” was selected, what resources or technical assistance will be implemented by the CoC to reach to goal of ending chronically homelessness by 2017? (limit 1000 characters)**

Although the CoC as an entity has adopted the goals of “Opening Doors,” the various governmental entities within the CoC geographic area have yet to agree on a single plan to address chronic homelessness. Providers have increased street and shelter outreach, worked to link outreach to SOAR, and utilize coordinated assessment for new project openings; the CoC provides a scoring preference to projects that prioritize or dedicate CH beds; new partnerships with the Housing Authority seek to expand housing opportunities for CH. The primary barrier to achieving this goal is the identification of other resources to provide housing and support services, including the provision of match, and to engage local government. Reallocation of existing resources would be insufficient to meet the need and would severely exacerbate the plight of homeless households with children that do not meet the definition of being chronically homeless.

## 3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

### 3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Strategic Planning Objectives

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**HUD will evaluate CoC's based on the extent to which they are making progress to achieve the goal of ending homelessness among households with children by 2020.**

**3B-2.1. What factors will the CoC use to prioritize households with children during the FY2016 Operating year? (Check all that apply).**

Vulnerability to victimization:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of previous homeless episodes:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unsheltered homelessness:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Criminal History:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bad credit or rental history (including not having been a leaseholder):	<input type="checkbox"/>
Head of household has mental/physical disabilities:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3B-2.2. Describe the CoC's strategies including concrete steps to rapidly rehouse every household with children within 30 days of those families becoming homeless. (limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC coordinated assessment and entry plan calls for all families to be assessed within 7 days of entry, and for referrals to be made to appropriate housing services based on the assessment. The CoC has shifted resources from TH projects to RRH projects to facilitate movement to permanent housing. CoC resources have been coordinated with ESG rapid re-housing efforts to maximize the number of households that can be assisted. RRH projects conduct direct outreach to ES providers. Standardized assessment identifies households with the greatest need and RRH providers are committed to housing first principles to reduce barriers to entry and assistance. RRH and PH providers utilize a network of over 200 landlords to identify scattered site properties as possible housing locations. The current median length of stay in ES is 26 days.

**3B-2.3. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve families from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.**

	2015	2016	Difference
RRH units available to serve families in the HIC:	0	13	13

**3B-2.4. How does the CoC ensure that emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent housing (PSH and RRH) providers within the CoC do not deny admission to or separate any family members from other members of their family based on age, sex, gender or disability when entering shelter or housing? (check all strategies that apply)**

CoC policies and procedures prohibit involuntary family separation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
There is a method for clients to alert CoC when involuntarily separated:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CoC holds trainings on preventing involuntary family separation, at least once a year:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3B-2.5. Compare the total number of homeless households with children in the CoC as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015).**

**PIT Count of Homelessness Among Households With Children**

	2015 (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016	Difference
--	--	------	------------

Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless households with children:	751	833	82
Sheltered Count of homeless households with children:	703	785	82
Unsheltered Count of homeless households with children:	48	48	0

**3B-2.5a. Explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the total number of homeless households with children in the CoC as reported in the 2016 PIT count compared to the 2015 PIT count. (limit 1000 characters)**

- The modest increase in the number of sheltered homeless households with children between 2015 and 2016 is due to a number of factors, including: the opening of an additional 12-bed domestic violence shelter; units under renovation in 2015 being open in 2016; and a precipitous increase in rents within the CoC area that has caused low-income households to experience a general increase in housing instability. While PiT methodology remained constant, there was improved and more complete reporting of beds by non-CoC, non-HMIS transitional housing providers that were contacted as part of the PiT count.
- There was no unsheltered count conducted in 2016 due to constraints on local resources. The next unsheltered count will be conducted in 2017.

