CoCB Grant Committee
March 31st, 2017
11:00 AM – 12:30 PM
River Place Conference Room 3 - Polk County Health Services

Agenda
Welcome  Susan Minks=Lisa Crabb
15 Minutes  Review Performance Management Plan and LOI changes: Mark/Jim
   - PmP review comments
   - LOI review comments: CoCB Priorities section
     - Date to launch the LOI? Confirm in work team on April 7th.
   - Review reports with agencies at the April/May Directors Council

Summary on PmP and LOI:
The Performance Management Plan (PMP) begins by providing an introduction to and the basics of measuring project performance. The PMP then describes in detail the monitoring of project performance including the frequency of monitoring, the use of performance reports generated by HMIS as the basis for monitoring, and the providers responsibilities and meeting performance objectives. The PMP concludes with a detailed description of performance measures by project type.

Appendix A of the PMP is the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). The QIP begins with an introduction and overview of the quality improvement process followed by a description of the development and implementation of a QIP. The QIP concludes with a description of how a project's QIP will be monitored and evaluated as well as the impact of a QIP on project submission for the annual CoC application and biannual City of Des Moines ESG application.

45 Minutes  CoC Grant items:
   - AAQ Submitted asking to find out why scored the way we did, submitted question in packet.
   - 2016 PIT Commentary: We will review the 2 questions and commentary submitted.
   - Potential cuts and Funding Mix
   - House of Mercy and bed count: Email discussion in packet
   - YESS: Email and AAQs in packet
   - TA requested: Copy in packet
   - CISS: Changes to Length of Stay and First Work, in packet

15 minutes  Letter of Support Process/Criteria
   - Discuss what would need to be completed in order to be approved
• Participates in CoCB activities:
  o Member of the CoC
  o Regularly attend CoCB board meetings
  o Regularly attend CoCB committee meetings
  o Regularly attend Director's Council/Service meetings
  o Participates in Centralized Intake if funded
  o Participate in Point In Time
  o Serve a specific subpopulation
• CISS: 1 for Grant Per Diem and 1 for a HUD grant

15 Minutes Additional questions or items

Adjourn: 12:30 PM

Next Meeting – April 28th, 2017

Follow us:

• Facebook: facebook.com/polkcountycoc
• Twitter: @PCCOCB
• Website: www.polkcares.org
Polk County Continuum of Care
2017 HUD Continuum of Care Application

Letter of Interest

OVERVIEW

To assist in planning for the 2017 HUD Continuum of Care Application process, the Polk County Continuum of Care Board ("CoCB") is implementing a Letter of Interest (LOI) process. The LOI process will assist the Board in (1) understanding the expenditure rate and budgetary needs of existing projects and whether they will request renewal funding; and (2) requesting assistance in implementing new permanent housing projects needed to fill specific gaps in the local continuum using HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) permanent housing bonus funds or through reallocation of existing program funds.

If your organization is considering renewing an existing grant or submitting an application for a new permanent housing project, you must submit a non-binding LOI by email to Mark K. Phillips at m.phillips@pehsia.org no later than [time] on [day], [date]. LOI’s submitted after this deadline WILL NOT be accepted and the organization WILL NOT be considered for submitting a full project application for 2017 HUD CoC funds.

RENEWAL PROJECTS

Organizations with CoC-funded programs currently under contract with HUD must complete and submit the attached Letter of Interest – Renewal Projects in order for their project to be considered for inclusion in the Polk County Continuum of Care’s 2017 HUD CoC Application.

NEW PROJECTS

Organizations wishing to submit a new Permanent Supportive Housing or Rapid ReHousing project application must complete and submit the attached Letter of Interest – New Projects for their project to be considered for inclusion in the Polk County Continuum of Care’s 2017 HUD CoC Application.

A. To verify if your project is eligible, please review the 2016 HUD CoC NOFA:
http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/view-opportunity.html?oppId=285539

B. To be eligible for consideration, new bonus projects must:

1. Propose to serve chronically homeless individuals, unaccompanied youth, or families; or homeless individuals or families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, including persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of HUD’s definition of homelessness. (INSERT CoCB’S APPLICATION PRIORITIES)

2. Provide scattered-site leasing or tenant-based rental assistance or, if the applicant can provide a deed or long-term lease demonstrating site control for a building or units where evidence of site control exceeds the requested grant term, and where building or units are ready to be occupied no later than 6 months after award of funds, the applicant may instead request operating costs or project-based rental assistance.

3. Be submitted by a project applicant that is in good standing with HUD, which means that the project applicant does not have any open monitoring findings or history of slow expenditure of grant funds;

4. Demonstrate a plan for rapid implementation of the program. The project narrative must document how the project will be ready to begin housing the first program participant within 6 months of the award.

5. Demonstrate a connection to mainstream service systems.

6. Demonstrate that the type, scale, and location of the housing, as well as the type and scale of the supportive services, fit the needs of program participants.
(7) Demonstrate that program participants will be assisted to obtain and remain in permanent housing in a manner that fits their needs.
(8a) Demonstrate that 100% chronically homeless individuals and families will be served through new permanent supportive housing; or
(8b) Demonstrate that 100% homeless individuals and families coming directly from the streets or emergency shelters, including persons fleeing domestic violence situations and other persons meeting the criteria of paragraph (4) of the definition of homelessness will be served through new rapid rehousing projects. [IS THIS MATERIALLY DIFFERENT THAN (1) ABOVE?]
(9) Be a current participant or agree to participate in the CoCB’s coordinated assessment system.
(10) Provide a 25% match (cash or in-kind contributions) for all non-lease grant funds for which the applicant has applied.

Additionally, HUD will assess all new projects for the following minimum project eligibility, capacity, timeliness, and performance standards. To be considered as meeting project quality threshold, all new projects must meet all of the following criteria:

(a) Project applicants and potential sub-recipients must have satisfactory capacity, drawdowns, and performance for existing grant(s) that are funded under the SHP, S+C, or CoC Program, as evidenced by timely reimbursement of sub-recipients, regular drawdowns, and timely resolution of any monitoring findings.
(b) For expansion projects, project applicants must clearly articulate the part of the project that is being expanded. Additionally, the project applicants must clearly demonstrate that they are not replacing other funding sources.
(c) Project applicants must demonstrate they will be able to meet all timeliness standards per §578.85. Project applicants with existing projects must demonstrate that they have met all project renewal threshold requirements of this NOFA. HUD reserves the right to deny the funding request for a new project if the request is made by an existing recipient that HUD finds to have significant problems related to capacity, performance, or unresolved auditing or monitoring related to one or more existing grants, or does not routinely draw down funds from e-LOCCS at least once per quarter. Additionally, HUD reserves the right to withdraw funds if no APR is submitted on the prior grant. [WHAT HUD CONSIDERS A "SIGNIFICANT ISSUE" OR PROBLEM IS NOT A CLEAR STANDARD IF WE LATER NEED TO ENFORCE THIS PROVISION.]

The expected grant amount for the Permanent Housing Bonus will be up to five percent (5%) of the CoC Preliminary Pro Rata Need (PPRN), which totaled $156,036. in 2016. New project applications will be ranked by the CoCB Grant Committee with the current renewals.
Polk County Continuum of Care
2017 Continuum of Care Application

Letter of Interest – Renewal Project

ORGANIZATION
Name: ________________________________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________________________
City: ___________________________ State: _______ Zip: __________
Phone: _______________ Fax: _______________ Email: ____________________

CONTACT
Grant Contact Person: ________________________________________________
Phone: _______________ Email: _______________________________________
Agency Director: _____________________________________________________
Phone: _______________ Email: _______________________________________

PROJECT
HUD Grant Number: ________________________________
HUD Project Name: ________________________________________________
Project Address: ____________________________________________________
City: ___________________________ State: _______ Zip: __________
Program Type:
  _ PSH    _ RRH    _ TH    _ HMIS
Primary Population Served: __________________________________________
Unit Configuration (PSH and RRH):
  ____ 0 BR  ____ 1 BR  ____ 2 BR  ____ 3 BR  ____ 4 BR  ____Total
Total Number of Beds (TH): ________

ELIGIBILITY
Grant Expiration Date (mm/dd/yyyy): ________________________
Total Grant Amount: $____________
Amount of Grant Drawn Down: $____________
Date of Last Draw Down (mm/dd/yyyy): ________________

Centralized Intake Verification – This project accepts referrals exclusively from the CoCB Centralized Intake System and follows all policies and procedures of the CoCB Centralized Intake System.
   ___ Yes  ___ No

Housing First Verification – This project follows the CoCB’s Housing First policy.
   ___ Yes  ___ No

Are there any unresolved HUD monitoring findings, or outstanding audit findings related to this project? ___ Yes  ___ No  If “Yes,” briefly describe.

