

Before Starting the CoC Application

The CoC Consolidated Application is made up of two parts: the CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listing, with all of the CoC's project applications either approved and ranked, or rejected. The Collaborative Applicant is responsible for submitting both the CoC Application and the CoC Priority Listing in order for the CoC Consolidated Application to be considered complete.

The Collaborative Applicant is responsible for:

- Reviewing the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition NOFA in its entirety for specific application and program requirements.

- Using the CoC Application Detailed Instructions while completing the application in e-snaps.

- Answering all questions in the CoC application. It is the responsibility of the Collaborative Applicant to ensure that all imported and new responses in all parts of the application are fully reviewed and completed. When doing this keep in mind:

- This year, CoCs will see that a few responses have been imported from the FY 2015 CoC Application.

- For some of the questions HUD has provided documents to assist Collaborative Applicants in completing responses.

- For other questions, the Collaborative Applicant must be aware of responses provided by project applications in their Project Applications.

- Some questions require the Collaborative Applicant to attach a document to receive credit. This will be identified in the question.

- All questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory and must be completed in order to submit the CoC Application.

For CoC Application Detailed Instructions click [here](#).

1A. Continuum of Care (CoC) Identification

Instructions:

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

1A-1. CoC Name and Number: UT-500 - Salt Lake City & County CoC

1A-2. Collaborative Applicant Name: Salt Lake County Government

1A-3. CoC Designation: CA

1A-4. HMIS Lead: Utah Department of Workforce Services

1B. Continuum of Care (CoC) Engagement

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

The CoC draws on its membership to assure a full range of stakeholder expertise is drawn on. The CoC reviews membership annually to assure representation from all interested parties & geographic areas. The membership annually approves a Governance Charter which delineates CoC roles and responsibilities.

The State Government Staff stakeholder group: 1) Is a member of the Collective Impact Steering Committee and the CoC Board 2) Regularly attends CoC membership meetings as well as Local Homeless Coordinating Council Meetings 3) Is the HMIS Lead for the CoC and 4) Is housed in the State's Dept of Workforce Services which oversees mainstream benefits.

The Public Housing Authority Staff stakeholder group: 1) Is a member of the Collective Impact Steering Committee and the CoC Board 2) Regularly attends CoC membership meetings and CoC grant workgroup meetings 3) Invites PHA plan input from the CoC and 4) operates homeless preferences through their respective Section 8 programs.

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

Youth Service Provider (up to 10)	RHY Funded?	Participated as a Voting Member in at least two CoC Meetings between July 1, 2015 and June 20, 2016.	Sat on CoC Board as active member or official at any point between July 1, 2015 and June 20, 2016.
Salt Lake County Division of Youth Services	Yes	No	No
Utah Department of Human Services	Yes	No	No
Volunteers of America Utah	Yes	Yes	Yes
Asian Association of Utah DBA Refugee and Immigrant Center	Yes	No	No

1B-1c. List the victim service providers (CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded) who operate within the CoC's geographic area. Then select "Yes" or "No" to indicate if each provider is a voting member or sits on the CoC Board.

Victim Service Provider for Survivors of Domestic Violence (up to 10)	Participated as a Voting Member in at least two CoC Meetings between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016	Sat on CoC Board as active member or official at any point between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.
YWCA Utah	Yes	No
South Valley Services	Yes	No

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

The CoC is open to proposals from entities that have not previously received funds in prior CoC program competition. Examples include:

- Public Posting of RFP on CoC web site
- Email announcing RFP release to CoC Membership list
- RFP release and training dates announced through the Utah Public Notice web site
- Copy of RFP distributed to local ESG funders and requested to share with subgrantees
- Held pre-proposal training for new projects that was geared towards first time applicants

The following factors are used in determining whether to include a new project on the projects listing:

- 1) Guidance from the NOFA
- 2) Agency Capacity for administering a federal grant
- 3) Project design including: Population target and ability to increase community performance on HUD System Performance Measures

The CoC was pleased to receive new applications two new entities that have not previously received funds in prior CoC Program competitions.

