

GOALS: Decrease the length of homeless episodes • Increase placements in housing • Reduce returns to homelessness • Decrease first-time homelessness • Increase incomes • Reduce the total number of people experiencing homelessness in Sonoma County					
Organization Name	CAPSC		Project Name	HCA Family Fund	
Organization Location	141 Stony Circle, #210, Santa Rosa		Project Location	141 Stony Circle, #210, Santa Rosa	
CDC Funding History		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	
Requested	N/A - 3-year award		N/A - 3-year award (adjusted)		50,000
Awarded	42,000		43,236		30,000
Households Served			2019-2020 Request	50,000	
	Proposed	Achieved			
Number Served - July 1 - Dec 31 (Existing Projects)		179 (per quarterly report)	Funding Sources Eligible for Project	CSF, LMIHAF	
Projected # Served- July 1 - June 30 (Existing Projects)	190				
Planned # to be served in FY 19-20 (New and Existing Projects)	225				
Budget and Anticipated Cost of Services					
Organizational Budget	11,229,959	% Served low/mod income		100%	
Project Budget	485,000	Cost per Housing Outcome	\$ 6,532	Score 0-5	1
CDC Request	50,000	Current Ratio		1.01	
Request as % of Project budget	10%	Debt to Asset Ratio		0.73	
Project as % of Org Budget	4%	Debt to Equity Ratio		2.74	
The following criteria refer to Selection Criteria of the FY 18-19 Homeless Services Funding Policies (Section 5, p. 16-19).					
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations	
5.2.	Joint Funding from Other Sources				
5.2.1.	Demonstrate leveraging of other funds and/or in-kind contributions.	Yes	N/A	A private donor contributes the vast majority of the HCA program budget, but requires local matching funds for project administration. Project administration is funded solely by the County and the City of Santa Rosa. CAPSC has been administering this program for about 30 years.	
5.2.2.	Percent of total project budget from other sources (Higher is better, 0-4 points)	90%	4		
5.2.3.	Demonstrated administrative capacity and adequate provisions for long-range maintenance and operations.	Yes	N/A		
5.3.	Organizational Capacity - no scoring				
5.3.1.	Application materials timely, complete and accurate	Yes	The HCA application was submitted complete and on time, and the project has a long history of complete and on time submissions. The HCA program once operated as a partnership with nonprofits throughout Sonoma County, with the goal of preventing homelessness countywide. Through successive administrations, CAPSC shifted to directly administering the funds and taking referrals from partner agencies only. This requires participants to present at CAPSC offices in Santa Rosa; effectively, the project serves primarily Santa Rosa beneficiaries.		
5.3.2.	Existing projects: required submissions submitted complete and on-time	Yes			
5.3.4.	Demonstrated support for geographic preference (single jurisdiction or region)	No			
5.3.5.	The project is appropriate in size, scope, and location to address the targeted client population and defined service area.	Yes			

Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations
<b>5.4 Housing First</b>				
5.4.1	Housing First Assessment Tool Scores stated in the application - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	No	N/A	CAPSC did not record the HCA program's scores in the Housing First Assessment Tool, but checked the box stating as a funded agency, they had completed this assessment before. The application is not complete with regard to this requirement. While the narrative states that the project prioritizes "some of our most vulnerable residents," it names significant barriers to participation, such as meeting income guidelines.
	Quality of Synopsis of Narrative Response (Score 0-7, 1 point per section)	No	1	
<b>5.5 Coordinated Entry</b>				
5.5.1	Acceptance of referrals only from Coordinated Entry (CE) and lowered barriers to entry (e.g., no income or sobriety requirements) - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	No		CAPSC did not respond to this section in the application, and does not mention Coordinated Entry in the narrative. Coordinated Entry Diversion does refer clients to HCA for financial assistance, but many do not meet the income guidelines to receive assistance from the HCA fund.
5.5.2	Participation in Coordinated Entry collaborative efforts - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	No		
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations
<b>5.6 Performance Measurement &amp; Project Priorities</b>				
5.6.1.1	<b>Increase housing placements:</b> Number to be housed (Permanent or Temporary) Score 0-5 pts	%		The application does not clearly describe achievements in housing retention for HCA participants, so this data comes from the HCA's 2nd quarterly report on the current fiscal year's operations: For FY 2018-19, HCA proposed that 85% of 175 participants would retain their housing. In the first half of the year, 179 people have been assisted and a total of 59 people (33% of them) retained housing: 40 homeless people obtained housing with HCA assistance, and 19 people imminently at risk of homelessness remained permanent housing.