MODIFICATIONS

Have there been or will there be any significant changes in the project since the last funding approval? Check all that apply:

   ___ Number of persons served: from ____ to ____
   ___ Number of units: from ____ to ____
   ___ Number of beds: from ____ to ____
   ___ Location of project sites.
   ___ Line item or cost category budget changes more than 10%.
   ___ Change in project sponsor.
   ___ Change in component type.
   ___ Other: ___________________________________________________________

Please explain changes:

Person completing the Letter of Interest:

________________________________________________________________________
Name  Signature  Title

I certify, on behalf of my organization, that all information contained in this Letter of Interest is accurate and true to best of my knowledge and belief, and is consistent with my organization’s records. I understand and acknowledge that presenting false information or failing to provide accurate and complete information as required could have a negative impact on my organization’s application potentially including, but not limited to, rejection of my organization’s grant application.

_____________________________  __________________________
Executive Director/CEO/President  Date

Letter of Interest Submission: Please submit this LOI by email to Mark K. Phillips at m.phillips@pchsia.org no later than [time] on [day], [date]. LOI’s submitted after this deadline WILL NOT be accepted and the organization WILL NOT be considered for submitting a full project application for 2017 HUD CoC funds.

Polk County Continuum of Care
2017 Continuum of Care Application

DRAFT FOR COMMENT
Letter of Interest – New Project

ORGANIZATION

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
City: ____________________________ State: _______ Zip: ___________
Phone: ______________ Fax: __________ Email: ________________________

CONTACT

Grant Contact Person: ____________________________
Phone: ______________ Email: ________________________
Agency Director: ____________________________
Phone: ______________ Email: ________________________

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Name: ____________________________
Program Type:

  _ PSH      _ RRH      _ TH
Primary Population Served: ____________________________
Unit Configuration (S+C and RRH):

  __0 BR     __1 BR     __2 BR     __3 BR     __4 BR     __Total
Total Number of Beds (TH): ________

Project Description (type of housing – scattered site or project-based; strategies to be used in assisting hard-to-serve populations secure housing; scope of services to be provided and specific partners who will provide services; strategies for assisting participants in accessing mainstream resources; and timetable for implementing the project) – 2,000 characters (excluding spaces)

Organization Experience and Capacity (organization’s previous experience in operating a similar project; challenges faced and specific strategies used to overcome challenges in implementing or operating a similar project; organization’s ability and qualifications to operate the proposed project - identify key members of the project operations team and briefly describe their relevant experience and duties) – 3,000 characters (excluding spaces)

BUDGET

Complete the attached Project Budget Worksheet.
ELIGIBILITY

Centralized Intake Verification – This project will accept referrals exclusively from the CoCB Centralized Intake System and follows all policies and procedures of the CoCB Centralized Intake System.

_____Yes  _____No

Housing First Verification – This project will follow the CoCB’s Housing First policy.

_____Yes  _____No

Are there any unresolved HUD monitoring findings, or outstanding audit findings related to this organization? _____Yes  _____No  If “Yes,” briefly describe.

Person completing the Letter of Interest:

________________________________________  ___________________________  __________________________
Name                                  Signature                          Title

I certify, on behalf of my organization, that all information contained in this Letter of Interest is accurate and true to best of my knowledge and belief, and is consistent with my organization’s records. I understand and acknowledge that presenting false information or failing to provide accurate and complete information as required could have a negative impact on my organization’s application potentially including, but not limited to, rejection of my organization’s grant application.

________________________________________  ___________________________
Executive Director/CEO/President              Date
### Project Budget Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Total Assistance Request for 1 Year Grant Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Leased Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Leased Structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rental Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supportive Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HMIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Subtotal Cost Requested (lines 1a.- 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Administration (7% of line 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Total Assistance plus Admn. (total lines 6 and 7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cash Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In-Kind Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Total Match (lines 9 and 10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Total Budget (lines 8 and 11)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash and/or In-Kind Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cash (check)</th>
<th>In-kind (check)</th>
<th>Signed MOU or Agreement for in-kind amounts prior to a HUD grant agreement (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Letter of Interest Submission:** Please submit this LOI by email to Mark K. Phillips at m.phillips@pchsia.org no later than [time] on [day], [date]. LOI’s submitted after this deadline WILL NOT be accepted and the organization WILL NOT be considered for submitting a full project application for 2017 HUD CoC funds.
Introduction

Section 578.7(a)(6) of the interim rule implementing the Continuum of Care (CoC) program authorized by the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act) directs local continua of care to:

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

Section 427 of the Act established selection criteria for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to use in awarding CoC funding that require CoCs to report to HUD their system-level performance. The intent of these selection criteria is to encourage CoCs, in coordination with ESG Program recipients and all other homeless assistance stakeholders in the community, to regularly measure their progress in meeting the needs of people experiencing homelessness in their community and to report this progress to HUD.

System performance targets are intended to reflect performance across multiple projects of a given type (e.g., emergency shelter) or across a range of projects and project types (e.g., length of time homeless) and subpopulations. Performance targets for the overall system represent performance of all applicable projects for all populations.

The Polk County Continuum of Care (PCCoC) Performance Management Plan (PMP) identifies project and system performance goals for the PCCoC and outlines how performance is measured and monitored.

The intent of the PMP is not only to meet the requirements of the HEARTH Act but also to:

1. Align housing and services to community needs
   a. Determine whether projects are achieving intended results
   b. Modify the approach or activities if the project is not achieving intended results
   c. Use outcome data to communicate the effectiveness of projects to funders and community

2. Engage in resource allocation
   a. Review and rank existing projects for renewal
   b. Reallocate resources from existing projects to new projects to meet new priority needs or to increase the project’s performance in meeting intended results.

Basics of Performance Measurement

The Polk County Continuum of Care Board (CoCB) is charged with monitoring project performance, system performance and setting performance measures. The CoCB’s Grant Committee is responsible for conducting quarterly project and system performance reviews while the CoCB’s Performance Measures Committee is responsible for setting project and system performance measures. Both committees make regular reports to the CoCB at its monthly meeting.

DRAFT FOR COMMENT
Project Performance Measurement
HUD, which provides federal homeless assistance funds through its CoC Program, requires project performance reporting via the annual CoC application and Annual Performance Reports (APRs). Measuring the performance of homeless assistance projects (i.e., CoC-funded and City of Des Moines ESG-funded) also is critical to:

- Understanding how well projects are doing at ending homelessness, or what issues projects may need to improve upon.
- Identifying project types/models that may be more successful at ending homelessness than others.

System Performance Measurement
As part of the new CoC Program regulations, HUD is requiring that all CoCs begin to monitor the performance of their system. Measuring system performance also is critical to:

- Understanding how well the community is doing at addressing and ending homelessness.
- Identifying areas of the system that may need improvement.

Setting Performance Measures
The Performance Measures Committee considered HUD’s project performance objectives and system performance measures in determining where to set project and system goals for the PCCoC.

Monitoring Project Performance

Quarterly Performance Measures Report
Homeless assistance projects’ performance is monitored on a quarterly basis via the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) generated Performance Measures Summary Report (PMSR). The PMSR provides project-level performance information for each measure listed in this plan and is shared with the CoCB and the full PCCoC each quarter.

