

ORANGE COUNTY
CONTINUUM OF CARE BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
Wednesday, September 14, 2022
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location:
County Administration South (CAS) Building
Conference Center
425 West Santa Ana Blvd. Room 104/106
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4599
[Click Here](#) for parking information

AGENDA

Board Members

Matt Bates, City Net [Secretary]
Judson Brown, City of Santa Ana
Nikki Buckstead, Family Solutions Collaborative
Donald Dermit, The Rock Church
Becks Heyhoe, OC United Way [Vice Chair]
Tim Houchen, Hope4Restoration
Patti Long, Mercy House
Nishtha Mohendra, Families Forward
Dawn Price, Friendship Shelter

Eric Richardson, Volunteers of America
Maricela Rios-Faust, Human Options [Chair]
Soledad Rivera, Families Together of OC
Elida Sanchez, OC Department of Education
Dr. Shauntina Sorrells, Orangewood Foundation
George Searcy, Jamboree Housing
Tim Shaw, Individual
Christina Weckerly Ramirez, Health Care Agency

* In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and County Language Access Policy, those requiring accommodation and/or interpreter services for this meeting should notify the Office of Care Coordination 24 hours prior to the special meeting at (714) 834-5000 or email CareCoordination@ochca.com. Requests received less than 24 hours prior to the special meeting will still receive every effort to reasonably fulfill within the time provided. *

Call to Order – Maricela Rios-Faust, Chair

Board Member Roll Call – Matt Bates, Secretary

Public Comments: Members of the public may address the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board on items listed within this agenda or matters not appearing on the agenda so long as the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the CoC Board. Members of the public may address the CoC Board with public comments on agenda items in the business calendar after the CoC Board member discussion. Comments will be limited to three minutes. If there are more than five public speakers, this time will be reduced to two minutes.

To address the CoC Board, members of the public are to complete a Request to Address the CoC Board form prior to the beginning of each agenda item and submit it to CoC Board staff. Staff will call your name in the order received.

Members of the public may also submit public comment by emailing CareCoordination@ochca.com. All comments submitted via email at least 60 minutes before the start of the CoC Board meeting will be distributed to the CoC Board members for their consideration and all comments will be added to the administrative records of the meeting. Please include “CoC Board Meeting Comment” in the email subject line.

Board Member Comments: Members of the CoC Board may provide comments on matters not appearing on the agenda so long as the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the CoC Board.

CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters are approved by one motion unless pulled by a Board Member for discussion or separate action. The CoC Board requests that only pertinent information be discussed during this time.

No Consent Calendar Items.

BUSINESS CALENDAR

1. **FY2022 CoC Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)** – Zulima Lundy, Director of Operations, Office of Care Coordination
 - a. Approve the selection of the proposals submitted in response to the CoC Bonus, Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus and Reallocation Request for Proposals (RFP) as recommended by the two Review Panel – one for CoC Bonus and Reallocation proposals and one for DV Bonus proposals – for inclusion in the Orange County CoC Program NOFO collaborative application.
 - i. Friendship Shelter, Inc’s. rapid rehousing project proposal called Friendship Shelter Rapid Rehousing Project in the amount of \$362,312 as part of the CoC Bonus.
 - ii. People Assisting the Homeless’ (PATH) rapid rehousing project proposal called PATH Rapid Rehousing in the amount of \$1,134,727 as part of the CoC Bonus.
 - iii. Human Options’ Joint Transitional Housing and Permanent Housing – Rapid Rehousing project proposal called DV Housing First Collaborative Project in the amount of \$1,498,858 as part of the DV Bonus.
 - b. Approve the CoC Project Ranking and Tiering policy as recommended by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc.
 - c. Approve the CoC Project Priority Listing, including all renewal, transition, and new projects to be included in the Orange County CoC’s FY 2022 CoC Program NOFO application as recommended by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc.
2. **CoC Special Notice of Funding Opportunity to Address Unsheltered Homelessness (CoC Special NOFO)** – Zulima Lundy, Director of Operations, Office of Care Coordination
 - a. Approve the CoC Special NOFO funding priorities as recommended by the CoC Special NOFO Ad Hoc.
 - b. Update on Housing Stability Vouchers
3. **Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Data Request** – Zulima Lundy, Director of Operations, Office of Care Coordination; Erin DeRycke, 2-1-1 Orange County
 - a. Approve The Mark, USA and Family Solutions Collaborative’s HMIS data request for the period of July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2022, to assist in the evaluation of the family homeless response system on a system-level and family-level outcomes.