**3B-2.6. From the list below select the strategies to the CoC uses to address the unique needs of unaccompanied homeless youth including youth under age 18, and youth ages 18-24, including the following.**

Human trafficking and other forms of exploitation?	Yes
LGBTQ 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
Unaccompanied minors/youth below the age of 18?	Yes

**3B-2.6a. Select all strategies that the CoC uses to address homeless youth trafficking and other forms of exploitation.**

Diversion from institutions and decriminalization of youth actions that stem from being trafficked:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increase housing and service options for youth fleeing or attempting to flee trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specific sampling methodology for enumerating and characterizing local youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Cross systems strategies to quickly identify and prevent occurrences of youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Community awareness training concerning youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3B-2.7. What factors will the CoC use to prioritize unaccompanied youth including youth under age 18, and youth ages 18-24 for housing and services during the FY 2016 operating year? (Check all that apply)**

Vulnerability to victimization:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Length of time homeless:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unsheltered homelessness:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lack of access to family and community support networks:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3B-2.8. Using HMIS, compare all unaccompanied youth including youth under age 18, and youth ages 18-24 served in any HMIS contributing program who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry in FY 2014 (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) and FY 2015 (October 1, 2014 - September 30, 2015).**

	FY 2014 (October 1, 2013 - September 30, 2014)	FY 2015 (October 1, 2014 - September 30, 2105)	Difference
Total number of unaccompanied youth served in HMIS contributing programs who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry:	32	57	25

**3B-2.8a. If the number of unaccompanied youth and children, and youth-headed households with children served in any HMIS contributing program who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry in FY 2015 is lower than FY 2014 explain why.**

**(limit 1000 characters)**

**3B-2.9. Compare funding for youth homelessness in the CoC's geographic area in CY 2016 and CY 2017.**

	Calendar Year 2016	Calendar Year 2017	Difference
Overall funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects (CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded):	\$851,418.00	\$851,418.00	\$0.00
CoC Program funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects:	\$407,889.00	\$407,889.00	\$0.00
Non-CoC funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects (e.g. RHY or other Federal, State and Local funding):	\$443,529.00	\$443,529.00	\$0.00

**3B-2.10. To what extent have youth services and educational representatives, and CoC representatives participated in each other's meetings between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016?**

Cross-Participation in Meetings	# Times
CoC meetings or planning events attended by LEA or SEA representatives:	4
LEA or SEA meetings or planning events (e.g. those about child welfare, juvenile justice or out of school time) attended by CoC representatives:	8
CoC meetings or planning events attended by youth housing and service providers (e.g. RHY providers):	6

**3B-2.10a. Based on the responses in 3B-2.10, describe in detail how the CoC collaborates with the McKinney-Vento local educational authorities and school districts.  
(limit 1000 characters)**

CoC representatives work with local education/homelessness liaisons to ensure systems and communication channels are in place to rapidly connect students experiencing homelessness or who are at the risk of homelessness with resources to allow them to become or remain housed. Local education/homelessness liaisons are able to directly contact CoC- and ESG funded programs that participate in the coordinated entry process so affected students and families are connected with appropriate emergency, preventative, and remedial services. Local education/homelessness liaisons provide input for CoC program and initiative planning purposes. Individual providers within the CoC also meet with education officials/homelessness liaisons regarding specific issues and connecting students and their families with housing and resources.

**3B-2.11. How does the CoC make sure that homeless individuals and families who become homeless are informed of their eligibility for and receive access to educational services? Include the policies and procedures that homeless service providers (CoC and ESG Programs) are**

**required to follow.  
(limit 2000 characters)**

Case managers of CoC-funded programs are required to ensure program participants of school age are enrolled in schools and are attending on a regular basis. School attendance is a priority achievement for families with children and unaccompanied youth who are assisted by CoC programs and is incorporated into self-sufficiency plans. ESG-funded rapid re-housing and homelessness prevention programs also place emphasis on ensuring school-age children are enrolled in school. Both CoC and ESG housing programs attempt to help families locate housing that accommodates the school needs of children in the households. ESG-funded emergency shelter providers inform each family of school-age children that they are expected to continue attending school and provide information regarding resources to help them continue to attend school during their stay in an emergency shelter.

RHY and child welfare agencies have been incorporated into the coordinated entry system. The CoC engages on at least a quarterly basis RHY agencies, organizations that serve foster youth, and agencies that serve victims of child abuse to update information about direct referral to CoC and ESG programs.