The PMSR is generated from HMIS approximately 10 days after the end of each quarter. Providers should be sure their HMIS data have been fully updated and are accurate prior to the generation of each report. The quarters are as follows:

- 1st Quarter = January 1 – March 31
  - Reports performance data for first quarter
- 2nd Quarter = January 1 – June 30
  - Reports performance data for first and second quarters
- 3rd Quarter = January 1 – September 30
  - Reports performance data for first, second, and third quarters
- 4th Quarter = January 1 – December 31
  - Reports performance data for the full year

DRAFT FOR COMMENT
All projects should review their quarterly performance data and contact the HMIS Lead, Institute for Community Alliances (ICA), with any questions or concerns. Projects that consistently fail to meet project performance measures should develop internal plans and processes for improvement.

Victim Services Providers
City of Des Moines ESG-funded projects and CoC-funded projects that are Domestic Violence (DV) victim services providers and thus not participating in HMIS do not have their performance data generated out of HMIS via the PMSR. However, all of these DV providers must submit an APR generated from the agency’s HMIS-comparable database to CoCB staff on a quarterly basis. These quarterly APRs must report data cumulatively, as described above, and are due to CoCB staff within 10 days of the end of each quarter.

HMIS Data Quality
In addition to reporting on performance on each of the Project Performance Measures, the PMSR reports on the percentage of missing data applicable to the reporting period and objective for each project. Projects with more than 2% missing data do not have high enough data quality to allow their performance to be measured (with the exception of the measures looking at exits to permanent housing). Therefore, projects with more than 2% missing data for any objective will be considered to have failed to achieve the objective. Ongoing data quality issues could lead to the required development of a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and the loss of CoC Program funding or City of Des Moines ESG funding.

Sharing PMSR Data
Each quarter, the final PMSR will be posted on the PCCoC’s website. CoC-funded and City of Des Moines ESG-funded grantees will be notified via email of its availability. Individual project data can be accessed via the dashboard on ICA’s website.

Quality Improvement Process
Projects that fail to meet an objective for one year will be required to develop a QIP as outlined in Appendix A. Ongoing poor performance could ultimately result in the loss of CoC Program funding or City of Des Moines ESG funding.

Implementing the Performance Management Plan
The CoCB’s staff is responsible for implementing this Performance Management Plan on behalf of the CoCB. Implementation involves working with the ICA’s staff to generate the PMSR and reviewing all data therein, reviewing APRs, and sharing project and system performance information with the CoCB and full PCCoC on a quarterly basis. In reviewing quarterly and annual project performance information, CoCB staff will also work with the CoCB’s Grant Committee to identify any consistently under-performing projects and to target them for QIP development as needed. In addition to monitoring project and system performance, CoCB staff will work with the CoCB’s Performance Committee to annually review and update the performance measures found in the Performance Management Plan.

DRAFT FOR COMMENT
Providers’ Responsibilities and Meeting Performance Objectives

Submit APRs to the CoCB and HUD
This Performance Management Plan continues to require all CoC-funded and City of Des Moines ESG-funded projects to submit APRs to CoCB staff in addition to HUD.
ICA staff generate the PMSR referenced in this document. Providers do not generate these reports.

Ensure HMIS Data Quality
Because the PMSRs used to monitor project performance are generated from HMIS, it is critical that HMIS data be accurate and of good quality. To this end, providers should regularly engage in data quality reviews and ensure timely data entry. Providers can use the Data Quality Reports available in ART to help monitor and manage their HMIS data quality on an ongoing basis.

As mentioned above, projects with more than 2% missing data for any project performance measure will be considered to have failed to meet the objective. Consistent HMIS data quality issues could trigger the development of a QIP or impact a project’s renewal for CoC Program funding or City of Des Moines ESG funding.

Run and Review PMSR: Project Level
To help homeless providers manage their performance on the measures set forth in this PMP, ICA staff will create the PMSR: Project Level. The PMSR: Project Level provides detailed information about a project’s performance on all objectives including client-level data.

Providers can generate the PMSR: Project Level on their projects using ART on their own. At a minimum, providers are encouraged to generate the report on a quarterly basis so they know, in advance of the published PMSR, how they performed on all the objectives in the PMP.

Develop Internal Improvement Plans as Needed
If providers notice in the PMSR and PMSR: Project Level that they are not meeting an objective, it is the providers’ responsibility to develop internal plans to address the poor performance and to ensure improvements are made. Projects that fail to meet an objective for at least one year will be targeted for development of a QIP. Ensuring that project performance objectives are met will prevent projects being targeted for QIP development.

Participate in Quality Improvement Plan as Required
Providers required to develop a QIP are expected to address the deficiencies outlined in the QIP in the timeframe indicated. Grantees risk losing renewal funding if they fail to improve performance within the required timeframe.

PCCoC Project Performance Measures
Project performance measures for PCCoC homeless assistance projects are set forth below. The measures apply to all City of Des Moines ESG-funded and CoC-funded projects.
Projects will generally be considered to have met the performance measure if their performance is within 5% of the identified objective.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) projects in which no participants depart the program (departing participants referred to as “leavers”) during the reporting period will be considered to have met all performance measures that are only measured for project leavers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>How Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time Homeless</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter (ES) projects will have a 10% reduction in average length of stay annually.</td>
<td>Percent reduction in average length of stay from the previous year for leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES projects will have a 10% reduction in median length of stay annually.</td>
<td>Percent reduction in median length of stay from the previous year for leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>ES projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, Transitional Housing (TH), or Street Outreach (SO) within six months of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, TH or SO within 6 months of exit / number of adult leavers to permanent housing) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, TH or SO within two years of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, TH or SO within 24 months of exit / number of adult leavers to permanent housing) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exits to Permanent Housing*</td>
<td>At least (TBD%) of participants in ES projects will move into permanent housing at exit.</td>
<td>(number of participants who moved to PSH upon exit / number of participants who exited ES project) X 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transitional Housing Projects Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>How Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time Homeless</td>
<td>TH projects will have a 10% reduction in average length of stay annually.</td>
<td>Percent reduction in average length of stay from the previous year for leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TH projects will have a 10% reduction in median length of stay annually.</td>
<td>Percent reduction in median length of stay from the previous year for leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>TH projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, SH, TH, or Outreach within six months of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, SH, TH, or Outreach within 6 months of exit/number of adult leavers to permanent housing) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TH projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, SH, TH or Outreach within two years of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, SH, TH, or Outreach within 24 months of exit/number of adult leavers to permanent housing) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Income Growth</td>
<td>TH projects will have a 10% increase annually in the number of adults who have increased employment cash income overtime.</td>
<td>% increase in number of adults who gained or increased employment cash income from the previous year for stayers and leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Employment Income Growth</td>
<td>TH projects will have a 10% increase annually in the number of adults who have increased non-employment cash income overtime.</td>
<td>% increase in number of adults who gained or increased non-employment cash income from the previous year for stayers and leavers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exits to Permanent Housing¹</td>
<td>At least (TBD)% of participants in TH projects will move into permanent housing at exit.</td>
<td>(number of participants who moved to PSH upon exit / number of participants who exited TH project) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of Non-cash Benefits and Health Insurance¹</td>
<td>TH projects will have a (TBD)% increase in the number of adults who received at least one source of non-cash benefits or health insurance at program exit.</td>
<td>% increase in number of adult leavers with one or more sources of non-cash benefits or health insurance from the previous year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rapid Re-Housing Projects Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>How Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returns to Homelessness</td>
<td>Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, TH, or SO within six months of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, TH, or SO within 6 months of exit/number of adult leavers to permanent housing) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RRH projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, TH, or SO within two years of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, TH, or SO within 24 months of exit/number of adult leavers to permanent housing) X 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Notes:

1. TBD = To Be Determined
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>How Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Returns to Homelessness</strong></td>
<td>PSH projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, SH, TH, or Outreach within six months of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, TH, or SO within 6 months of exit / number of adult leavers) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSH projects will have no more than 10% of adults who exited to permanent housing return to ES, SH, TH, or Outreach within two years of exit.</td>
<td>(number of adults who returned to ES, TH, or SO within 24 months of exit / number of adult leavers) X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Income Growth</strong></td>
<td>TH projects will have a 10% increase annually in the number of adults who have increased employment cash income overtime.</td>
<td>% increase in number of adults who gained or increased employment cash income from the previous year for stayers and leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Employment Income Growth</strong></td>
<td>TH projects will have a 10% increase annually in the number of adults who have increased non-employment cash income overtime.</td>
<td>% increase in number of adults who gained or increased non-employment cash income from the previous year for stayers and leavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exits to or Retention of Permanent Housing</strong></td>
<td>At least (TBD)% of participants remain in PSH project or exit to PSII as of the end of the reporting period or at program exit.</td>
<td>(number of participants who moved to PSH upon exit + number of participants who remained in PSH project) / number of participants served by PSH project X 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipt of Non-cash Benefits and Health Insurance</strong></td>
<td>TH projects will have a (TBD)% increase in the number of adults who received at least one source of non-cash benefits or health insurance at program exit.</td>
<td>% increase in number of adult leavers with 1+ sources of non-cash benefits or health insurance from the previous year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"To receive maximum points, the CoC must have monitored the renewing project applicants and projects for utilization rates, increasing housing stability, participant eligibility, length of time homeless, destination upon program exit, increasing participant income, and connecting program participants to mainstream benefits. " See page 40 of 2016 NOFA

1 Recommend to Performance Committee to include in the list of system performance measures.
APPENDIX A

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLANNING AND PROCESS
POLK COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE
Quality Improvement Planning & Process

Introduction
The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has increasingly emphasized Continuum of Care (CoC) Homeless Assistance Program performance evaluation for purposes of receiving federal funds. Program performance is so critical that HUD has regularly used CoC performance as a primary scoring component for its annual CoC application process. In turn, the Polk County Continuum of Care Board (CoCB) has developed program- and system-level quality improvement processes.

A Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) is a plan, developed by the grantee and approved by the CoCB staff, to aid in the improvement of program performance. The QIP is based on a continuous quality improvement process, which consists of the following steps:

- Plan the timeline, activities, and tools to measure outcomes
- Do the work to implement actions and data collection
- Check the results and complete a full analysis
- Act on items learned and next steps following the analysis.

Technical assistance will also be a component of the QIP. It may be requested by the grantee in their QIP or recommended by CoCB staff following their review of the QIP. As the CoC Applicant/ESG Recipient, the City of Des Moines must submit any request for HUD Technical Assistance to the Omaha HUD Field Office. Requests for HUD Technical Assistance will be coordinated by the CoCB staff with the appropriate city staff person.

Quality Improvement Process Overview

Process Overview
The QIP process begins with the CoCB Grant Committee reviewing performance of all CoC-funded projects. Using criteria described below, the CoCB Grant Committee will determine which grantees are required to developing QIPs-development. Each grantee will be notified concerning any requirement to develop a QIP and, if so, the performance areas on which the QIP should focus. Once the QIP is developed, the grantee will submit the plan to the CoCB staff for approval and, if approved, will implement the QIP. The grantee will engage in quarterly monitoring with the CoCB Grant Committee (or designated staff) for one year, at which time grantees and the CoCB Grant Committee will evaluate project improvement and make a determination about QIP termination, continuation, or other action.

Project Selection
The CoCB Grant Committee will review the performance of all HUD CoC funded projects annually. The CoCB Grant Committee will primarily use submitted Annual Performance Reports (APRs) as data sources.
The CoCB Grant Committee will target for QIP development projects that have not met performance measures for multiple consecutive years or that are performing significantly below these measures. Grantees will be chosen to develop a QIP based on the following issues (prioritized in this order):

- Project did not meet a performance measure for three consecutive years.
  - Projects not meeting multiple objectives are prioritized over projects not meeting one objective.
- Project did not meet a performance measure for two consecutive years.
  - Projects not meeting multiple objectives are prioritized over projects not meeting one objective.
- Project currently implementing a QIP, but evaluation of progress to date indicates that the QIP will not be successfully completed within one year.
- Projects falling below performance measures by larger percentages will be prioritized over projects falling by smaller percentages.

Performance Measures
For renewal project evaluation purposes and consideration for future City of Des Moines ESG funding, the performance measures considered for QIP purposes will be those listed in the PCCoC Project Performance Measures section of the Performance Management Plan (pages 5-7).

As needed, grantees may be required to develop QIPs to help in the resolution of critical program issues that are not performance related. Such issues may include developing a plan to implement HMIS or developing a plan to ensure program operations have started in accordance with HUD requirements.

Notification of Required QIP Development
The CoCB staff will inform the grantee of their identification as a targeted project for a QIP and next steps. The CoCB staff will rely on the most recent Exhibit 2s (CoC project applications) for updated grantee contact information.

Development and Implementation of QIP

QIP Development: The Basics
Grantees requiring a QIP will be informed of specific areas requiring improvement and will be provided the QIP tool and instructions for completing the tool. Grantees must develop a QIP that addresses all identified performance deficiencies. Grantees will be given the opportunity to receive individualized technical assistance from CoCB staff as they begin developing their QIPs.

QIPs must address all noted deficiencies. Grantees must complete the QIP tool. Grantees must adhere to all timelines and goal dates outlined in QIP correspondence.

QIP Duration
Grantees must develop QIPs that are one-year in length, unless otherwise noted by CoCB staff. For example, if the start date of QIP implementation is July 1, then proposed QIP termination should be July 1 of the following year.
**Terminating or Continuation of a QIP**

The CoCB Grant Committee will evaluate the extent to which QIP grantees improved performance on deficient areas over the course of the QIP’s implementation. If the CoCB Grant Committee determines that a grantee has sufficiently improved in the area of concern based on quarterly monitoring and APRs, then the grantee will be notified of the termination of the QIP and no further action will be required.

If the CoCB Grant Committee determines that a grantee has not made adequate improvement during the QIP process, then the grantee may be required to complete additional QIP implementation. A continuing QIP may involve revision of the QIP developed by the grantee or changes to the monitoring process.

**QIP Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Quarterly Monitoring and Reporting Expectations**

Grantees will be required to participate in monitoring meetings concerning QIP implementation and program improvement with the CoCB Grant Committee (or designated staff) on at least a quarterly basis. Monitoring will generally take place via face-to-face meetings with grantee staff and CoCB staff, and will cover both progress in implementation of activities outlined in the QIP and progress in improving performance of targeted issue.

Grantees will be expected to report, at minimum, on the following items:

- Progress in implementing each activity identified in the QIP
  - Assure QIP activities are implemented/completed
  - If an activity is not fully implemented/completed, then the grantee must be able to report on status of implementation, expected completion dates, and other information relevant to the QIP.
- Progress in meeting stated QIP performance goal
  - Assure QIP performance goal is met
    - For example, if a grantee’s QIP goal was to have 80% of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) residents maintain their housing for at least six months, then the grantee will be expected to report on the percentage of residents maintaining housing at each quarterly monitoring.
  - If QIP goal is not met, then the grantee must report on the status of implementation, expected completion dates, and other information relevant to the QIP.
  - If QIP goal is not met, then grantee may be informed that the QIP will continue beyond the initial one-year period.
- Progress in assuring that the data obtained through the QIP are accurate, thorough, and have been analyzed
  - Assure quality data are obtained
• Progress in reporting trends and findings from the QIP
  o Assure trends and findings are noted
• Progress in prioritizing issues that need further review and consideration
  o Assure that issues are prioritized
• Progress in identifying educational needs
  o Assure that staff educational needs are met

Determining Success or Failure of QIP

Achievement of QIP goals is not necessarily the only condition that could lead to successful QIP termination. Grantees who can clearly demonstrate significant progress toward meeting their goals, and who have fully and successfully implemented all QIP activities and participated in quarterly monitoring, may be eligible to have their QIPs successfully terminated. Such determination will be made at the discretion of the CoCB Grant Committee. [DO WE WANT TO BE MORE VAGUE ABOUT THIS, AND SIMPLY INCLUDE THAT QIP CAN TERMINATE AT THE COCB GRANT COMM’S DISCRETION?]