4. **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, September 28, 2022, from 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Date: September 14, 2022

Subject: FY2022 Continuum of Care (CoC) Program Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO)

Recommended Actions:

- a. Approve the selection of the proposals submitted in response to the CoC Bonus, Domestic Violence (DV) Bonus and Reallocation Request for Proposals (RFP) as recommended by the two Review Panel for inclusion in the Orange County CoC Program NOFO collaborative.
 - i. Friendship Shelter, Inc. Inc's. rapid rehousing project proposal called Friendship Shelter Rapid Rehousing Project in the amount of \$362,312 as part of the CoC Bonus.
 - ii. People Assisting the Homeless' (PATH) rapid rehousing project proposal called PATH Rapid Rehousing in the amount of \$1,134,727 as part of the CoC Bonus.
 - iii. Human Options' Joint Transitional Housing and Permanent Housing – Rapid Rehousing project proposal called DV Housing First Collaborative Project in the amount of \$1,498,858 as part of the DV Bonus.
- b. Approve the CoC Project Ranking and Tiering policy as recommended by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc
- c. Approve the CoC Project priority Listing, including all renewal, transition, and new projects, to be included in the Orange County CoC's FY 2022 CoC Program NOFO application as recommended by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc.

Background and Analysis

Selection of Proposals in Response to CoC Bonus, DV Bonus and Reallocation RFP

The Orange County CoC is eligible to apply for an estimated amount of \$1,497,148 in CoC Bonus Funding and an estimated \$1,984,683 in DV Bonus funding. As approved by the CoC Board on August 24, 2022, the County of Orange as the Coordinated Entry System (CES) Lead is eligible to submit a Supportive Services Only (SSO) – CES project to be funded by the DV Bonus in an amount not to exceed \$250,000. Thus, the new total DV Bonus funding available for the Orange County CoC is approximately \$1,734,683. Additional funding may be available for new projects and/or expansion projects through the reallocation process, however, at this time, no renewal projects are being recommended for reallocation as part of the FY2022 CoC Program NOFO.

During the August 24, 2022, CoC Board Meeting, the Orange County CoC Board approved the recommendation to establish two non-conflicted Review Panel to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the CoC Bonus and Reallocation Funding RFP for the FY2022 CoC Program NOFO, one for the CoC Bonus and reallocation funding and one for the DV Bonus funding. The Office of Care Coordination worked to identify individuals with a deep knowledge and understanding of the CoC and the homeless service system to support with this review process. The CoC Bonus and Reallocation Review Panel was comprised of three members – Imelda Buncab, Chief Program and Engagement Officer, Share Our Selves Community Health Center; Jonathan Forbes, Director of Strategic Partnerships, Orangewood Foundation; and Robert Morse, member of the Lived Experience Advisory Committee. The DV Bonus Review Panel was comprised of three members – Nichole Gideon, member of the Lived Experience Advisory Committee; Lisa

Kim, Assistant City Manager/Community and Economic Development Director of the City of Garden Grove; and Shannon Lamb, Director of Quality Assurance, The Salvation Army California South Division.

The CoC Bonus and Reallocation Proposal Projects must serve persons who qualify as homeless under paragraphs (1), (2), or (4) of 24 CFR 578.3. Additionally, new Permanent Housing – Permanent Supportive Housing projects must be either designated as DedicatedPLUS project or Dedicated to Chronically Homeless Individuals and Families. Eligible project types under the CoC Bonus and Reallocation component of the RFP include Joint Transitional Housing and Permanent Housing – Rapid Rehousing (Joint TH and PH-RRH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH). Proposals could be entirely new projects or serve as expansion projects to increase the total funding amount and households to be served of a renewal project.

The members of the CoC Bonus and Reallocation Review Panel reviewed the two proposals as submitted by Friendship Shelter and People Assisting the Homeless (PATH) independently based on the scoring criteria as outlined in the RFP and approved by the CoC Board. The RFP Review Panel participated in a consensus meeting to discuss the proposals at length, provide feedback on areas for improvement and highlight the unique strengths of each proposal. The RFP Review Panel recommended both projects for inclusion in the Orange County CoC Program Collaborative Application, as neither requested the maximum amount available under the CoC Bonus. The RFP Review Panel ranked the proposal by Friendship Shelter, Inc. first and the proposal by PATH second.

The DV Bonus Projects must be dedicated to serve survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that are defined as homeless, as defined in 24 CFR 578.3. Eligible project types include Permanent Housing – Rapid Rehousing and Joint Transitional Housing and Permanent Housing - Rapid Rehousing.

The members of the DV Bonus Review Panel reviewed one proposal submitted by Human Options based on the scoring criteria as outlined in the RFP and approved by the CoC Board. The DV Bonus Review Panel participated in a consensus meeting to discuss the proposal at length, provide feedback on areas for improvement and highlight the unique strengths. The RFP Review Panel recommended the project for inclusion in the Orange County CoC Program Collaborative Application.