5.6.1.2	<b>Decrease the overall length of homeless episodes:</b> Number of Days to Permanent Housing Exit from Shelter. Score 0-5 pts			
5.6.1.3	<b>Minimize returns to homelessness from permanent housing:</b> Number anticipated to retain permanent housing. Score 0-5 pts	33%	0	
<b>5.6.2 Project Priorities</b>				
5.6.2.1	Number of housing units to be developed (see Capital Projects evaluation tool)			See Performance Measurement section above. While CAPSC has worked to offer participants programs that can help them avoid repeat requests for services (such as financial training workshops), in general HCA offers an older style program design that relies on a single instance of assistance to prevent future homeless or at risk episodes. There is no evidence in the data nationally that this model actually <i>prevents</i> homelessness: only when delivered to people with past homeless experience is this intervention supported by evidence. This service delivery model necessarily prioritizes people who are more likely to succeed with one-time assistance, justifying income guidelines. CAPSC has so far not adjusted the program to work with either Coordinated Entry or a Housing First approach. In addition, stabilizing 33% of participants in housing is not a very impressive achievement when 90% is the expected benchmark. The cost per housing outcome calculation above is the program budget (\$485,000) divided by 33% of the 225 households expected to be served (74 households), yielding a rather high cost per outcome of \$6,532. Note however that the HCA program is perhaps the only source available that local rapid rehousing projects tap for one-time financial assistance for such things as security deposits, and first/last month rent. This is a critical need in ending homeless episodes. Revamping the program to primarily partner with rapid re-housing providers to address needs that are ineligible costs for the RRH funding might be a useful way to serve a documentable system need.
5.6.2.2	Permanent Supportive Housing: Serves chronically homeless person. 2 pt	N/A		
	Permanent Supportive Housing: case management:client ratio <15:1. 1 pt	N/A		
	Permanent Supportive Housing: Partnership with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.). 1 pt	N/A		
5.6.2.3	Rapid Re-Housing: Housing Locator staff included, 2 pt.	N/A		
	Rapid Re-Housing: demonstrate partnerships with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.), 2 pt.	N/A		
5.6.2.4	Shelters/Navigation Centers: Investment will lower barriers and address special needs, 0-9 points.	N/A		
5.6.2.5	Day Centers and street/encampment outreach projects will serve as CE Access Point, 0-4 pts	N/A		
5.6.2.6	Homeless Prevention Projects: Planned & historic % of persons demonstrating improved housing stability, 0-9 pts	33%	2	
	Homeless Diversion Projects: Percent of participants at imminent risk of homelessness who avoid entering homeless services. 0-9 pts	%		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>8.00</b>	<b>FUNDING RECOMMENDATION</b>
<b>RATIONALE</b>			<b>Up to \$30,000</b>	
The HCA Fund is currently operating with \$30,000 support from the County, but the system model is less than ideal. Evaluators and the Leadership Council might consider a minimum award on the understanding that this continued funding would be conditioned on CAPSC refocusing the program to primarily fund move-in expenses that are ineligible for other Rapid Re-Housing projects.				

GOALS: Decrease the length of homeless episodes • Increase placements in housing • Reduce returns to homelessness • Decrease first-time homelessness • Increase incomes • Reduce the total number of people experiencing homelessness in Sonoma County						
Organization Name	Catholic Charities		Project Name	Homeless Prevention/Diversion		
Organization Location	PO Box 4900, Santa Rosa		Project Location	465 A Street, Santa Rosa, CA		
CDC Funding History		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019		
Requested	\$0		\$0		\$0	
Awarded	\$86,429		\$88,972		\$86,429	
Households Served			2019-2020 Request	\$150,000		
	Proposed	Achieved				
Number Served - July 1 - Dec 31 (Existing Projects)		203	Funding Sources Eligible for Project	Federal / State ESG Community Service Fund (CSF) Low Moderate Housing Asset Fund (LMIHAF) California Emergency Services & Housing (CESH) Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP)		
Projected # Served - July 1 - June 30 (Existing Projects)	NA					
Planned # to be served in FY 19-20 (New and Existing Projects)	350					
Budget and Anticipated Cost of Services						
Organizational Budget	18,325,292	% Served low/mod income		100%		
Project Budget	170,000	Cost per Housing Outcome	\$ 540	Score 0-5	5.00	
CDC Request	150,000	Current Ratio		0.71		
Request as % of Project budget	88%	Debt to Asset Ratio		0.31		
Project as % of Org Budget	1%	Debt to Equity Ratio		0.44		
The following criteria refer to Selection Criteria of the FY 18-19 Homeless Services Funding Policies (Section 5, p. 16-19).						
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations		
5.2.	Joint Funding from Other Sources					
5.2.1.	Demonstrate leveraging of other funds and/or in-kind contributions.	Yes	N/A	For FY 2019-2020, Catholic Charities is requesting \$150,000 for their Homeless Prevention/Diversion project. Their project budget contains \$20,000 in Fundraising as the only other source of funds for the project. Catholic Charities has operated the Homeless Prevention/Diversion project over the past 4 years, but it has evolved with the implementation of Coordinated Entry to enable CE staff to conduct diversion assessments, and to assist clients to avoid literal homelessness. The project pays for staff time that cannot be paid with the CE project's other funds. Catholic Charities requests \$150,000 for the project, with \$40,000 in direct assistance dollars for clients and the balance going to staff time.		