In general, the success of a QIP process (and, ultimately, its termination) will be determined based on the following:

• Grantee participated in the required QIP process
• Grantee fully implemented identified QIP activities
• Grantee participated in quarterly monitoring and provided sufficient status updates on QIP implementation and progress on program improvement
• Grantee made significant progress on or met their QIP goals

Continuing a QIP may also involve revising the QIP or increasing frequency of monitoring. If the CoCB Grant Committee determines a QIP has failed for two consecutive years, then the grantee may be required to develop a QIP for additional periods or may lose renewal of HUD CoC funding or City of Des Moines ESG funding. If the CoCB Grant Committee determines a QIP has failed for three consecutive years yet the grantee has received renewed HUD CoC funding, then renewed project funds may be reallocated in the next CoC application cycle. If the grantee receives City of Des Moines ESG funds, the project will be ineligible for funding in the next ESG application cycle.

Grantees who do not develop required QIPs or do not participate in quarterly monitoring will be considered to have failed in their QIP. These grantees may be required to develop another QIP or may be excluded from the PCCoC consolidated application for HUD CoC funding or City of Des Moines ESG funding.

Impact of QIP on Annual CoC Application

Renewal CoC Applications and City of Des Moines ESG Applicants

DRAFT FOR COMMENT
Grantees with an ongoing QIP at the time of the annual HUD CoC application process or biannual City of Des Moines ESG application process will have points deducted from their applications for any QIP-targeted projects. Grantees in any ongoing QIPs extending beyond one year at the time of the annual HUD CoC application process or biannual City of Des Moines ESG application process will have additional points deducted from their applications for any QIP-targeted projects.

New CoC and City of Des Moines ESG Applicants
Grantees with an ongoing QIP are permitted to submit a new CoC or City of Des Moines project application. However, new project applications will be scored, in part, on the grantee’s required QIP participation, implementation, and program improvement. If a first-year QIP grantee is showing substantial improvement and is on track to implement all QIP activities and achieve all QIP goals, such facts may be considered by the CoCB Grant Committee in evaluating the new project application. Such new project applications are eligible for funding under the HUD CoC application process and the City of Des Moines’ ESG application process. Conversely, if a grantee subject to an ongoing QIP fails to show substantial improvement or otherwise fails to undertake actions required under the QIP, such facts may be considered by the CoCB Grant Committee in evaluating the new project application.
Thank you for submitting a question via the HUD Exchange. We will review the question and try to provide you with a response within 7-10 business days. However, note that some questions must be referred to HUD subject matter experts and/or attorneys and will take longer to address. We appreciate your patience as we work to provide a response as quickly as possible.

Requestor Name: Mark Phillips

Requestor Email: m.phillips@pchsia.org

Question Related To: Continuum of Care Program

Question ID: 95062

Question Subject:

CoC Grant Application Score 2016

Question Text:

CoC Application Question 3B-2.3 states “Compare the number of RRH units available to serve families from the 2015 and 2016 HIC.” Our answer reflected 88 RRH units available to serve families in the 2015 HIC and 214 RRH units available to serve families in the 2016 HIC. Despite the 126 unit increase in RRH units for families, we scored 0 out of 5 points. We are seeking clarification of this score.

Please click on the [View Question] button below to perform the following actions:

- View your question, answer, and any applicable attachments
- Add additional information to this question
- Ask another question using the same requestor information
- Cancel this question if a response is no longer necessary

View Question

This email account (aaq@hudexchange.info) does not have the ability to reply to emails. Please DO NOT REPLY to this email address, as all messages sent to this address will not be responded to. Please direct any inquiries regarding HUD Exchange or its Ask A Question system to info@hudexchange.info or ask another question using the "View Question" link located above. Please keep this email for your records.
### PIT Counts

**Date of PIT Count:** 1/25/2017  
**Type of Count Conducted This Year:** Sheltered and Unsheltered Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheltered Population</th>
<th>Sheltered Subpopulations</th>
<th>Unsheltered Population</th>
<th>Unsheltered Subpopulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> What data source(s) was used to produce the total number of people included in the sheltered population (staying in an emergency shelter, Safe Haven, or transitional housing) on the night of the count? Please indicate the percentage of the PIT count derived from each of the sources. (If a source was not used, please enter zero).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS Data</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider-level surveys</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-level surveys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.** Was the CoC able to collect information about the number of people being sheltered on the night of the count from all emergency shelters, Safe Havens, and transitional housing projects listed on the H2C or only some?
- ☐ Complete census count
- ☐ Random sample and extrapolation
- ☐ Non-random sample and extrapolation

**3.** What information or method(s) was used to de-duplicate the count of the total number of people included in the sheltered population? (Check all that apply)
- ☐ Comparison of personally identifying information (PII), such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number
- ☑ Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)
- ☐ Blitz count of persons in shelters (i.e., count occurred at same time to avoid double counting)
- ☐ Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)
- ☐ No specific approach was used
- ☐ Other (specify):
4. What data source(s) was used to produce the demographic and subpopulation data included in the sheltered population (staying in an emergency shelter, Safe Haven, or transitional housing) on the night of the count? (select all that were used)
- ☑ HMIS Data
- ☑ Provider-level surveys
- ☐ Client-level surveys
- ☐ Observation
- ☐ Other (specify): 

5. Was the CoC able to collect information about the demographic and subpopulation characteristics of all sheltered people or only some?
- ☑ All sheltered people
- ☐ A subset of sheltered people

5a. How did the CoC select the subset of people?
- ☑ Sheltered people were selected randomly
- ☑ Sheltered people were not selected randomly, but an effort was made to select a sample of people that "represented" all sheltered people in emergency shelters, safe havens, and transitional housing providers in the CoC
- ☑ Sheltered people were not selected randomly, and the selection was driven by convenience or expediency (e.g., people that were willing to provide information)
- ☐ Other (specify): 

5b. Did the CoC adjust the information in some way (e.g., statistical adjustment or extrapolation) to account for all sheltered people?
- ☑ Yes
- ☐ No
6. Looking at the change in your sheltered count from last year's count, please choose up to three reasons that best explain these changes from the drop down list below.

☐ Change in PIT count methodology
☐ Change in participation of programs serving general homeless populations (e.g., singles, families)
☐ Change in participation of programs serving subpopulations (e.g., veterans, youth)
☐ Increased or improved PIT count training
☐ More volunteers for PIT count
☐ Change in awareness of PIT count and relevant resources
☐ Change in CoC geographic coverage area
☐ Change in emergency shelter capacity
☐ Change in transitional housing capacity
☐ Change in rapid re-housing capacity
☐ Change in homelessness prevention capacity
☐ Change in permanent supportive housing capacity
☐ Change in other supportive housing subsidy capacity
☐ Change in landlord partnerships
☐ Impact of coordinated entry;
☐ Impact of Housing First practices
☐ Change in availability of affordable housing
☐ Change in economic conditions (employment rate, etc.)
☐ Weather
☐ Other (specify):

Please provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit):
7. What approach(es) was used to count the total number of people included in the unsheltered population during the PIT count. (select all that were used)

☐ "Night of the count" - complete census  
☑ "Night of the count" - known locations  
☐ "Night of the count" - random sample  
☐ Service-based count  
☐ HMIS

7a. Were certain areas within the CoC geography specifically excluded because the CoC had reason to believe there were no unsheltered people in those areas?

☐ Yes  
☐ No

7b. How did the CoC select the areas that were included for canvassing?