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

1C. Continuum of Care (CoC) Coordination

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

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

	Number
Number of Con Plan jurisdictions with whom the CoC geography overlaps	8
How many Con Plan jurisdictions did the CoC participate with in their Con Plan development process?	7
How many Con Plan jurisdictions did the CoC provide with Con Plan jurisdiction level PIT data?	8
How many of the Con Plan jurisdictions are also ESG recipients?	3
How many ESG recipients did the CoC participate with to make ESG funding decisions?	3
How many ESG recipients did the CoC consult with in the development of ESG performance standards and evaluation process for ESG funded activities?	3

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

A Collective Impact Steering Committee on homelessness has formed. Members of the Committee include: State and local Government (representing 7/8 Con Plans) and representation from the CoC Board and HMIS Lead. Members of the Committee are meeting monthly for two hours to refine local efforts on reducing homelessness. The Committee is focused on 1) a shared community vision 2) a set of 14 shared outcomes 3) clear, defined, measurable indicators and 4) a shared evaluation lens for funding decisions. [Note: 8th Con Plan also attends as an interested stakeholder.]

The CoC also works with Con Plan Jurisdictions on a specific basis: 1) Grant Coordination meetings; 8/8 Con Plans attend as does the CoC CA. Meetings are held every six months for two hours. The CoC presents info about goals, system performance, policy priorities, and data. 2) CoC provides PIT level data for the Salt Lake County HOME Consortium Consolidated Plan and ESG CAPER reports.

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

The community has formed a Collective Impact Steering Committee on homelessness. Members of the Committee include representatives from 3/3 ESG jurisdictions in the CoC as well as representation from the CoC: CoC Board members sit on the Committee as does the HMIS Lead. The Committee has adopted a set of 14 shared outcomes and related indicators and is working on developing community-wide performance standards and evaluation outcomes.

In addition, the CoC works with ESG recipients on a specific basis. This includes: 1) a formal mechanism to provide CoC perspective on ESG funding for 2/3 ESG recipients 2) training on HEARTH system performance measures to 3/3 ESG recipients 3) narrative and PIT data input on CAPER reporting for evaluation of outcomes to 3/3 ESG recipients. Further, 3/3 ESG recipients sit on the CoC ranking committee and receive training and instruction on CoC funded project performance standards and evaluation of outcomes which includes APR, PIT, and HIC level data.

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

address how the service providers ensure and maintain the safety and security of participants and how client choice is upheld. (limit 1000 characters)

There are 2 DV providers in the CoC. They work collaboratively with the homeless assistance providers to ensure that survivors of DV are provided housing and have their safety and security maintained if they:

1) Present to a homeless assistance (HA) provider. Household is given option to be served by HA provider or referred to DV provider. If they choose served by HA, they may opt out of being tracked in HMIS in order to maintain their safety and security. Every homeless family is offered progressive engagement RRH assistance. If they choose referred, the HA provider gets a signed release on file. The household is then fast tracked to a DV provider.

2) Present to a DV provider. The victim service providers protect the confidentiality rights of victims that are guaranteed under VAWA. A full spectrum of housing options is provided in the community for victims, including DV shelter, TH, and RRH. DV providers do not enter into HMIS, but track information in a comparable database.

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

Public Housing Agency Name	% New Admissions into Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Program from 7/1/15 to 6/30/16 who were homeless at entry	PHA has General or Limited Homeless Preference
Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake	19.00%	Yes-HCV
Housing Authority of Salt Lake City		Yes-HCV
West Valley City Housing Authority		No

If you select "Yes--Public Housing," "Yes--HCV," or "Yes--Both" for "PHA has general or limited homeless preference," you must attach documentation of the preference from the PHA in order to receive credit.

1C-5. Other than CoC, ESG, Housing Choice Voucher Programs and Public Housing, describe other subsidized or low-income housing opportunities that exist within the CoC that target persons experiencing homelessness. (limit 1000 characters)

There are many housing opportunities for veterans experiencing homelessness

in the CoC. As documented on the 2015 HIC, this includes: 382 VASH beds, 225 GPD beds, and 137 SSVF beds. These programs are funded by the VA in partnership with local PHA's and non-profit housing providers.