The Office of Care Coordination, as the Collaborative Applicant, will work with the agencies to update their proposal accordingly to ensure the most competitive new project applications are included in the collaborative application to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

[CoC Project Ranking and Tiering Policy](#)

The CoC NOFO Ad Hoc and the Office of Care Coordination, as the CoC Collaborative Applicant, developed an updated FY2022 CoC Project Ranking and Tiering Policy. During the August 25, 2022, CoC Board Meeting, the Orange County CoC Board approved the Scoring and Rating Criteria for FY 2022 CoC Renewal Projects, including the project performance measures, thresholds and point allocations, as recommended by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc.

Utilizing the CoC Board approved scoring rubrics for renewals and transition project applications, the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc also considered the following items in the ranking and tiering process:

- Rating and Ranking Criteria Score

- Project type
- Competitiveness of CoC Bonus Funding Applications and DV Bonus Funding Applications
- Strategy to maximize available funding in the DV Bonus and CoC Bonus opportunities.

The CoC NOFO Ad Hoc decided to rank and tier projects based on the overall score from highest score to lowest score, expect the HMIS and CES projects being included in Tier 1 due to the vital infrastructure they provide to the Orange County CoC. For renewal projects that did not have relevant information for project performance and unspent funds, the total points possible were adjust accordingly. The Collaborative Applicant prepopulated the scores from the Agency Administrative Review, Project Performance Measures, and unspent funds. The remainder of the criteria, such as CES participation, housing first/low-barrier implementation and project effectiveness, was scored by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc as part of the annual CoC grant application process.

Additionally, the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc determined that new project applications under the CoC Bonus and DV Bonus would be placed in Tier 2, as the projects would bring increased capacity to the CoC and did not want to jeopardize any established project by placing additional renewal project in Tier 2. The CoC NOFO Ad Hoc also ranked the projects based on the hire core score (without the bonus points) and considered the difference in DV Bonus projects scoring criteria and how these may impact the overall ranking if projects in Tier 2. Given the infrastructure that the proposed SSO-CES project to be funded by the DV Bonus it was determined it should be listed above the Joint TH/PH-RRH project proposed by Human Options.

The proposed policy supports the thoughtful evaluation of renewal and new project applications, as well as reflect the priorities and guidance as provided by the CoC Board and HUD.

[FY2022 CoC Program Priority Listing](#)

Utilizing the above described CoC Project Ranking and Tiering Policy, the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc and the Office of Care Coordination developed an updated FY2022 CoC Program Priority Listing.

Attachment A details the FY2022 CoC Program Priority Listing as recommended by the CoC NOFO Ad Hoc and details the ranking and tiering of renewal projects, CoC Bonus and DV Bonus projects for inclusion in the Orange County CoC Program Consolidated Application. Approval of the recommended action will support the Orange County CoC in fulfilling the requirements of the FY2022 CoC Program NOFO.