5.2.2.	Percent of total project budget from other sources <i>(Higher is better, 0-4 points)</i>	12%	1			
5.2.3.	Demonstrated administrative capacity and adequate provisions for long-range maintenance and operations.	Yes	N/A			
5.3.	Organizational Capacity - no scoring					
5.3.1.	Application materials timely, complete and accurate	Yes	Catholic Charities submitted its application for the Homeless Prevention/Diversion project on time and complete. The agency has several years of experience operating the Homeless Diversion project. An earlier 3-year "homeless prevention" award was revamped to provide "diversion," only because the primary source funding the CE project, a Continuum of Care grant, does not allow funds to be used to support beneficiaries who are not literally homeless. This application requests 1.0 FTE Diversion Specialist in addition to billing CE team hours to Diversion (as opposed to CE). It is worth noting that Catholic Charities submitted a separate application to build the CE team in new locations: if adequately funded, the expanded State and local funds in this competition could be used for diversion as well, and eliminate the need for recordkeeping for a second award.			
5.3.2.	Existing projects: required submissions submitted complete and on-time	Yes				
5.3.4.	Demonstrated support for geographic preference (single jurisdiction or region)	N/A				
5.3.5.	The project is appropriate in size, scope, and location to address the targeted client population and defined service area.	Yes				
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations		

5.4		Housing First			
5.4.1	Housing First Assessment Tool Scores stated in the application - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes	N/A	Catholic Charities scored 84 on the Housing First assessment tool, out of 108 (assuming that they used the Street Outreach category on the tool--there is no Diversion category). The score is the same as that submitted for the Homeless Services Center. The project is considered low barrier as conditional items such as drug testing is not a requirement.	
	Quality of Synopsis of Narrative Response (Score 0-7, 1 point per section)	Yes	7		
5.5		Coordinated Entry			
5.5.1	Acceptance of referrals only from Coordinated Entry (CE) and lowered barriers to entry (e.g., no income or sobriety requirements) - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes	The Homeless Prevention/Diversion Project is a key piece of the Coordinated Entry System, with an attempt at diversion from homelessness being the first step in the CE enrollment process. Households that do not qualify to enroll in CE are referred to a diversion specialist, preventing their enrollment into homeless services until it's utterly necessary. Historically no direct financial assistance has been provided to clients (only outside referrals), but this request includes \$40,000 for direct client assistance.		
5.5.2	Participation in Coordinated Entry collaborative efforts - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes			
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations	
5.6		Performance Measurement & Project Priorities			
5.6.1.1	Increase housing placements: Number to be housed (Permanent or Temporary) Score 0-5 pts	%		The Homeless Prevention /Diversion project has diverted 203 households during the first 6 months of Fiscal Year 2018-19 and anticipates to serve 350 persons in FY 2019-2020. Historical outcomes for this project show that 80% of households at imminent risk of homelessness, retained housing and avoided entering homeless services. For FY 2019-20, with the additional staffing and direct client assistance included in this budget, Catholic Charities anticipates that 90% of participants can avoid entering the shelter system.	
5.6.1.2	Decrease the overall length of homeless episodes: Number of Days to Permanent Housing Exit from Shelter. Score 0-5 pts	N/A			
5.6.1.3	Minimize returns to homelessness from permanent housing: Number anticipated to retain permanent housing. Score 0-5 pts	90%	5		
5.6.2		Project Priorities			
5.6.2.1	Number of housing units to be developed (see Capital Projects evaluation tool)			Diversion programs help participants who are not yet literally homeless to utilize resources that help stabilize their housing with minimum intervention. This project aims to divert/provide assistance to 350 individuals/households. While participants are not enrolled into CE, minimum data is captured within the HMIS and then reviewed for return requests for homeless services. In FY 2017-18, 133 out of 185 households served by this project (72%) did not return for more services. One of the unintended consequences of designing the project as it has operated for the last 2 years is that it did not have the funds to provide direct assistance to clients. The agency did not specify how many served would receive direct assistance and how many those served would be provided with other resources, likely because direct client assistance resources were not available in recent years. Instead, the project referred to places like Seasons of Sharing and CAPSC HCA Fund, which have high barriers. This expansion proposal aims to add a diversion specialist (in addition to existing CE Service Navigators), as well as financial assistance. It's not clear how a 1.0 FTE Diversion specialist would provide better service than the current structure of allowing CE service navigators to bill to this grant when clients don't meet minimum requirements for the CoC-funded CE grants. The cost per housing outcome calculation above is the program budget (\$170,000) divided by 90% of the 350 households to be served in FY 2019-20 (315 households).	