There are also many Rapid Rehousing opportunities for families and individuals experiencing homelessness in the CoC. This includes 73 TANF funded Rapid Rehousing beds. In addition, Salt Lake County has a Pay for Success Homeless Initiative targeting persons with a high number of homeless nights for Rapid Rehousing assistance. This initiative will provide a total of \$4 million of funding for RRH over the course of five years.

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

Engaged/educated local policymakers:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Engaged/educated law enforcement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implemented communitywide plans:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No strategies have been implemented	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other:(limit 1000 characters)	
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

1D. Continuum of Care (CoC) Discharge Planning

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

N/A

1E. Centralized or Coordinated Assessment (Coordinated Entry)

Instructions:

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

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

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

The CoC developed a Coordinated Access plan in 2014. DV is considered in any interaction and referrals are made to ensure safety.

Homeless and at risk households enter the emergency intervention system through many access points in the community. Once identified, families are screened for diversion and shelter options. Single individuals are screened for emergency interventions. Families, Individuals identified as CH and Veterans are tracked by housing placement teams while homeless until the point of housing placement.

There are 3 housing processes in place for literally homeless persons in the CoC: 1) Rapid Rehousing and Progressive Engagement available to all families 2) Housing placement process for Veterans and for 3) Chronically Homeless. Regular training for CoC members is held. Recent topics within the past year have included: Chronically Homeless Housing Prioritization, Veteran Housing Placement, Family Referral Process, and Diversion.

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

or individual participates in the CoC's coordinated entry process. If there are other organizations or persons who participate but are not on this list, enter the information in the blank text box, click "Save" at the bottom of the screen, and then select the applicable checkboxes.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

How many renewal project applications were submitted in the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition?	24
How many of the renewal project applications are first time renewals for which the first operating year has not expired yet?	6
How many renewal project application APRs were reviewed by the CoC as part of the local CoC competition project review, ranking, and selection process for the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition?	18
Percentage of APRs submitted by renewing projects within the CoC that were reviewed by the CoC in the 2016 CoC Competition?	100.00%

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

Performance outcomes from APR reports/HMIS:	
% permanent housing exit destinations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
% increases in income	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring criteria:	
Utilization rates	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drawdown rates	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Frequency or Amount of Funds Recaptured by HUD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Need for specialized population services:	

Youth	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Victims of Domestic Violence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Families with Children	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Persons Experiencing Chronic Homelessness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Veterans	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None:	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The CoC included indicators related to severity of needs and vulnerability in the ranking process. Indicators included percent of participants: 1) coming from literal homelessness 2) with a disabling condition 3) with Chronic Homelessness backgrounds. In addition, the CoC used participation in coordinated access and adoption of housing first as an indicator that the project was serving those with severe needs and vulnerabilities. Projects which targeted participants with the highest severity of needs and vulnerabilities were given higher priority in the ranking and review process. Applicants were asked to provide narrative about how the project ends homelessness, including preventing returns to homelessness. Narrative was expected to be specific to the populations served by the project. Additionally, applicants were rated on their responses to the use of best or promising practices for the populations that the projects will employ.

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

Local comp. began with an email notice to renewal applicants and posted to the CoC website on 6/6/16. A notice for new project applicants and a re-release of the renewal was sent on 7/15/16. This information was sent via email to CoC membership, State and Local homeless provider grantees, posted to our website & the Utah Public Notice website. As part of the application package for both new & renewal applications the Prioritization Committee policies & procedures & scoring guidelines were provided. These were also posted on 8/19/16. Local application & esnaps materials were reviewed & scored. Final funding decisions were provided to all applicants on 8/30 via email & posted to our website. Posting proof attached.