Attachments

Attachment A – FY2022 CoC Program Priority Listing

Item 1. Attachment A

Orange County Continuum of Care FY2022 Priority Program Listing

Total Annual Renewal Amount: \$29,942,953

Tier 1 (95% of ARA): \$28,445,805

Tier 2 (5% of ARA + CoC Bonus + DV Bonus): \$4,978,979

CoC Bonus: \$1,497,148

DV Bonus: \$1,984,683

CoC Planning: \$898,289

Project Ranking	Applicant Name	Project Name	Project Component	Total ARA	Score
1	Interval House	Domestic Violence TH-RRH Program	Joint TH-RRH	\$946,775	100.0%
2	Interval House	Rapid Rehousing Program	RRH	\$234,783	99.3%
3	Friendship Shelter, Inc.	Henderson House Permanent Supportive Housing	PSH	\$632,877	96.1%
4	Orange County Housing Authority	#3 Consolidated Continuum of Care TRA	PSH	\$2,957,977	95.3%
5	Mercy House Living Centers	OC PSH Collaboration Project II	PSH	\$2,298,858	92.6%
6	Mercy House Living Centers	Mills End and PSH Leasing Consolidation	PSH	\$574,790	92.5%
7	Mercy House Living Centers	OC PSH Collaboration Project	PSH	\$3,641,354	91.4%
8	Orange County Housing Authority	#4 Consolidated Continuum of Care TRA	PSH	\$2,304,462	91.2%
9	Orange County Housing Authority	#1 Consolidated Shelter Plus Care TRA	PSH	\$4,472,267	89.6%
10	Illumination Foundation	Street2Home OC Expansion	PSH	\$1,956,881	88.4%
11	Orange County Housing Authority	Jackson Aisle Shelter Plus Care	PSH	\$389,050	87.8%
12	Illumination Foundation	Stanton Multi-Service Center	PSH	\$472,533	87.7%
13	Orange County Housing Authority	#2 Consolidated Continuum of Care TRA	PSH	\$1,938,248	87.3%
14	Mercy House Living Centers	Mercy House - CoC Leasing - Renewal	PSH	\$539,006	84.9%
15	Serving People In Need, Inc.	CoC Rapid Re-Housing	RRH	\$629,234	84.7%
16	Anaheim Supportive Housing, Inc.	Tyrol Plaza Senior Apartments	PSH	\$231,212	80.5%
17	Mercy House Living Centers	Aqua PSH	PSH	\$295,784	75.3%
18	American Family Housing	Permanent Housing Collaborative	PSH	\$384,629	71.7%
19	Fullerton Interfaith Emergency Service	PSH for Families	RRH	\$346,067	68.3%
20	Families Forward	Families Forward Rapid Re-Housing Expansion	RRH	\$579,869	68.0%
21	American Family Housing	Permanent Housing 2	PSH	\$593,107	67.9%
22	County of Orange	Coordinated Entry System SSO Grant 2021	SSO-CES	\$1,231,239	
23	People for Irvine Community Health (211OC)	HMIS Consolidated Community Support NOFA 2021	HMIS	\$650,575	
24	Human Options	DV Bonus Project	Joint TH-RRH	\$144,228	65.0%
			Tier 1 Total	\$ 28,445,805	
25	Human Options	DV Bonus Project	Joint TH-RRH	\$1,497,148	65.0%
26	Friendship Shelter	Friendship Shelter Rapid Re-Housing (CoC Bonus)	RRH	\$362,312	92.0%
27	County of Orange	Coordinated Entry System – DV (DV Bonus)	SSO	\$250,000	
28	Human Options	DV Housing First Collaborative Project (DV Bonus)	Joint TH-RRH	\$1,498,858	88.9%
29	PATH	PATH Rapid Re-Housing (CoC Bonus)	RRH	\$1,134,727	88.3%
			Tier 2 Total	\$ 4,743,045	
				\$ 33,188,850	

Date: September 14, 2022

Subject: CoC Special Notice of Funding Opportunity to Address Unsheltered Homelessness (CoC Special NOFO)

Recommended Actions:

- a. Approve the CoC Special NOFO Scoring criteria and funding priorities as recommended by the CoC Special NOFO Ad Hoc.

Background and Analysis

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is making approximately \$322 million in funding available through a Continuum of Care Supplemental to Address Unsheltered and Rural Homelessness Notice of Funding Opportunity (CoC Special NOFO). Funding will be utilized to support communities in developing plans to address rural and unsheltered homelessness, particularly in communities with very high levels of unsheltered homelessness. Eligible project types for this funding include permanent housing (rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing), joint transitional housing and permanent housing – rapid rehousing, supportive services only, and Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS). The CoC Special NOFO application for the three-year grant is due on October 20, 2022.

At the July 12, 2022, meeting of the CoC Board, the CoC Board membership approved the recommendation to establish an Ad Hoc to support the local competition process. The CoC Special NOFO Ad Hoc (Ad Hoc) is comprised of non-conflicted members and has been tasked with providing recommendations to the CoC Board around the CoC Special NOFO, such as determining the rating and ranking criteria for projects, reviewing project applications, and determining the final ranking for the CoC Special NOFO Priority Listing for the Consolidated Application. The Ad Hoc membership includes Michael Shepherd of OC United Way, Sarah Nance of Cal Optima, and Steven Kim of Project Kinship, and is facilitated by the Office of Care Coordination, as the CoC Collaborative Applicant.

The Ad Hoc met on September 6, 2022, to discuss rating and scoring criteria and funding priorities for the CoC Special NOFO. The Office of Care Coordination confirmed support from the Ad Hoc for the recommended Scoring Criteria for proposals received in response to the Orange County CoC Special NOFO solicitation. The rating and scoring criteria for the CoC Special NOFO is detailed in Attachment A.

In addition to discussing the Scoring criteria, the Ad Hoc discussed the recommended funding priorities for the CoC Special NOFO. The Ad Hoc concluded that the funding priorities should be in two tiers, with the Tier One focusing on permanent housing projects (rapid rehousing and permanent supportive housing) and the Tier Two focusing on programs with more support. Including the joint transitional housing and rapid rehousing and supportive services only project types. The Ad Hoc will recommended prioritizing projects in Tier One for funding. Additionally, the Ad Hoc discussed the importance of project proposals articulating and demonstrating how they will best support people with Severe Service Needs.

The CoC Special NOFO Ad Hoc has reviewed and recommended the scoring and rating criteria and funding priorities for Special NOFO. The CoC Board is being asked to review and take action on the recommended Ranking and Scoring criteria and funding priorities as set by the CoC Special NOFO Ad Hoc.