**3B-2.12. Does the CoC or any HUD-funded projects within the CoC have any written agreements with a program that services infants, toddlers, and youth children, such as Head Start; Child Care and Development Fund; Healthy Start; Maternal, Infant, Early Childhood Home Visiting programs; Public Pre-K; and others?  
(limit 1000 characters)**

Head Start has written agreements with, and provides services in conjunction with, New Directions, St. Mary's Interfaith, and Housing Authority of the County of San Joaquin.

## 3B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Performance and Strategic Planning Objectives

### Objective 3: Ending Veterans Homelessness

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**Opening Doors outlines the goal of ending Veteran homelessness by the end of 2016. The following questions focus on the various strategies that will aid communities in meeting this goal.**

**3B-3.1. Compare the total number of homeless Veterans in the CoC as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT count compared to 2015 (or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015).**

	2015 (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016	Difference
Universe: Total PIT count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless veterans:	144	158	14
Sheltered count of homeless veterans:	83	97	14
Unsheltered count of homeless veterans:	61	61	0

**3B-3.1a. Explain the reason(s) for any increase, or no change in the total number of homeless veterans in the CoC as reported in the 2016 PIT count compared to the 2015 PIT count. (limit 1000 characters)**

The reduction in the number of sheltered veterans between 2015 and 2016 is primarily attributable to the work of local SSVF projects that successfully and rapidly link veterans to HUD-VASH vouchers and veteran services, including rapid re-housing programs. A reduction in overall shelter beds for single individuals also reduced the number of people counted at any point in time. There was no unsheltered count conducted in 2016 due to constraints on local resources. The next unsheltered count will be conducted in 2017.

**3B-3.2. Describe how the CoC identifies, assesses, and refers homeless veterans who are eligible for Veterean's Affairs services and housing to**



**appropriate resources such as HUD-VASH and SSVF.  
(limit 1000 characters)**

Street outreach projects identify homeless veterans by through engagement activities with individuals encountered and utilize coordinated entry to facilitate connection with available projects. Two local SSVF projects conduct direct outreach to homeless veterans and one utilizes the coordinated entry system. The VA conducts direct outreach to shelters and street locations to identify HUD-VASH eligible households. The County Office of Veterans Affairs makes referrals. The Housing Authority hosts weekly sessions where veterans can make direct contact with the VA. CoC and HMIS-active organizations utilize the coordinated entry to determine veteran status so that there can be linkages to appropriate services. Coordinated entry ensures initial point of referral when veterans are involved is to SSVF and VA programs; VA benefit providers work with veterans to determine eligibility for specific projects. Veterans can also be referred to CoC and HMIS-active service providers for services.

**3B-3.3. Compare the total number of homeless Veterans in the CoC and the total number of unsheltered homeless Veterans in the CoC, as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT Count compared to the 2010 PIT Count (or 2009 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2010).**

	2010 (or 2009 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2010)	2016	% Difference
Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless veterans:	101	97	-3.96%
Unsheltered Count of homeless veterans:	36	36	0.00%

**3B-3.4. Indicate from the dropdown whether you are on target to end Veteran homelessness by the end of 2016.** No

This question will not be scored.

**3B-3.4a. If "Yes", what are the strategies being used to maximize your current resources to meet this goal? If "No" what resources or technical assistance would help you reach the goal of ending Veteran homelessness by the end of 2016?  
(limit 1000 characters)**

The CoC acknowledges homelessness among veterans as a priority issue, though in this CoC the number of sheltered and unsheltered homeless veterans has always been a substantially lower number and percentage than in many other communities. Despite CoC efforts to incorporate them into the HMIS, not all VA funded SSVF projects enter HMIS data directly into the HMIS and not all non-CoC outreach efforts enter HMIS data, creating a situation where the CoC lacks the capacity to identify and track all unsheltered homeless veterans within

the CoC, though it does have reliable information on sheltered homeless veterans, who comprise 10% of the sheltered homeless population; in the 2015 unsheltered count, 12% of those counted identified as veterans. While the CoC has the capacity to shelter and house veterans who contact the CoC for services, the CoC needs additional resources to accurately identify and connect all unsheltered homeless veterans to those services.