5.6.2.2	Permanent Supportive Housing: Serves chronically homeless person. 2 pt.	N/A			
	Permanent Supportive Housing: case management: client ratio <15:1. 1 pt.	N/A			
	Permanent Supportive Housing: Partnership with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.). 1 pt.	N/A			
5.6.2.3	Rapid Re-Housing: Housing Locator staff included, 2 pt.	N/A			
	Rapid Re-Housing: demonstrate partnerships with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.), 2 pt.	N/A			
5.6.2.4	Shelters/Navigation Centers: Investment will lower barriers and address special needs, 0-9 points.	N/A			
5.6.2.5	Day Centers and street/encampment outreach projects will serve as CE Access Point, 0-4 pts	N/A			
5.6.2.6	Homeless Prevention Projects: Planned & historic % of persons demonstrating improved housing stability, 0-9 pts	N/A			
	Homeless Diversion Projects: Percent of participants at imminent risk of homelessness who avoid entering homeless services. 0-9 pts	90%	7		
TOTAL SCORE			25	FUNDING RECOMMENDATION	\$100,000-\$150,000
RATIONALE:	This proposal addresses the anticipated growing demand on the CE system due to new investments from this funding competition, and housing crises following the 2017 fires. Evaluators and the Leadership Council may want to consider incorporating awarded funds into the CE project rather than maintaining a standalone project. The need for added client financial assistance is well-founded. The suggested award range reflects the project with the 1.0 FTE Diversion specialist or without it.				

GOALS: Decrease the length of homeless episodes • Increase placements in housing • Reduce returns to homelessness • Decrease first-time homelessness • Increase incomes • Reduce the total number of people experiencing homelessness in Sonoma County						
Organization Name	COTS		Project Name	Prevention/Diversion		
Organization Location	PO Box 2744, Petaluma, CA		Project Location	900 Hopper Street, Petaluma		
CDC Funding History		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019		
Requested	N/A		N/A		N/A	
Awarded	0		0		0	
Households Served			2019-2020 Request	180,400		
	Proposed	Achieved				
Number Served -July 1 - Dec 31 (Existing Projects)		76	Funding Sources Eligible for Project	Federal/State ESG,CSF, LMIHAF, CESH, HEAP		
Projected # Served- July 1 - June 30 (Existing Projects)						
Planned # to be served in FY 19-20 (New and Existing Projects)	2 populations: 200 total receiving case management, 30 receiving financial assistance.					
Budget and Anticipated Cost of Services						
Organizational Budget	6,486,469	% Served low/mod income		100%		
Project Budget	192,360	Cost per Housing Outcome	\$ 6,412	Score 0-5	2	
CDC Request	180,400	Current Ratio		7.28		
Request as % of Project budget	94%	Debt to Asset Ratio		0.04		
Project as % of Org Budget	3%	Debt to Equity Ratio		0.04		
The following criteria refer to Selection Criteria of the FY 18-19 Homeless Services Funding Policies (Section 5, p. 16-19).						
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations		
5.2.	Joint Funding from Other Sources					
5.2.1.	Demonstrate leveraging of other funds and/or in-kind contributions.	Yes	N/A	The COTS Prevention/Diversion project is requesting 94% of funding for this project from the County and a 2-year award. The project proposes funding for a 0.8 FTE diversion specialist, yielding a rather low case management to client ratio of 38:1 for a relatively light-touch, short-term intervention. Although COTS has not requested funding from the County for this program in recent years, the organization has a strong track record administering projects with both the County and other funders.		
5.2.2.	Percent of total project budget from other sources ( <i>Higher is better, 0-4 points</i> )	6%	1			
5.2.3.	Demonstrated administrative capacity and adequate provisions for long-range maintenance and operations.	Yes	N/A			
5.3.	Organizational Capacity - no scoring					
5.3.1.	Application materials timely, complete and accurate	Yes	Application materials were submitted on time, complete and accurate. COTS has a good track record with managing grants and operating effective programs. This project will address a need COTS has identified, of persons who are at risk of homelessness and therefore do not meet the "literally homeless: requirements of Rapid Rehousing programs. The project will serve all at risk populations, providing case management services to 200 households and will provide rental assistance to 30 households. Due to funding limitations, Sonoma County currently has no projects providing this best practice mix of case management and financial assistance, and financial assistance in particular is needed to help people avoid entering the Coordinated Entry system for homeless services. COTS does not state whether the project would be available to people across the County, or just for those residing in southern Sonoma County.			
5.3.2.	Existing projects: required submissions submitted complete and on-time	Yes				
5.3.4.	Demonstrated support for geographic preference (single jurisdiction or region)	N/A				
5.3.5.	The project is appropriate in size, scope, and location to address the targeted client population and defined service area.	Yes				
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria				
5.4	Housing First					

5.4.1	Housing First Assessment Tool Scores stated in the application - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes	N/A	This project lists a score of 103 on the Housing First Assessment tool, however the Housing First assessment does not have a category for homelessness prevention. The narrative describes a low-barrier program, with participants served regardless of their substance use, lack of income, health/mental health issues, criminal history, etc. The narrative clearly articulates an understanding of Housing First and low barriers to entry. The project allows clients to re-engage if additional needs occur after they have exited, focusing on long term housing retention.