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

1F-5. Did the CoC use the reallocation process in the FY 2016 CoC Program Competition to reduce or reject projects for the creation of new projects? (If the CoC utilized the reallocation process, evidence of the public posting of the reallocation process must be attached.) Yes

1F-5a. If the CoC rejected project application(s), on what date did the CoC and Collaborative Applicant notify those project applicants that their project application was rejected? (If project applications were rejected, a copy of the written notification to each project applicant must be attached.) 08/30/2016

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

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

Instructions

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

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

The CoC has developed a monitoring tool for review of each recipient to include: 1) utilization rates 2) increasing housing stability 3) participant eligibility 4) length of time homeless 5) destination upon program exit 6) increasing participant income and 7) connecting program participant to mainstream benefits. The tools identify each of the criterion and measures compliance by referencing project performance on HUD APR, PIT, HIC, Data Quality, and System Measure reports. In addition the CoC conducts an on-site hard and electronic file monitoring for each recipient to check eligibility record keeping compliance. This relates to accuracy of project reporting on 3) participating eligibility and 4) length of time homeless. The CoC also assess project capacity to implement CoC Program requirements including timely submission of APRs and timely draws from eLOCCS by requirement recipients to provide: date of APR submission 2) HUD deadline for APR submission and 3) date of draw downs.

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

2A. Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Implementation

Intructions:

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

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

2A-1a. Include the page number where the roles and responsibilities of the CoC and HMIS Lead can be found in the attached document referenced in 2A-1. In addition, in the textbox indicate if the page number applies to the CoC's attached governance charter or attached MOU/MOA. Pages 4-8 MOU

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

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

2A-4. What is the name of the HMIS software Client Track

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

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

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

Instructions

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

2B-1. Select the HMIS implementation coverage area: Statewide

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

2B-2.1 Funding Type: Federal - HUD

Funding Source	Funding
CoC	\$223,151
ESG	\$55,800
CDBG	\$0
HOME	\$0
HOPWA	\$0
Federal - HUD - Total Amount	\$278,951

2B-2.2 Funding Type: Other Federal

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

2B-2.3 Funding Type: State and Local

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

City	\$0
County	\$0
State	\$0
State and Local - Total Amount	\$0

2B-2.4 Funding Type: Private

Funding Source	Funding
Individual	\$0
Organization	\$0
Private - Total Amount	\$0

2B-2.5 Funding Type: Other

Funding Source	Funding
Participation Fees	\$0
Other - Total Amount	\$0

2B-2.6 Total Budget for Operating Year	\$278,951
---	------------------

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

Instructions:

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

2C-1. Enter the date the CoC submitted the 2016 HIC data in HDX, (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/29/2016

2C-2. Per the 2016 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) Indicate the number of beds in the 2016 HIC and in HMIS for each project type within the CoC. If a particular project type does not exist in the CoC then enter "0" for all cells in that project type.

Project Type	Total Beds in 2016 HIC	Total Beds in HIC Dedicated for DV	Total Beds in HMIS	HMIS Bed Coverage Rate
Emergency Shelter (ESG) beds	1,696	259	1,351	94.02%
Safe Haven (SH) beds	0	0	0	
Transitional Housing (TH) beds	438	74	307	84.34%
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) beds	655	0	655	100.00%
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds	1,997	0	1,698	85.03%
Other Permanent Housing (OPH) beds	0	0	0	

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

The TH coverage rate is 84%. To increase the coverage rate, the CoC and the HMIS lead plan to reach out to the Director of the local rescue mission and have a meeting to inform him about benefits of participation in the local HMIS, especially for his TH program and invite them to participate.

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

VA Grant per diem (VA GPD):	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------

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

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

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

Instructions:

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

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

Universal Data Element	Percentage Null or Missing	Percentage Client Doesn't Know or Refused
3.1 Name	0%	0%
3.2 Social Security Number	0%	4%
3.3 Date of birth	0%	0%
3.4 Race	0%	0%
3.5 Ethnicity	0%	0%
3.6 Gender	0%	0%
3.7 Veteran status	1%	0%
3.8 Disabling condition	1%	0%
3.9 Residence prior to project entry	4%	1%
3.10 Project Entry Date	0%	0%
3.11 Project Exit Date	0%	0%
3.12 Destination	55%	2%
3.15 Relationship to Head of Household	0%	0%
3.16 Client Location	6%	0%
3.17 Length of time on street, in an emergency shelter, or safe haven	5%	1%

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

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

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

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

12

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

Quarterly

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

Both Project and CoC

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

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

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

N/A

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

2E-2. Indicate the date of the most recent sheltered PIT count: (mm/dd/yyyy) 01/27/2016

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

2E-3. Enter the date the CoC submitted the sheltered PIT count data in HDX: (mm/dd/yyyy) 04/29/2016

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our sheltered PIT count came from three main sources; 1) HMIS, 2) client interviews at non-HMIS shelters, and 3) provider surveys from domestic violence service providers. Using these methods, we gathered all of the

population and subpopulation data that was required for the PIT. Using these three sources, we were able to get a complete census count of the sheltered population in the continuum of care so no extrapolation was used.