☐ Areas were selected randomly  
☐ Areas were not selected randomly, but an effort was made to select a sample of areas that "represented" the larger community  
☐ Areas were not selected randomly, but an effort was made to use local knowledge to target known locations (e.g., areas with known concentrations of unsheltered homeless people)  
☐ Other (please specify):

7b1. Did the CoC adjust the information in some way (e.g., statistical adjustment or extrapolation) to account for areas within the CoC geography that were not canvassed but where unsheltered people might have been on the night of the PIT count?

☐ Yes  
☐ No

7c. In areas that were canvassed, did the CoC count all unsheltered people in those areas or a sample of people?

☐ All people encountered during the count  
☐ A sample of people encountered during the count

8. What information or method(s) was used to de-duplicate the total count of people in the unsheltered population? (Check all that apply)

☐ Comparison of personally identifying information (PII), such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number  
☐ Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)  
☐ Blitz count of unsheltered people (i.e., canvassing of different areas occurred at same time to avoid double counting)  
☐ Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)  
☐ No specific approach was used  
☐ Other (Please Specify):
9. What approach(es) was used to collect demographic and subpopulation data about unsheltered people included in the unsheltered population during the PIT count? (select all that were used)

- Surveys/interviews of people identified as unsheltered on the night of the PIT count
- Surveys/interviews of people identified as unsheltered on the night of the count, but completed at a later date
- Surveys/interviews of people identified within 7 days following the night of the PIT count night who may have been unsheltered on the night of the PIT count (e.g., "service-based" surveys at locations where people who are homeless go for assistance)
- HMIS data from street outreach and/or other providers
- Other (Please Specify):

10. Were all people who were encountered during canvassing on the night of the count or during post night of the count PIT activities asked to complete a survey/interview?

- All people encountered were surveyed
- A subset of people was surveyed

10a. How did the CoC select those people?

- People were selected randomly
- People were not selected randomly, but an effort was made to select a sample of people that "represented" all unsheltered people
- People were not selected randomly, and the selection was driven by practicality or expediency (e.g., people willing and able to complete a survey on the night of the PIT count)
- Other (please specify):

10b. Did the CoC adjust the information in some way (e.g., statistical adjustment or extrapolation) to account for all persons in all projects?

- Yes
- No

11. What information or method(s) was used to produce an unduplicated total count of homeless people across your sheltered and unsheltered populations?

- Comparison of personally identifying information (PII), such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number
- Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)
- Bill count of unsheltered people (i.e., sheltered and unsheltered counts occurred at same time to avoid double counting)
- Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)
- No specific approach was used
- Other (Please Specify):
12. Looking at the change in your unsheltered count from last year's count, please choose up to three reasons that best explain these changes from the drop down list below. Please also provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit).

☐ Change in PIT count methodology
☐ Change in participation of programs serving general homeless populations (e.g., singles, families)
☐ Change in participation of programs serving subpopulations (e.g., veterans, youth)
☐ Increased or improved PIT count training
☐ More volunteers for PIT count
☐ Change in awareness of PIT count and relevant resources
☐ Change in CoC geographic coverage area
☐ Change in emergency shelter capacity
☐ Change in transitional housing capacity
☐ Change in rapid re-housing capacity
☐ Change in homelessness prevention capacity
☐ Change in permanent supportive housing capacity
☐ Change in other supportive housing subsidy capacity
☐ Change in landlord partnerships
☐ Impact of coordinated entry;
☐ Impact of Housing First practices
☐ Change in availability of affordable housing
☐ Change in economic conditions (employment rate, etc.)
☐ Weather
☐ Other (specify): 

Please provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit):
Eileen Mitchell

From: McCormick, Lynn <LMcCormick@mercydesmoines.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Jim Cain; Eileen Mitchell; 'Mark Phillips'
Cc: Julie Eberbach; 'Shelby Ridley (PHC)'; Shawn McAninch
Subject: RE: Documenting decision regarding House of Mercy Project Together's status as a homeless-dedicated project

Eileen:
Is it necessary for us to pull a listing of names of anyone still in the TH program in Service Point and end the service (exit assessment) as of April 30, 2016? We want your data to be clean.
Lynn

From: Jim Cain [mailto:jcain@familypromisedm.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 2:37 PM
To: 'Eileen Mitchell'; 'Mark Phillips'; McCormick, Lynn
Cc: 'Julie Eberbach'; 'Shelby Ridley (PHC)'; 'Shawn McAninch'
Subject: RE: Documenting decision regarding House of Mercy Project Together's status as a homeless-dedicated project

CAUTION: This email is not from a CHI source. Only click links or open attachments you know are safe.

Eileen,
I agree with your assessment.

Jim

From: Eileen Mitchell [mailto:eileen.mitchell@icalliances.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2016 2:27 PM
To: Mark Phillips <M.Phillips@PCHSIA.org>; Lynn McCormick (House of Mercy) <LMcCormick@mercydesmoines.org>
Cc: Julie Eberbach <julie.eberbach@icalliances.org>; Jim Cain (Family Promise) <jcain@familypromisedm.org>; Shelby Ridley (PHC) <sriddle@phcinc.net>; Shawn McAninch <shawn.mcaninch@icalliances.org>
Subject: Documenting decision regarding House of Mercy Project Together's status as a homeless-dedicated project

Hello everyone,

All of us have talked about this in a variety of conversations, so I wanted to get a final common understanding documented. I am doing this now because I need to have a decision so I can proceed with submitting the AHAR (Annual Homeless Assessment Report) to HUD.

The question is do we still count House of Mercy’s Project Together project as transitional housing for homeless. To be considered to be transitional housing for homeless, you must have a specific number of beds dedicated for homeless clients. That number of dedicated beds is your homeless project housing inventory.

I believe what I’ve heard from House of Mercy is that with the ending of the HUD CoC grant on 4/30/2016, House of Mercy no longer has beds dedicated for homeless clients. The clients who were in the project on 5/1/2016 are being exited as they leave, but their stays are no longer being funded with homeless funds. If this is the case, then I believe
Housing of Mercy Project Together should no longer be counted as a homeless project for any HUD reporting beginning 5/1/2016. This would include the AHAR, point-in-time count, homeless housing inventory, system performance measures, or CoC applications.

Please reply and let me know if you agree or disagree with this decision.

Thank you,
Eileen

Eileen Mitchell
System Administrator
Institute for Community Alliances
1111 9th Street, Suite 245
Des Moines, IA 50314
Phone: 515.246.6643
Fax: 515.246.6637
eileen.mitchell@icalliances.org
www.icalliances.org

Institute for Community Alliances
Many years ago YESS received ESG funding, and therefore entered their clients into HMIS. Because they were in HMIS and received federal homeless funds, ICA included them in the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR).

In 2012, HUD’s technical assistance team for the AHAR questioned our high number of single homeless children, and told us not to include these children in AHAR. Also at this time Julie Eberbach spoke with Ann Oliva, the head of HUD’s office that oversees ESG funding, and she told us this type of respite stay would be considered prevention, and agreed we should not include them.

We began to exclude YESS clients from reporting although they were still entered in HMIS.

In 2014, HUD released an expanded HMIS data instruction manual that included data entry requirements for Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) funding through the Department of Health and Human Services. YESS was a recipient of a RHY Basic Center Program (BCP) grant. The BCP program has two components: homeless prevention and emergency shelter. The data manual describes the following service as a prevention service:

“Preventative – overnight interim, respite”: The youth was provided not more than three nights of interim, provisional accommodations at the BCP shelter (for respite, but not as a full program participant although within the care and supervision of the program.) This experience could be for a “cooling off” period or during transfer to an appropriate permanent living setting. The expectation is that the youth returns to the original household or alternative permanent living situation within three days.

Because this seems to fit exactly the service that YESS provides with their BCP grant, it was ICA’s opinion they should be set up as a prevention project. YESS had written the grant to provide emergency shelter, so they did not agree with recording their services as prevention.