	Quality of Synopsis of Narrative Response (Score 0-7, 1 point per section)	Yes	7	
5.5 Coordinated Entry				
5.5.1	Acceptance of referrals only from Coordinated Entry (CE) and lowered barriers to entry (e.g., no income or sobriety requirements) - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	No		This project did not check the box within the application to accept referrals from Coordinated Entry. The narrative suggests clients will be asked to reach out directly to COTS rather than coordinate with the CE system. This project seems to be designed to complement what CE can offer, addressing a gap in prevention assistance before people reach the point of imminent homelessness. However the narrative does not address how the project would prioritize its limited resources or identify who is most "at risk" of homelessness - one of the primary challenges of homeless prevention projects, and one of the reasons HUD recommends focusing limited resources on literally homeless persons at this time.
5.5.2	Participation in Coordinated Entry collaborative efforts - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes		
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations
5.6 Performance Measurement & Project Priorities				
5.6.1.1	Increase housing placements: Number to be housed (Permanent or Temporary) Score 0-5 pts	%		During the first six months of this fiscal year, COTS provided 76 households with prevention assistance with other funds. This project aims to serve 200 households in FY 2019-20 and to provide rental assistance to 30 households (15% of them). COTS anticipates 100% of households receiving rental assistance will successfully retain housing. Having two service populations makes it difficult to calculate outcomes; here staff are using 100% of the 30 households receiving financial assistance, as COTS gives no assessment of its anticipated success with the larger group.
5.6.1.2	Decrease the overall length of homeless episodes: Number of Days to Permanent Housing Exit from Shelter. Score 0-5 pts	N/A		
5.6.1.3	Minimize returns to homelessness from permanent housing: Number anticipated to retain permanent housing. Score 0-5 pts	100%	5	
5.6.2 Project Priorities				
5.6.2.1	Number of housing units to be developed (see Capital Projects evaluation tool)			The COTS Prevention/Diversion project aims to maximize retention of permanent housing with prevention resources for people <u>at risk of</u> homelessness. This project's combined case management and financial assistance could offer a key system resource to prevent people from entering the homeless system of care. Over half of the project funds, \$135,000, are budgeted to provide direct financial assistance. These prevention funds are one of the most difficult resources for clients to access. However, the lack of research-based evidence of which "at risk" people are most likely to actually become homeless makes it extremely difficult to target interventions effectively: it's more of a "shot in the dark" approach. This project might be more effective if it only accepted people referred by the CE Diversion effort, and provided the best practice mix of case management and financial assistance to that group which is understood to be closer to literal homelessness. The cost per housing outcome calculation above is the program budget (\$180,400) divided by 100% of the 30 households receiving financial assistance. The resulting cost, \$6,412, is higher than COTS' cost to house a homeless person through Rapid Re-Housing (\$6,200). Home Sonoma County data from the 2018 Homeless Count & Survey indicates that following the 2017 fires, homelessness is likely to rise. Combined with the fact that other financial assistance programs such as HCA Fund and Season of Sharing present barriers to those most in need, there is a great felt (but not well documented) need for low barrier prevention programs offering financial assistance and case management.
5.6.2.2	Permanent Supportive Housing: Serves chronically homeless person. 2 pt	N/A		
	Permanent Supportive Housing: case management:client ratio <15:1. 1 pt	N/A		
	Permanent Supportive Housing: Partnership with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.). 1 pt	N/A		
5.6.2.3	Rapid Re-Housing: Housing Locator staff included, 2 pt.	N/A		
	Rapid Re-Housing: demonstrate partnerships with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.), 2 pt.	N/A		
5.6.2.4	Shelters/Navigation Centers: Investment will lower barriers and address special needs, 0-9 points.	N/A		
5.6.2.5	Day Centers and street/encampment outreach projects will serve as CE Access Point, 0-4 pts	N/A		
5.6.2.6	Homeless Prevention Projects: Planned & historic % of persons demonstrating improved housing stability, 0-9 pts	100%	8	
	Homeless Diversion Projects: Percent of participants at imminent risk of homelessness who avoid entering homeless services. 0-9 pts	%		
TOTAL SCORE			23	FUNDING RECOMMENDATION
				\$150,000-\$180,000
RATIONALE:		Home Sonoma County staff recognize the need for targeted prevention assistance to the people most likely to become homeless--a group that's difficult to define. Evaluators and the Leadership Council may want to consider funding this proposal on the condition that COTS receive its referrals only from CE Diversion, to target this limited resource as well as possible in a whole systems approach.		