## 4A. Accessing Mainstream Benefits

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**4A-1. Does the CoC systematically provide information to provider staff about mainstream benefits, including up-to-date resources on eligibility and program changes that can affect homeless clients?** Yes

**4A-2. Based on the CoC's FY 2016 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of projects have demonstrated they are assisting project participants to obtain mainstream benefits? This includes all of the following within each project: transportation assistance, use of a single application, annual follow-ups with participants, and SOAR-trained staff technical assistance to obtain SSI/SSDI?**

### FY 2016 Assistance with Mainstream Benefits

Total number of project applications in the FY 2016 competition (new and renewal):	11
Total number of renewal and new project applications that demonstrate assistance to project participants to obtain mainstream benefits (i.e. In a Renewal Project Application, "Yes" is selected for Questions 2a, 2b and 2c on Screen 4A. In a New Project Application, "Yes" is selected for Questions 5a, 5b, 5c, 6, and 6a on Screen 4A).	11
Percentage of renewal and new project applications in the FY 2016 competition that have demonstrated assistance to project participants to obtain mainstream benefits:	100%

**4A-3. List the organizations (public, private, non-profit and other) that you collaborate with to facilitate health insurance enrollment, (e.g., Medicaid, Medicare, Affordable Care Act options) for program participants. For each organization you partner with, detail the specific outcomes resulting from the partnership in the establishment of benefits. (limit 1000 characters)**

The common intake form used by all CoC and ESG funded projects identifies households who do not have health insurance and make referrals to partners that facilitate enrollments such as CARE-LINK, Behavioral Health Services, Council for the Spanish Speaking, Community Partnership for Families, Catholic Charities, San Joaquin General Hospital, Human Services Agency. Eighty-five percent of enrollees in TH, RRH and PSH have health insurance at entry; TH, RRH and PSH projects report that at exit 100% of those eligible had obtained healthcare coverage. San Joaquin Human Services Agency reports that since

the advent of ACA, nearly 100,000 more people have access to healthcare in the CoC.

**4A-4. What are the primary ways the CoC ensures that program participants with health insurance are able to effectively utilize the healthcare benefits available to them?**

<b>Educational materials:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>In-Person Trainings:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Transportation to medical appointments:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Not Applicable or None:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 4B. Additional Policies

**Instructions:**

For guidance on completing this form, please reference the FY 2016 CoC Application Detailed Instructions and the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA. Please submit technical questions to the HUD Exchange Ask A Question.

**4B-1. Based on the CoCs FY 2016 new and renewal project applications, what percentage of Permanent Housing (PSH and RRH), Transitional Housing (TH), and SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) projects in the CoC are low barrier?**

### FY 2016 Low Barrier Designation

Total number of PH (PSH and RRH), TH and non-Coordinated Entry SSO project applications in the FY 2016 competition (new and renewal):	11
Total number of PH (PSH and RRH), TH and non-Coordinated Entry SSO renewal and new project applications that selected "low barrier" in the FY 2016 competition:	11
Percentage of PH (PSH and RRH), TH and non-Coordinated Entry SSO renewal and new project applications in the FY 2016 competition that will be designated as "low barrier":	100%

**4B-2. What percentage of CoC Program-funded Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), SSO (non-Coordinated Entry) and Transitional Housing (TH) FY 2016 Projects have adopted a Housing First approach, meaning that the project quickly houses clients without preconditions or service participation requirements?**

### FY 2016 Projects Housing First Designation

Total number of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, and TH project applications in the FY 2016 competition (new and renewal):	11
Total number of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, and TH renewal and new project applications that selected Housing First in the FY 2016 competition:	11
Percentage of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, and TH renewal and new project applications in the FY 2016 competition that will be designated as Housing First:	100%

**4B-3. What has the CoC done to ensure awareness of and access to housing and supportive services within the CoC's geographic area to persons that could benefit from CoC-funded programs but are not currently participating in a CoC funded program? In particular, how does the CoC reach out to for persons that are least likely to request housing or services in the absence of special outreach?**

Direct outreach and marketing:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 0 auto;">X</div>
--------------------------------	---

Use of phone or internet-based services like 211:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marketing in languages commonly spoken in the community:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Making physical and virtual locations accessible to those with disabilities:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**4B-4. Compare the number of RRH units available to serve populations from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.**

	2015	2016	Difference
RRH units available to serve all populations in the HIC:	7	28	21