ICA submitted an Ask A Question (AAQ) request for guidance to HUD in 2015, and again in 2016. HUD technical assistance contractors replied saying the clients should count as emergency shelter since they stayed overnight. ICA did not agree and took the issue to Robert Pulster of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in 2016 – he agreed that the respite stays are prevention. Mr. Pulster forwarded the question to Peter Nicewicz of Health and Human Services who agreed exactly with ICA’s interpretation (see email below). Because of this, YESS respite clients were excluded from the initial submission of the HUD System Performance Measures as agreed on at a Performance Measure committee meeting (unsure of date). Since that time, HUD technical assistance contractors have continued to state during monthly webinars that any overnight stay counts as emergency shelter, not as prevention. Because of this, we are questioning the decision to exclude YESS respite stays, since there is disagreement among the federal representatives, and would like to ask the CoC to review and either uphold or change the decision.

Eileen Mitchell
System Administrator
Hi Eileen,

I reached out to my contact at ACF and I think he clarified the issue. See below. Let me know if you have any further questions. Great to meet you yesterday and please stay in touch. I hope you are enjoying day 2 of the Symposium. Bob

Robert Pulster
Regional Coordinator
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness
https://www.usich.gov/

(202) 754-1584
@RobertPulster

Stay Informed.

---

Hi Bob,

Great to hear from you! I actually talked to Michelle about this issue earlier. We usually consider respite (even if overnight) to be prevention, so their program should be set up in HMIS as BCP-prevention rather than emergency shelter. This helps differentiate the lengths of stay averages between our typical BCP shelters (which usually have a much longer LOS especially if another funding source supplements the 21 day ceiling) and briefer programs such as these. See also page 67 of the 2014 HMIS Data Standards (which are being revised soon, btw) on “prevention services – respite”:

Hope all is well!

Peter
Peter Nicewicz, J.D.
Runaway and Homeless Youth Program Analyst
Family and Youth Services Bureau
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
330 C St SW
Washington, DC 20201
Phone: (202) 475-2466
peter.nicewicz@acf.hhs.gov

FYSB Family & Youth Services Bureau

From: Robert Pulster [mailto:robert.pulster@usich.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2016 12:04 PM
To: Nicewicz, Peter (ACF)
Subject: FW: Question Response for HMIS Question ID 77129 - HUD Exchange Ask A Question

Hi Peter,
Hope you are well and enjoying your new role. I thought you may be able to provide some guidance on this question I received while in Des Moines yesterday for a Symposium on Homelessness. Perhaps it is in your scope as I recall you would be working in the HMIS RHY integration.

Thanks! Bob

Robert Pulster
Regional Coordinator
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness
https://www.usich.gov/

(202) 754-1584
@RobertPulster

Stay Informed.

[Email icons]

From: Eileen Mitchell [mailto:eileen.mitchell@icalliances.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 12:52 PM
To: Robert Pulster <robert.pulster@usich.gov>
Cc: Julie Eberbach <julie.eberbach@icalliances.org>; Mark Phillips <M.Phillips@PCHSIA.org>
Subject: FW: Question Response for HMIS Question ID 77129 - HUD Exchange Ask A Question

Good morning, Mr. Pulster,

Thank you so much for speaking with me this morning regarding the Des Moines CoC’s issue with how to count respite stays at our RHY BCP-funded youth shelter, Youth Emergency Services and Shelter (YES). I’m forwarding the last AAQ that I submitted on the subject that directs us to include them in the CoC’s emergency shelter data. I believe it was answered by Michelle Budzek, but I don’t know who from FYSB she spoke with. It seems that a lot of the decision hinges
on the term emergency shelter, which YESS uses to describe a broad range of services, including their Crisis Nursery project and respite stays. The following are excerpts from their website:

"Some have been removed from their parent’s care due to unsafe living conditions (such drugs in the home). Other little ones stay at YESS when a caregiver is hospitalized, incarcerated, or other crisis situations prevent a guardian from caring for their children. YESS is one of the few emergency shelters that also provides respite services – up to 72 hours where a child can stay in shelter while their parents make plans for moving past a crisis situation.

Some children come to our doors because they have been removed from their parents’ care due to allegations of abuse. Others arrive at YESS because they ran away from home or are currently homeless.”

They do serve some runaway and homeless youth, although not as a part of their RHY funding or as their primary service. I believe the majority of their clients are system-involved youth and respite.

I greatly appreciate your offer to take another look at this to make sure we are managing this data correctly.

Thank you,
Eileen Mitchell

Eileen Mitchell  
System Administrator  
Institute for Community Alliances  
1111 9th Street, Suite 245  
Des Moines, IA 50314  
Phone: 515.246.6643  
Fax: 515.246.6637  
eileen.mitchell@icalliances.org  
www.icalliances.org

Institute for Community Alliances

From: aaq@hudexchange.info [mailto:aaq@hudexchange.info]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2016 11:00 AM  
To: Eileen Mitchell  
Subject: Question Response for HMIS Question ID 77129 - HUD Exchange Ask A Question

Thank you for submitting a question via the HUD Exchange. The response to your question is listed below.

Requestor Name: Eileen Mitchell

Requestor Email: eileen.mitchell@icalliances.org

Question Related To: Homeless Management Information Systems
Hello, In the HMIS lead TA call on 5/25/16 there was a comment that most BCP grantees should have both a prevention and an ES project in HMIS, and that they should be providing both services. My CoC’s BCP grantee is Youth Emergency Services and Shelter (YESSION), grant #90CY6610. They told me that their grant only covers emergency shelter. They are providing a max 3-day respite stay in their facility as their BCP service, and told me that is what they stated they would do in their grant. I’ve asked both their RHY TA and HUD TA about how to categorize these stays, because they are providing exactly meets the description in the HUD standards v3, page 67 for the service called “Preventative - overnight interim, respite,” which falls under the BCP-Prevention category. YESSION, the RHY TA and HUD TA all told me that these should be entered under BCP-ES. I disagreed, but set them up for only a BCP-ES project anyway as directed. Does their grant indeed cover prevention, or only ES? If it also covers prevention, I don’t think they are aware of that.

With this new information, I would also like to confirm one last time how to count these respite stays. My concern is that if they are truly supposed to be counted as prevention, but I count them as emergency shelter our baseline year for our System Performance Measure will be greatly affected. They serve around 300 clients a year, which is a lot for our CoC. My concern is that if we count them as ES, and then find out in an other year that they should have been prevention, our system stay will show a large increase because their short stays drive our average down.

So, if you could please confirm that a max 3 day respite stay counts as emergency shelter and not prevention I would appreciate it. The only published resource from RHY that I can find says that "most" BCP-ES projects provide up to 21 days of shelter for up to 20 youth. This is not how our BCP-ES operates.

Thanks, Eileen Mitchell

Response:

Hi Eileen

We’ve discussed this with RHY so that we are giving the same message to all RHY grantees.

If a BCP grantee is providing respite shelter for youth in a facility (building) that is normally used as a shelter for youth, then that youth must be recorded in the BCP-ES project. If the respite shelter is provided at any other location (hotel, hostel, etc. ....) then that service to youth should be recorded in BCP – Homelessness Prevention and recorded as a "respite" service in the system. If we don't - your PIT/HIC information, that FYSB also looks at will be off.

If the only "service" this BCP is providing is this respite service in shelter than they are correct you only need a BCP-ES. Most BCP's, however, also provide other services for youth that really don't need shelter and those are the youth in prevention. There is no firm rule that they have to provide
these other service, most just do, which is why we are encouraging HMIS leads to ask again about the prevention projects.

Thanks for being on top of this!

Please click on the [View Question] button below to perform the following actions:

- **View your question**, answer, and any applicable attachments
- **Ask another question** using the same requestor information

This email account (aag@hudexchange.info) does not have the ability to reply to emails. Please DO NOT REPLY to this email address, as all messages sent to this address will not be responded to. Please direct any inquiries regarding HUD Exchange or its Ask A Question system to info@hudexchange.info or ask another question using the "View Question" link located above. Please keep this email for your records.
HUD approves this request for technical assistance (TA) to provide TA to IA-502- Des Moines/Polk County Continuum of Care (CoC). The purpose of the TA is to: (1) provide recommendations to help the CoC develop program strategies within Rapid Rehousing that allow families to move quickly (20-30 days) into a unit; (2) engaging clients in services and to seek employment using a Housing First approach; (3) strategies for development of PSH for persons with mental health and/or substance abuse issues.