GOALS: Decrease the length of homeless episodes • Increase placements in housing • Reduce returns to homelessness • Decrease first-time homelessness • Increase incomes • Reduce the total number of people experiencing homelessness in Sonoma County						
Organization Name	Social Advocates for Youth		Project Name	TAY Homelessness Prevention		
Organization Location	2447 Summerfield Road, Santa Rosa		Project Location	All locations in Sonoma County		
CDC Funding History		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019		
Requested	N/A		N/A		\$128,077 in two Lower Russian River funding rounds	
Awarded	0		0		\$108,077 (Lower Russian River Homeless Initiative)	
Households Served			2019-2020 Request	150,000		
	Proposed	Achieved				
Number Served -July 1 - Dec 31 (Existing Projects)	20	35	Funding Sources Eligible for Project	HEAP, CSF, LMIHAF		
Projected # Served- July 1 - June 30 (Existing Projects)	20					
Planned # to be served in FY 19-20 (New and Existing Projects)	40					
Budget and Anticipated Cost of Services						
Organizational Budget	6,500,000	% Served low/mod income		100%		
Project Budget	204,500	Cost per Housing Outcome	\$ 5,945	Score 0-5	3	
CDC Request	150,000	Current Ratio		2.45		
Request as % of Project budget	73%	Debt to Asset Ratio		0.2		
Project as % of Org Budget	3%	Debt to Equity Ratio		0.25		
The following criteria refer to Selection Criteria of the FY 18-19 Homeless Services Funding Policies (Section 5, p. 16-19).						
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations		
5.2.	Joint Funding from Other Sources					
5.2.1.	Demonstrate leveraging of other funds and/or in-kind contributions.	Yes	N/A	Social Advocates for Youth is the primary homeless services agency serving transition-aged youth. SAY has been operating a homelessness prevention effort in collaboration with its street outreach program in the Lower Russian River, to serve a TAY population that is presenting for services along with homeless youth. Through this project, SAY served 35 at risk youth in a broader outreach program, assisting 30 of them to retain housing along with their families. County funding makes up the majority of this request to continue with this project on a county-wide basis.		
5.2.2.	Percent of total project budget from other sources (Higher is better, 0-4 points)	27%	2			
5.2.3.	Demonstrated administrative capacity and adequate provisions for long-range maintenance and operations.	Yes	N/A			
5.3.	Organizational Capacity - no scoring					
5.3.1.	Application materials timely, complete and accurate	Yes	The application was on time and all materials were completed and accurate. SAY has submitted reports on time and has been responsive to monitoring. Rather than focusing resources in the Lower Russian River area only (as in FY 2018-19), SAY proposes to provide them countywide. While SAY's identification of a need among this population is informed by the agency's street outreach program, this need is not well documented.			
5.3.2.	Existing projects: required submissions submitted complete and on-time	Yes				
5.3.4.	Demonstrated support for geographic preference (single jurisdiction or region)	N/A				
5.3.5.	The project is appropriate in size, scope, and location to address the targeted client population and defined service area.	Yes				

Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations
<b>5.4 Housing First</b>				
5.4.1	Housing First Assessment Tool Scores stated in the application - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	No	N/A	A score was not recorded, possibly because the project is "new" or because the Housing First Assessment Tool is not designed for prevention programs. However, SAY is a leader in Housing First implementations for transition age youth.
	Quality of Synopsis of Narrative Response (Score 0-7, 1 point per section)	Yes	6	
<b>5.5 Coordinated Entry</b>				
5.5.1	Acceptance of referrals only from Coordinated Entry (CE) and lowered barriers to entry (e.g., no income or sobriety requirements) - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes		SAY did not check any boxes in the Coordinated Entry section of the application. However, SAY offers the primary access point for Youth Coordinated Entry and works closely with the Coordinated Entry Operator, Catholic Charities.
5.5.2	Participation in Coordinated Entry collaborative efforts - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes		
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations
<b>5.6 Performance Measurement &amp; Project Priorities</b>				
5.6.1.1	<b>Increase housing placements:</b> Number to be housed (Permanent or Temporary) Score 0-5 pts	%		No data was provided on outcomes for returns to homelessness, however the narrative states that 30 of 35 youth served in the Lower Russian River youth prevention project (86%) had positive housing outcomes. 40 individuals are estimated to be served by the project, so staff have estimated 86% (34) youth will retain the housing.
5.6.1.2	<b>Decrease the overall length of homeless episodes:</b> Number of Days to Permanent Housing Exit from Shelter. Score 0-5 pts			
5.6.1.3	<b>Minimize returns to homelessness from permanent housing:</b> Number anticipated to retain permanent housing. Score 0-5 pts	86%	3	
<b>5.6.2 Project Priorities</b>				
5.6.2.1	Number of housing units to be developed (see Capital Projects evaluation tool)			The project's goals and outcomes are unclear, and the need SAY describes is not well documented. Nor does the research on homelessness prevention support limited resources being invested in homelessness prevention over interventions with literally homeless persons. The application does not indicate the percentage of individuals who would improve housing stability or avoid entering homelessness. The only number given was 40 served (the budget requests direct client assistance for 50). Home Sonoma County staff have used knowledge from SAY's current program to get an idea of what might be done in the proposed program. The cost-per-housing outcome calculation above is the proposed program budget (\$204,500) divided by 86% of the proposed 40 participants (34 youth), based on past performance with the Lower Russian River youth outreach project. The resulting cost per housing outcome is \$5,945. It should be noted that SAY is accomplishing many of the goals of this project with current funding well below the requested \$150,000.