Attachments

Attachment A - FY2022 CoC Special NOFO Scoring Criteria

Item 2. Attachment A

Orange County Continuum of Care Special Notice of Funding Opportunity to Address Unsheltered Homelessness Request for Proposals Ad Hoc Scoring Sheet

Ad Hoc Member Name:

Applicant and Project Name:

Criterion	Criterion and description of basis for assigning points	Maximum Points	Reviewer Score	Comments
1. CoC Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant has demonstrated participation and involvement in the Orange County CoC and core activities of the CoC, such as Point In Time Count and Housing Inventory Count. Applicant participates in the local HMIS and completes timely and curate data submissions, as requested. Applicant participates in the local CES. Reference Exhibit 3 Recommendation – Assigning 2 points per section in Exhibit 3: Local participation, HMIS, PIT, HIC, and CES 	Up to 10 points		
2. Capacity of Applicant and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Past and current relevant experience in providing housing and services related to those in this solicitation, including evaluation of current and similar project types Past and current relevant experience in effectively utilizing federal funds and performing the activities proposed in the application, including, administrative, financial, and programmatic components Reference Exhibit 2, Exhibit 5 (Questions 1 to 4), and Section 2B in the E-Snaps Application. 	Up to 10 points		
3. Applicant Service Experience and Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant has demonstrated experience in working with target population to quickly secure housing, make connections to supportive services, and promote housing stability. Applicant described service delivery approach for serving people with severe service needs. Applicant described service delivery approach to serving underserved communities. Applicant described data driven approach to service delivery. Reference Exhibit 5 (Questions 5 to 12), and Section 2B in the E-Snaps Application 	Up to 20 points		

Item 2. Attachment A

<p>4. Involving Persons with Lived Experience</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant has a member on Board of Director’s with current and/or experience of homelessness. Reference Attachment 2 • Applicant ensures perspectives of people with lived experience of homelessness are meaningfully and intentionally integrated into the decision-making process. Reference Exhibit 6 • Applicant practices meaningful involvement of people with lived experience in the delivery of services. Reference Exhibit 6 • Recommendation – Assign 2 points to Board od Directors and 4 points per question in Exhibit 6 	<p>Up to 10 points</p>		
<p>5. Proposed Project-Service Plan and Supportive Services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed project, including service plan and supportive services, is appropriate for the household type and/or subpopulation. • Proposed project includes strategies to assist participants to obtain and remain in permanent housing, increase their employment and/or income and maximum their ability to live independently. Reference Section 4A in the E-Snaps Application • Proposed project will implement a Housing first, client-centered approach and evidence-based practices in program operations. In order to receive full points, applicants must clearly describe the evidence-informed practices that the project will use in policies, procedures, and operations. Reference Exhibit 7 (Question 8) and Attachment 13 • Proposed project will have tailored approach to serve people with severe service needs and underserved communities. Reference Exhibit 7 (Questions 9 -14) and Section 4A in the E-Snaps Application • Proposed project will aim to leverage housing resources and/or health care resources. Reference Exhibit 8 • Note: Based on the Ad Hoc’s discussion this is of particular importance when addressing severe service needs, underserved communities and unsheltered homelessness. These should also be appropriate based on the project type being proposed. 	<p>Up to 25 points</p>		
<p>6. Outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed performance outcomes (not outputs) that will be achieved by the project and how data will be used to measure those outcomes and determine success. • Proposed performance outcomes should focus on participants 	<p>Up to 10 points</p>		

Item 2. Attachment A

	<p>housing placement and permanent housing retention, as well as improved quality of life, rather than measuring the amount or types of services provided (not outputs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference Section 3B, 5A and 5B in the E-Snaps Application • Note: Based on the Ad Hoc’s discussion this is of particular importance as the project should meaningfully reduce homelessness and promote housing stability. 			
7. Project Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated schedule for the proposed project to begin operations, including housing services and supportive services activities. Full points will be given to projects that can begin soon after grant is awarded. • Reference Section 1D Question 17 in the E-Snaps Application. • Note: Based on Ad Hoc’s discussion this is of particular importance if the project is requesting acquisition and rehabilitation funding 	Up to 5 points		
8. Budget and Match	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget is reasonable for type of project proposed, total number of households and participants to be served and clearly articulated. • Applicant is able to provide the required match of at least 25% is included and documented. • Applicant is able to demonstrate how leverage housing resources and/or health care resources contribute to the overall budget of the project proposed. • Reference Section 6 in the E-Snaps Application • Note: Based on Ad Hoc’s discussion this is of particular importance if the project is requesting acquisition and rehabilitation funding in comparison to other budget line items 	Up to 10 points		
Total Points		100		

Date: September 14, 2022

Subject: Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Data Request

Recommended Actions:

- a. Approve The Mark, USA and Family Solutions Collaborative’s HMIS data request for the period of July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2022, to assist in the evaluation of the family homeless response system on a system-level and family-level outcomes.