HomeBase is the approved TA provider. Kevin Kissinger is the SNAPS Desk Officer until July 2017, to be replaced by April Mitchell after that date.

Before beginning remote assistance, the TA provider should contact the HUD Field Office, the SNAPS Desk officer, and the TA requestor within one week of the date HUD sends this tasking.

During remote TA provision, if the TA provider believes that more in-depth, onsite TA is required, the TA provider will work the TA recipient, the HUD Field Office, and the SNAPS Desk Officer to develop a proposed scope of work for onsite TA. After agreement by these three parties regarding the proposed scope of work, the TA provider should complete the “TA Upgrade Form” and submit it via e-mail to Kevin Kissinger, Program Office TA Coordinators at HUD, as well as the SNAPS Desk Officer.

The TA upgrade form should specify that the new request is a follow-up to remote TA. It should propose clear tasks and clearly link them to one or more of the TA objectives on the form. Proposed onsite TA must address HUD TA priorities.

Once submitted, the HUD Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs will review the information on the TA Upgrade Form to make a final funding determination. If HUD agrees to fund the onsite TA, it will then task work plan development.

**Technical Assistance Request Details**

**Request Date:** 3/23/2017  
**Request ID:** #3309

**Technical Assistance Point of Contact:**  
Mark Phillips  
Des Moines, IA  
m.phillips@pchsia.org  
5154024101

**Requested for:**  
IA-502 - Des Moines/Polk County CoC - Omaha Field Office
Technical Assistance Request Summary

Requestor Provided Subject
Rapid Rehousing, Employment and Housing First, Housing for mental health and substance abuse ind.

Description of Assistance Needed

Ideally we would like to start discussing the potential assistance in the coming month and finalize what we will be working on in May. This would allow us to respond to the 2017 CoC Grant on areas focus and provide a list of items for our community to work on for fiscal year 2018.

Topics

- Homelessness > Homelessness subpopulations > Families Homeless
- Homelessness > Maximizing the use of mainstream resources (such as education, healthcare, job training, social services)
- Homelessness > Rapid Re-housing
- Housing Counseling
- Other - 1. Ast. for housing for ind. w/substance abuse and mental health barriers. 2 Housing 1st and employm

This email account (taportal@hudexchange.info) does not have the ability to reply to emails. Please DO NOT REPLY to this email address, as all messages sent to this address will not be responded to. Please direct any inquiries to info@hudexchange.info. Please keep this email for your records.
Mark Phillips

From: Melissa O'Neil <moneil@centraliowashelter.org>
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2017 10:47 AM
To: Mark Phillips
Subject: Policy- COCB
Attachments: Policy- COCB.docx

Mark,

Hopefully this is in time for your meeting. Attached are the recommendations CISS staff have made to the CISS Board for full approval. I have spoken with and received feedback from the Community Foundation and our community partners here at CISS.

It is our intent to ensure the community is aware of the changes and provide an opportunity for feedback. The changes are being made to ensure the financial longevity of CISS. It is due to a short fall in the budget that these changes are being considered. It is our hope that the research we have done to ensure a new LOS is a reflection of other best practices being utilized across the country. If you have any questions or concerns please do not hesitate to give me a direct call.

Thanks,

Melissa

---

Melissa O'Neil | Chief Executive Officer | P: 515.280.2987 | 1420 Mulberry St., Des Moines, IA 50309 | moneil@centraliowashelter.org | www.centraliowashelter.org
Like Tweet
Length of Stay

CISS will begin by enforcing the current policy in place with a modification about re-entry into the facility beginning as of May 1st, 2017. Clients who leave CISS and are exited must remain out of the facility for emergency shelter for 90 days. Upon re-entry they will be granted a 60 day stay limited. With extensions only being given if the client is enrolled in the Critical Time Intervention program and are actively working to improve their situation. A the end of 90 days clients must exit and remain out of the facility for 90 days before re-enter CISS. Upon re-entry after the 90 days clients will be given a 30 day maximum LOS (unless entered into Critical Time Intervention program). At the end of 30 days clients must exit for 90 days. If a client wishes to re-enter the facility after following the above prescribed plan they must pay a $5.00 program fee for each day they are spending the night in the facility. This is due at the bed sign in time and a receipt will be given for record keeping.

First Work

Beginning on May 1st, 2017 clients will be expected to contribute to the community in which they live in one of the following ways, or will be asked to leave the CISS facility from 9am-3pm each day.

1. May participate in 2 hours of morning or afternoon service hours back to CISS and the surrounding neighborhood. This service work includes pick up garbage, mowing and managing flower beds, cleaning inside the CISS facility or volunteering with the DMARC/Food Bank of Iowa. Along with attendance at a schedule service block.
2. Clients may participate in a 20 hour training program. Receiving minimum wage for the work and learning a new skill. The training programs include Mulberry Farms and Food, Community Kitchen, janitorial services or MFF profit center.
3. Clients can show the CISS Client Service Manager a copy of a recent pay stub demonstrating their contribution back to society.
4. Clients may show they are enrolled and attending classes as a local community college or workforce center.
March 27, 2017

Melissa O’Neil, Executive Director
Central Iowa Shelter & Services
1420 Mulberry Street
Des Moines, IA 50309

Dear Melissa,

The Polk County Continuum of Care Board (CoCB) is pleased to continue supporting relationships with Central Iowa Shelter and Services, the largest homeless shelter in the State of Iowa. This grant is very valuable in continuing the CoCB’s effort of making sure everyone has a safe place to call home.

Over the past several years, the CoCB has enthusiastically lead the charge in Centralized Intake for homeless individuals in Central Iowa the opportunity for provided coordinated Case Management for adult singles experiencing homeless is a natural next step. By implementing the evidence-based practice of Critical Time Intervention in Iowa, we will be able to reduce the current length of stay of individuals experiencing homelessness in emergency shelter and reduce the number of individuals who return the system.

The CoCB will continue to drive performance outcomes measures in alignment with Housing and Urban Development Standards, build collaborative partnerships across the continuum and support the Centralized Intake process that ensures individuals’ needs are addressed from day one. It is clearly a priority for us and our community will be well served.

In closing, we are excited for the opportunity for the CoCB and Central Iowa Shelter & Services to collaborate on this project.

Sincerely,

Mark Phillips, Executive Director
Polk County Continuum of Care Board
March 28, 2017

Melissa O’Neil, CEO
Central Iowa Shelter & Services
1420 Mulberry Street
Des Moines, IA 50309

Dear Mrs. O’Neil,

On behalf of the Polk County Continuum of Care Board of Directors, we are writing to support your application for Low Demand Housing under the 2017 Veterans Administration Grant and Per Diem NOFA.

The mission of the Polk County Continuum of Care Board is to end homelessness in Polk County by marshalling community resources and facilitating and managing effective partnerships focused on providing services, supports and solutions to create a safe home for everyone. We recognize the need for services and housing for veterans exceeds the availability and believe in the work of Central Iowa Shelter & Services. You have been attended bi-weekly meetings to end Veterans homelessness and were crucial in meeting the Mayor’s Challenge to end Veterans homelessness in Polk County. Central Iowa Shelter & Services is also active participants in work groups focused on the chronically homeless and the elderly. Central Iowa Shelter & Services has the experience and resources to provide these services to veterans experiencing homelessness.

The Polk County Continuum of Care Board looks forward to continuing to work with Central Iowa Shelter & Services in ensuring everyone in Polk County will have a safe place to call home.

Sincerely,

Mark K. Phillips
Executive Director
Polk County Continuum of Care Board