5.6.2.2	Permanent Supportive Housing: Serves chronically homeless person. 2 pt	N/A		
	Permanent Supportive Housing: case management:client ratio <15:1. 1 pt	N/A		
	Permanent Supportive Housing: Partnership with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.). 1 pt	N/A		
5.6.2.3	Rapid Re-Housing: Housing Locator staff included, 2 pt.	N/A		
	Rapid Re-Housing: demonstrate partnerships with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.), 2 pt.	N/A		
5.6.2.4	Shelters/Navigation Centers: Investment will lower barriers and address special needs, 0-9 points.	N/A		
5.6.2.5	Day Centers and street/encampment outreach projects will serve as CE Access Point, 0-4 pts	N/A		
5.6.2.6	Homeless Prevention Projects: Planned & historic % of persons demonstrating improved housing stability, 0-9 pts	86%	8	
	Homeless Diversion Projects: Percent of participants at imminent risk of homelessness who avoid entering homeless services. 0-9 pts	%		
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>22</b>	<b>FUNDING RECOMMENDATION</b>
				<b>\$100,000-\$125,000</b>
<b>RATIONALE:</b>		Some of the funds in this competition may only be used for Rapid Re-Housing or Homelessness Prevention. Despite the caveats about the lack of an evidence base for accurate targeting of homelessness prevention funds, evaluators and the Leadership Council may still choose to prioritize this prevention activity. The suggested range of funding would allow SAY to operate a workable program.		

GOALS: Decrease the length of homeless episodes • Increase placements in housing • Reduce returns to homelessness • Decrease first-time homelessness • Increase incomes • Reduce the total number of people experiencing homelessness in Sonoma County						
Organization Name	SHARE Sonoma County		Project Name	Home Share Program		
Organization Location	10 Fourth Street, Petaluma		Project Location	801 Bantam Way, Petaluma		
CDC Funding History		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019		
Requested	80,000	95,000	95,000			
Awarded	41,570	56,619	55,087			
Households Served		2019-2020 Request		202,220		
	Proposed	Achieved				
Number Served - July 1 - Dec 31 (Existing Projects)	150	28	Funding Sources Eligible for Project	LMIHAF, HEAP, CSF		
Projected # Served- July 1 - June 30 (Existing Projects)		56				
Planned # to be served in FY 19-20 (New and Existing Projects)		150 matches/ 300 persons				
Budget and Anticipated Cost of Services						
Organizational Budget	362,316	% Served low/mod income		93%		
Project Budget	282,220	Cost per Housing Outcome	\$ 1,980	Score 0-5	4	
CDC Request	202,220	Current Ratio		14.8		
Request as % of Project budget	72%	Debt to Asset Ratio		0.22		
Project as % of Org Budget	78%	Debt to Equity Ratio		0.29		
The following criteria refer to Selection Criteria of the FY 18-19 Homeless Services Funding Policies (Section 5, p. 16-19).						
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations		
5.2.	Joint Funding from Other Sources					
5.2.1.	Demonstrate leveraging of other funds and/or in-kind contributions.	Yes	N/A	SHARE Sonoma County submitted this application in a timely and complete manner. SHARE Sonoma County has a strong track record for operating this type of project and has received funding through Sonoma County CDC and Human Services Department during the previous three years. They submit reporting on time and have been successful utilizing grant funding. SHARE has recently separated from their previous fiscal sponsor and are now fully independent.		
5.2.2.	Percent of total project budget from other sources (Higher is better, 0-4 points)	28%	2			
5.2.3.	Demonstrated administrative capacity and adequate provisions for long-range maintenance and operations.	Yes	N/A			
5.3.	Organizational Capacity - no scoring					
5.3.1.	Application materials timely, complete and accurate	Y N	SHARE has been able to execute its SHARE Sonoma County grants well over the past three years and have been successful in meeting their antiquated outcomes. The SHARE program model is to identify seniors who have rooms to rent, and who may need financial or other forms of support to maintain their current housing situations. Homeless persons identified as good matches for the program are offered shared housing situations where they can pay rent, provide services, or a combination of the two. Six months of case management are provided to ensure that the match is a good fit for both parties. Based on historical VISPDAT data, it is unlikely that SHARE will work for more than 15% of the literally homeless population. The project proposes to make 150 matches in F 2019-20., of whom historically about 15% (22-23 of these matches) will involve literally homeless persons. The balance will be 150 seniors who need income or assistance to age in place, and 127 or so persons at risk of homelessness.			