Background and Analysis

On July 5, 2022, The Mark, USA submitted a data request to 2-1-1 Orange County (211OC), HMIS Lead, requesting data for the period of July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2022, to assist in the evaluation of the family homeless response system on a system-level and family-level outcomes. The Family Solutions Collaborative provided a letter in support of The Mark, USA’s request noting that it would be used as an evaluation of the work of the Family Solutions Collaborative, reference Attachment A.

The HMIS data request includes data from the Family Coordinated Entry System and Family Bed Reservation System, the Family Solutions Collaborative Housing Navigation project, and the shelters participating in the Family Bed Reservation System. The Mark, USA will analyze data from HMIS to understand how families are being supported and served through the Family Solutions Collaborative (FSC). The HMIS data will provide critical information about how the family system is performing and identify areas for improvement. The specific data elements requested are detailed below and the full request as submitted by The Mark, USA can be found on Attachment B.

Family Coordinated Entry System Data

- i. Population: All heads of households entered in FCES – excluding veterans who processed through the veteran coordinated entry system
- ii. Reporting period: July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2022
- iii. Client-level data: Yes
- iv. Data elements:
 - a. 5.09 Household identifier
 - b. FCES project enrollment date
 - c. VIS-SPDAT or Family Assessment date
 - d. 3.08 Disabling condition
 - e. 3.15 relationship to head of household
 - f. Total family size
 - g. Count of adults
 - h. Count of children 0-5
 - i. Count of children 0-17
 - j. Custom enrollment question – is anyone in the household pregnant
 - k. CES Data
 - i. Reassigned date (match date)
 - ii. Housing Data:

1. Project Start Date:
2. Housing Move-In Date:
3. Destination

Bed Reservation Data

- i. Population: Bed reservation heads of households
- ii. Reporting period: July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022
- iii. Client-level data: Yes
- iv. Data elements:
 - a. 5.09 Household identifier
 - b. Referral date to bed res queue
 - c. Date of match to shelter opportunity
 - d. Accepted date
 - e. 3.08 Disabling condition
 - f. 3.15 relationship to head of household
 - g. Total family size
 - h. Count of adults
 - i. Count of children 0-5
 - j. Count of children 0-17
 - k. Custom enrollment question – is anyone in the household pregnant
 - l. 3.03 Date of birth

Housing Navigation Project Data

- i. Population: Housing Navigation project heads of households
- ii. Reporting period: July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022
- iii. Client-level data: Yes
- iv. Data elements:
 - a. Project Start Date
 - b. Project Exit Date
 - c. CES Data
 - i. Reassigned Date
 - ii. Project Type Accepted To
 - iii. Project is CoC Funded (yes/no)
 - iv. Housing Data:
 1. Project Start Date
 2. Housing Move-In Date
 3. Destination

Shelter-Level Data

- i. Population: FSC-participating shelters
- ii. Reporting period: July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2022
- iii. Client-level data: Yes
- iv. Data elements:
 - a. Project start date
 - b. Project exit date
 - i. To calculate length of stay/time to exit & identify any movement between shelters
 - c. Residence Prior to Entry
 - d. Client has RRH Enrollment after ES (yes/no)

- e. Destination
- f. Income Status

Attachments

Attachment A – Family Solutions Collaborative Letter of Support

Attachment B – Family Solutions Collaborative Systems Evaluation Plan as submitted by The Mark, USA



Members:

American Family Housing

Casa Teresa

City of Huntington Beach

City Net

Colette's Children's Home

Families Forward

Family Assistance Ministries (FAM)

Family Promise of Orange County

Habitat for Humanity of Orange County

Homeless Intervention Services, OC (HIS OC)

HomeAid Orange County

Human Options

Illumination Foundation

Interval House

Laura's House

Mercy House

Pathways of Hope

Project Hope Alliance

The Salvation Army of Orange County

Serving People in Need (SPIN)

South County Outreach

StandUp for Kids

Tustin Emergency Shelter

Women's Transitional Living Center, Inc. (WTLC)

Nikki Buckstead, Executive Director

2-1-1 Orange County
1505 E 17th Street, Suite 108
Santa Ana, CA 92705

RE: Data Request for FSC Family Systems Evaluation

To whom it may concern:

The Family Solutions Collaborative is writing in support of the data request submitted by The Mark USA. This data will be used for an evaluation of the work of the FSC's family homeless response system.