**4B-5. Are any new proposed project applications requesting \$200,000 or more in funding for housing rehabilitation or new construction?** No

**4B-6. If "Yes" in Questions 4B-5, then describe the activities that the project(s) will undertake to ensure that employment, training and other economic opportunities are directed to low or very low income persons to comply with section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701u) (Section 3) and HUD's implementing rules at 24 CFR part 135? (limit 1000 characters)**

**4B-7. Is the CoC requesting to designate one or more of its SSO or TH projects to serve families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes?** No

**4B-7a. If "Yes", to question 4B-7, describe how the use of grant funds to serve such persons is of equal or greater priority than serving persons defined as homeless in accordance with 24 CFR 578.89. Description must**

include whether or not this is listed as a priority in the Consolidated Plan(s) and its CoC strategic plan goals. CoCs must attach the list of projects that would be serving this population (up to 10 percent of CoC total award) and the applicable portions of the Consolidated Plan. (limit 2500 characters)

4B-8. Has the project been affected by a major disaster, as declared by the President Obama under Title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended (Public Law 93-288) in the 12 months prior to the opening of the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition? No

4B-8a. If "Yes" in Question 4B-8, describe the impact of the natural disaster on specific projects in the CoC and how this affected the CoC's ability to address homelessness and provide the necessary reporting to HUD. (limit 1500 characters)

4B-9. Did the CoC or any of its CoC program recipients/subrecipients request technical assistance from HUD since the submission of the FY 2015 application? This response does not affect the scoring of this application. No

4B-9a. If "Yes" to Question 4B-9, check the box(es) for which technical assistance was requested.

This response does not affect the scoring of this application.

CoC Governance:	<input type="checkbox"/>
CoC Systems Performance Measurement:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinated Entry:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data reporting and data analysis:	<input type="checkbox"/>
HMIS:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Homeless subpopulations targeted by Opening Doors: veterans, chronic, children and families, and unaccompanied youth:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maximizing the use of mainstream resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Retooling transitional housing:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rapid re-housing:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under-performing program recipient, subrecipient or project:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable:	<input type="checkbox"/>

**4B-9b. Indicate the type(s) of Technical Assistance that was provided, using the categories listed in 4B-9a, provide the month and year the CoC Program recipient or sub-recipient received the assistance and the value of the Technical Assistance to the CoC/recipient/sub recipient involved given the local conditions at the time, with 5 being the highest value and a 1 indicating no value.**

Type of Technical Assistance Received	Date Received	Rate the Value of the Technical Assistance



## 4C. 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>

Document Type	Required?	Document Description	Date Attached
01. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Evidence of the CoC's communication to rejected participants	Yes	Rjected applications	08/26/2016
02. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Public Posting Evidence	Yes		
03. CoC Rating and Review Procedure (e.g. RFP)	Yes	Project scoring c...	08/26/2016
04. CoC's Rating and Review Procedure: Public Posting Evidence	Yes		
05. CoCs Process for Reallocating	Yes	Reallocation	08/26/2016
06. CoC's Governance Charter	Yes	CoC governance	08/26/2016
07. HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual	Yes	HMIS policies & p...	08/26/2016
08. Applicable Sections of Con Plan to Serving Persons Defined as Homeless Under Other Fed Statutes	No		
09. PHA Administration Plan (Applicable Section(s) Only)	Yes	PHA preferences	08/26/2016
10. CoC-HMIS MOU (if referenced in the CoC's Governance Charter)	No		
11. CoC Written Standards for Order of Priority	No	CoC project stand...	08/26/2016
12. Project List to Serve Persons Defined as Homeless under Other Federal Statutes (if applicable)	No		
13. HDX-system Performance Measures	Yes	HDX System Perfor...	08/05/2016
14. Other	No		
15. Other	No		

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** Rjected applications

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** Project scoring criteria

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** Reallocation

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** CoC governance

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** HMIS policies & procedures

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** PHA preferences

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** CoC project standards

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:** HDX System Performance Measures report

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

## **Attachment Details**

**Document Description:**

All submitted project application were reviewed and ranked. No submitted project applications were rejected.