5.3.2.	Existing projects: required submissions submitted complete and on-time	Y N				
5.3.4.	Demonstrated support for geographic preference (single jurisdiction or region)	Y N				
5.3.5.	The project is appropriate in size, scope, and location to address the targeted client population and defined service area.	Y N				
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria				

5.4		Housing First			
Policy Section #	Evaluative Measure	Meets Criteria	Score	Staff Observations	
5.4.1	Housing First Assessment Tool Scores stated in the application - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes	N/A	SHARE scored 147 on their Housing First Assessment tool which is an increase of 21 points from the previous score recorded in 2016. However, the program model of SHARE cannot be considered low barrier due to the need to screen with drug testing, and ensuring participants "fit" with home sharers. As a result, SHARE has communicated to Home Sonoma County staff that participants typically have very low vulnerability scores (1-6 on the 20+ point VISPDAT).	
	Quality of Synopsis of Narrative Response (Score 0-7, 1 point per section)	Yes	5		
5.5		Coordinated Entry			
5.5.1	Acceptance of referrals only from Coordinated Entry (CE) and lowered barriers to entry (e.g., no income or sobriety requirements) - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	No		SHARE Sonoma County states in their application that they will accept referrals from Coordinated Entry and that they will be a Coordinated Entry Access point. However, during the past three years they have not accepted referrals from Coordinated Entry for the SHARE program, as the program is most appropriate for participants with low vulnerability, and participating homeowners are allowed to screen for sobriety and personal fit.	
5.5.2	Participation in Coordinated Entry collaborative efforts - ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT	Yes			
5.6		Performance Measurement & Project Priorities			
5.6.1.1	Increase housing placements: Number to be housed (Permanent or Temporary) Score 0-5 pts	%		150 Sonoma County anticipates that they can provide home shares to 150 home-seekers, and 150 seniors who have homes to share. Their application is confusing in this regard, and the SHARE budget states that they will serve 300 persons in total, split between home seekers and home sharers.	
5.6.1.2	Decrease the overall length of homeless episodes: Number of Days to Permanent Housing Exit from Shelter. Score 0-5 pts	N/A			
5.6.1.3	Minimize returns to homelessness from permanent housing: Number anticipated to retain permanent housing. Score 0-5 pts	95%	5		
5.6.2		Project Priorities			
5.6.2.1	Number of housing units to be developed (see Capital Projects evaluation tool)			Historically SHARE has reported outcomes separately for home seekers, who sometimes come from homelessness, vs. home sharers. Per the application, SHARE seems to expect that 19 of the home seekers will come from homeless situations, and the balance of 131 will come from at risk situations, making SHARE more of a homeless prevention model than an intervention. To date in FY 2018-19, 71% of home seekers have become permanently housed, and 90% of home sharers have retained their housing ("aged in place"). SHARE does a good job of teaming up with outside agencies to identify seniors in need of support to maintain housing. SHARE has relationships with the Sonoma County Department of Human Services, and service providers throughout Sonoma County. While not meeting key Home Sonoma County priorities such as prioritizing chronically homeless persons, SHARE is a cost-effective strategy for a small number of homeless persons and a large number of at risk seniors--a population that experiences special challenges in re-entering the housing market and which experienced a disparate impact in housing loss following the 2017 fire disaster.	
5.6.2.2	Permanent Supportive Housing: Serves chronically homeless person. 2 pt	N/A			
	Permanent Supportive Housing: case management:client ratio <15:1. 1 pt	N/A			
	Permanent Supportive Housing: Partnership with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.). 1 pt	N/A			
5.6.2.3	Rapid Re-Housing: Housing Locator staff included, 2 pt.	N/A			
	Rapid Re-Housing: demonstrate partnerships with non-homeless supportive service agencies (e.g., health, employment, etc.), 2 pt.	N/A			
5.6.2.4	Shelters/Navigation Centers: Investment will lower barriers and address special needs, 0-9 points.	N/A			
5.6.2.5	Day Centers and street/encampment outreach projects will serve as CE Access Point, 0-4 pts	N/A			
5.6.2.6	Homeless Prevention Projects: Planned & historic % of persons demonstrating improved housing stability, 0-9 pts	95%	9		
	Homeless Diversion Projects: Percent of participants at imminent risk of homelessness who avoid entering homeless services. 0-9 pts	%			
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>25</b>	<b>FUNDING RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>\$150,000-\$185,000</b>
<b>RATIONALE:</b>		Home Sonoma County staff are supportive of SHARE as a low-cost intervention serving a segment of homeless and at-risk seniors, understanding that the number of at risk seniors increased post-fire. The high performance on past grants, the documented need for prevention services for seniors, and the understanding that Sonoma County has a significant untapped housing resource in the form of seniors with empty rooms, all argue for increasing funding to SHARE. The suggested range of awards focuses on service delivery costs rather development of the agency's organizational structure.			