First 5 Orange County has been involved and engaged in the work and success of the FSC since 2015, investing a variety of resources, both financially and strategically with several of our projects and evaluations. This evaluation has been commissioned and is being funded by First 5 of Orange County. As a partner and stakeholder of the FSC, First 5 Orange County is invested in supporting our systems-level work and impact we are making on the family homeless response system.

The Family Solutions Collaborative (FSC) has hired the Mark USA, an evaluation and research firm, to gather and analyze data from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to understand how families are being supported and served through the FSC systems level work. The HMIS data will provide critical information about how our system is performing and where we can improve.

The data request spans back to 2018, the last time we conducted a systems evaluation, and the year we launched the family coordinated entry system, and since then, implemented the FSC Shelter Provider Network, FSC Bed Reservation System as well as two other systems-level projects funded by First 5 Orange County – our Diversion Expansion Project and Housing Navigation Program. This historical data will allow The Mark to look back over the past four years of the work of the FSC and is critical to understanding the impact of our changes over time.

We are happy to provide any further information you need for this data request. Thank you for your time and consideration.

For the families,

Nikki Buckstead
Executive Director

1505 E 17th Street, Suite 220
Santa Ana, CA 92705



March 11, 2022

Family Solutions Collaborative Systems Evaluation

In 2018, the Orange County Family Shelter Network and Family Response System Evaluation identified several key gaps and limitations of the family homeless responses system. Key recommendations from the evaluation included:

- Complete the design and launch of coordinated entry for shelters
 - Assess coordinated entry functioning and align more closely to inventory
- Improve the consistency of the housing focus in shelters
- Make shelter diversion practice consistent and define clearly when a family is considered diverted
- Define and align core shelter practices and align length-of-stay targets, caps, and extension policies
 - Set performance targets

In response to these recommendations, the FSC, First Five, and other community stakeholders made several key changes to the family homeless response system. These changes included:

- Launching the family coordinated entry system
- Piloting and implementing the bed reservation system
- Funding family housing navigation in the housing navigation project with Families Forward and participating shelters
- Launching the Diversion Expansion Project with the access points
- Implementing FSC shelter guidelines consistently across FSC-participating shelters and collecting data on performance targets

The proposed evaluation seeks to assess the impact of these changes to the family homeless response system on system-level and family-level outcomes.

Evaluation questions:

1. How has Family Coordinated Entry System, Bed Reservation System, Family Housing Navigation, and Diversion Expansion addressed previously identified gaps and increased the efficiency of the family homeless response system since 2018?
2. To what extent have FSC-participating shelters become more efficient in addressing family homelessness since 2018?

Item 3. Attachment B

- a. Are participating shelters adhering to shelter guidelines and meeting FSC-identified shelter performance outcomes?
- b. What barriers and challenges have agencies experienced in implementing the changes that have been made to the homelessness response system (e.g., FCES, bed reservation, housing navigation) and meeting shelter performance outcomes?
3. To what extent has Family Housing Navigation impacted the experience of families seeking housing while in the shelter-system?
 - a. What barriers and challenges have families faced while participating in Family Housing Navigation?
4. To what extent does FSC address family homelessness as defined by national indicators and compared to outcomes in comparable counties?

See table below for breakdown of concepts to be measured, sample, data source, and planned analyses by evaluation question.

Breakdown of concepts to be measured, sample, data source, and planned analyses by evaluation question

Concepts measured ^a	Sample	Data source	Time period examined	Analysis	Reporting ^b
Impact of changes to the Family Homelessness Response System on system-level and family-level outcomes					
I. How has Family Coordinated Entry System, Bed Reservation System, Family Housing Navigation, and Diversion Expansion addressed previously identified gaps and increased the efficiency of the family homeless response system since 2018?					
<p>Efficiency of FCES: Has the process become more streamlined over time?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Length of time to be contacted by access point ● Length of time on the community queue ● Length of time to complete vulnerability assessment (are more vulnerable families being prioritized?) ● Identify characteristics of families that increase time on community queue (e.g., disability, family size, single parent, age of children) <p>Efficiency of Bed Reservation: How long are families waiting to be matched to shelter? Are all beds/units being utilized?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Occupancy rate ● Length of time spent on bed reservation queue ● Length of time from referral to match ● Identify characteristics of families that increase time on bed reservation queue (e.g., disability, family size, single parent, age of children) <p>Efficiency of Family Housing Navigation: Is this program successfully moving families in housing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Average time elapsed between contact with Housing Navigator and housing ● Average length of stay in shelter (if family enters shelter) ● Total number of families housed ● Total number of families housed with children 0-5 	<p>Families entered into FCES</p> <p>Families served through FSC shelters participating in bed reservation</p> <p>Families served through FSC shelters participating in housing navigation</p>	<p>HMIS</p>	<p>Fiscal year 2018-2022</p> <p>July 1, 2020-present (for bed reservation data)</p>	<p>Descriptive and inferential statistics; compare trends over time where possible (e.g., FCES variables)</p> <p>Compare current trends in bed reservation to pilot data if possible</p>	<p>Annual report (estimated September of 2022 and July of 2023). Additional information on trends will be inserted into the progress update reports.</p>