The CoC has rigorously reviewed all CoC-funded projects on an annual basis. Based on that continuing review, the CoC has not utilized the reallocation process because it has determined that while some projects within the CoC perform higher than others, all projects have been performing at or above performance standards established by HUD.

The CoC and providers have however used the grant amendment process to change transition-in-place projects to rapid re-housing projects utilizing housing first principles.

Using the grant amendment process, the percentage of ARD changed from TH to RRH has been 29 percent of the total ARD.

**From:** Carena Lane  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 16, 2016 10:50 AM  
**To:** 'Bill Mendelson' <[bmendelson@cvlihc.org](mailto:bmendelson@cvlihc.org)>  
**Cc:** Peter Ragsdale <[pragsdale@hacsj.com](mailto:pragsdale@hacsj.com)>  
**Subject:** CoC application

Bill,

Please find below the response to your questions. If you'd like to discuss further, let us know. We can arrange a conference call or an office meeting.

Thanks,

Carena Lane  
Director of Rental Assistance  
(209) 460-5026  
(209) 460-5126 (FAX)



\*\*\*\*\*

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This communication with its contents may contain confidential, private and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication. Further, if the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. (Revised 10/5/10)

As part of the Continuum of Care (CoC) application, we need to indicate whether the PHA has a homeless admission preference in its Public Housing and/or Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program.

**During this time period, the Housing Authority did not have a homeless admission preference for public housing or Housing Choice Voucher program.**

# Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

## 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.

	Universe (Persons)		Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)			Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)		
	Previous FY	Current FY	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
1.1 Persons in ES and SH		3349		67			27	
1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH		4097		139			49	

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.

	Universe (Persons)		Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)			Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)		
	Previous FY	Current FY	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
1.1 Persons in ES and SH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



# Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

## 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.

	Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0 - 180 days)		Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181 - 365 days)		Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)		Number of Returns in 2 Years	
		# of Returns	% of Returns	# of Returns	% of Returns	# of Returns	% of Returns	# of Returns	% of Returns
Exit was from SO	6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Exit was from ES	5	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	4	80%
Exit was from TH	155	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
Exit was from SH	0	0		0		0		0	
Exit was from PH	27	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%
TOTAL Returns to Homelessness	193	0	0%	3	2%	4	2%	7	4%

# Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

## Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons

### Metric 3.1 – Change in PIT Counts

This measures the change in PIT counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless person as reported on the PIT (not from HMIS).

	Previous FY PIT Count	2015 PIT Count	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons	1588	1708	120
Emergency Shelter Total	744	628	-116
Safe Haven Total	0	0	0
Transitional Housing Total	581	545	-36
Total Sheltered Count	1325	1173	-152
Unsheltered Count	263	535	272

### Metric 3.2 – Change in Annual Counts

This measures the change in annual counts of sheltered homeless persons in HMIS.

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons		4565	
Emergency Shelter Total		3831	
Safe Haven Total		0	
Transitional Housing Total		1035	

## 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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)		298	
Number of adults with increased earned income		0	
Percentage of adults who increased earned income		0%	

## Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Metric 4.2 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)		298	
Number of adults with increased non-employment cash income		3	
Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income		1%	

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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)		298	
Number of adults with increased total income		2	
Percentage of adults who increased total income		1%	

Metric 4.4 – Change in earned income for adult system leavers

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)		145	
Number of adults who exited with increased earned income		46	
Percentage of adults who increased earned income		32%	

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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)		145	
Number of adults who exited with increased non-employment cash income		63	
Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income		43%	

Metric 4.6 – Change in total income for adult system leavers

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)		145	
Number of adults who exited with increased total income		90	
Percentage of adults who increased total income		62%	

## Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

### 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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period.		3687	
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.		907	
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)		2780	

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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH, TH or PH during the reporting period.		3859	
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.		926	
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.)		2933	

### 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.

## Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

### 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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Persons who exit Street Outreach		396	
Of persons above, those who exited to temporary & some institutional destinations		62	
Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations		45	
% Successful exits		27%	

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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Persons in ES, SH, TH and PH-RRH who exited		3509	
Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations		795	
% Successful exits		23%	

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

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH		474	
Of persons above, those who remained in applicable PH projects and those who exited to permanent housing destinations		460	
% Successful exits/retention		97%	