Item 3. Attachment B

- Number of families who return to homelessness within a year of housing
- Number of families who received Tenant Education
- Number of families who returned to homeless who received Tenant Education (compared to those who did not)
- Number of families securing housing through Continuum of Care Rapid Rehousing (compared to those who did not secure housing with assistance from provider)
- Identify characteristics of families able to secure housing (e.g., disability, family size, single parent, age of children)

Efficiency of Diversion: How many families are being diverted rather than entering or remaining in shelter? What is the cost saved by diverting families compared to shelter?

- # families successfully diverted
- Length of time to diversion
- Average cost to divert

2. To what extent have FSC-participating shelters become more efficient in addressing family homelessness since 2018?

- Time to exit
- Length of stay
- Utilization of rapid re-housing funds
- Positive exits
- Current living situation-Destination
- Movement between shelters

- Emergency Maternity Shelter
- Family House
- Gilchrist House - Families
- Plumaria House
- Theriault House
- Family Care Center
- New Vista Emergency
- Via Esperanza

HMIS

Fiscal year 2018-2022

Descriptive and inferential analyses to examine trends over time; Examine indicators for all emergency family shelters using FSC guidelines and entering data into HMIS

Annual report (estimated September of 2022 and July of 2023). Additional information on trends will be inserted into the progress update reports.

Item 3. Attachment B

2a. Are participating shelters adhering to shelter guidelines and meeting FSC-identified shelter performance outcomes?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● % of families exiting directly to Permanent Housing ● % of families with positive exits ● % leave shelter to continued homelessness ● % entering shelter from literal homelessness ● % of families maintaining and increasing income ● Average occupancy rate of shelters ● % of families with average length of stay <= 60 days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emergency Maternity Shelter ● Family House ● Gilchrist House - Families ● Plumaria House ● Theriault House ● Family Care Center ● New Vista Emergency ● Via Esperanza 	<p>HMIS</p> <p>Shelter self-evaluations</p>	<p>January 2020-present</p>	<p>Frequencies; Outcomes compared to targets; compare over time; compare outcomes for congregate versus non-congregate facilities</p>	<p>Annual report (estimated September of 2022 and July of 2023). Additional information on trends will be inserted into the progress update reports.</p>
2b. What barriers and challenges have agencies experienced in implementing the changes that have been made to the homelessness response system (e.g., FCES, bed reservation, housing navigation) and meeting shelter performance outcomes?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Challenges faced in implementing changes to the homelessness response system ● Challenges faced in implementing guidelines ● Challenges faced in serving families ● How have challenges been overcome? ● Positive outcomes as a result of changes to the homelessness response system 	<p>Family service navigators and FSC administrators</p>	<p>Focus groups (FGs)</p>	<p>Conduct FGs in 2022 & 2023</p>	<p>Identify themes and compare themes across access points; compare over time</p>	<p>Annual report (estimated September of 2022 and July of 2023).</p> <p>Summary of FGs following completion of FGs (estimated July of 2022 and June 2023). Summary will be inserted into the</p>

progress update report.

3. To what extent has Family Housing Navigation impacted the experience of families seeking housing while in the shelter-system?

a. What barriers and challenges have families faced while participating in Family Housing Navigation?

- Family’s readiness/preparedness for housing.
- Family’s ability to maintain housing
- Impact of Housing Action plan
- Impact of housing resource connections
- Impact of Tenant Education
- Identify barriers and challenges

Heads of households who have participated in Family Housing Navigation

(Within shelters that are participating in Housing Navigation: families who are being housed and families who have secured housing)

Interviews

Conduct interviews in 2022 & 2023

Code for themes; compare themes from those using Housing Navigation to those who are not (if we have a comparison group)

Annual report (estimated September of 2022 and July of 2023).

Summary of interviews following completion of interviews (estimated July of 2022 and June 2023). Summary will be inserted into the progress update report.

Comparison to national indicators

4. To what extent does FSC address family homelessness as defined by national indicators?

Item 3. Attachment B

Success of addressing family homelessness (related to outcomes above)	FSC participating shelters	HMIS	Fiscal year 2022/2023	Examine outcomes from FSC participating shelters against national data/indicators using rubric	Annual report (estimated September of 2022 and July of 2023)
Nationally-recognized practices and indicators (e.g., goals defined by HUD, SAMHSA)	Other family emergency shelters in comparable cities	Published reports			

a. Data points indicated in the table are subject to change based on what data are available in HMIS. Additional data points may be added as needed.