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

There were no significant changes in our sheltered PIT count methodology from 2015 to 2016.

2F-5. Did your CoC change its provider coverage in the 2016 sheltered count? Yes

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

In 2016 one motel voucher project, that had 2 beds, didn't have any vouchers issued in 2016. We had 2 TH projects, with a total of 75 beds, which were open in 2016 close later in the year. One TH project, with 46 beds, converted to RRH before the 2016 count and one safe haven project, with 24 beds, was converted to PSH before the 2016 count.

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

There were no significant changes in our sheltered PIT count from 2015 to 2016 that would impact data quality.

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

2H-2. Indicate the date of the most recent unsheltered PIT count (mm/dd/yyyy): 01/27/2016

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

2H-3. Enter the date the CoC submitted the unsheltered PIT count data in HDX (mm/dd/yyyy): 04/29/2016

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

For the unsheltered count, our CoC sent approximately 100 PIT count volunteers and outreach workers to known locations to interview people on the night of the count as well as the two nights following the count. Guidance for this methodology has historically been provided by NAEH, USICH and to some extent HUD. As PIT counts have been performed across the country, best practices have developed. Sampling known locations is felt to be appropriate in areas with good outreach coverage throughout the year, which we have locally. This methodology fits the resources we have in place.

Interviewers surveyed all of the people who they came in contact with during these canvassing efforts. The interviews gathered all of the population and subpopulation data that are required for the PIT. We did not extrapolate as it was felt that all the areas where homeless persons might be staying were canvassed.

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

There were no significant changes in our unsheltered PIT count methodology from 2015 to 2016.

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

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

N/A

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

There were no significant changes in our unsheltered PIT count from 2015 to 2016 that would impact data quality.

3A. Continuum of Care (CoC) System Performance

Instructions

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

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

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

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

	2015 PIT (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016 PIT	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons	2,176	1,891	-285
Emergency Shelter Total	1,411	1,434	23
Safe Haven Total	22	0	-22
Transitional Housing Total	653	400	-253
Total Sheltered Count	2,086	1,834	-252
Total Unsheltered Count	90	57	-33

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

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

	Between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015
Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons	8,624
Emergency Shelter Total	7,714
Safe Haven Total	29
Transitional Housing Total	1,261

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

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

(limit 1000 characters)

In Nov. 2015 the CoC Membership affirmed through a formal vote the support of HUD System Performance Measure Reports as a tool for helping our community gauge progress in preventing and ending homelessness. Since that time, we have worked to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless for the first time by:

- 1) The State of Utah conducted a HPRP study; lessons from the study have been incorporated into current diversion and targeting techniques.
- 2) The State funds a diversion project at the emergency shelter. The project uses the VI-SPDAT to assess clients and determine service needs.
- 3) Collective Impact Steering Committee has adopted an outcome that focuses on homeless prevention. This allows community planners to identify risk factors and determine appropriate solutions at a systems planning level.
- 4) Posting a copy of the System Performance Measures report on the CoC web site.
- 5) Data cleanup and holding community discussions about YTD comparison data.

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

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

(limit 1000 characters)

In Nov. 2015 the CoC Membership affirmed through a formal vote the support of HUD System Performance Measure Reports as a tool for helping our community gauge progress in preventing and ending homelessness. Since that time, we have worked to reduce the length of time individuals and families remain homeless by:

- 1) Increasing RRH efforts through the use of TANF, HOME, CoC and ESG dollars.
- 2) Adopted prioritization guidance for PSH projects giving priority to those with the highest service needs and the longest histories of homelessness.
- 3) A new Pay for Success project will begin in late 2016 to provide rapid rehousing services to long term shelter stayers.
- 4) Requiring all CoC TH and PH applicants identify goal for number of days between participant referral to housing placement.
- 6) Posting a copy of the System Performance Measures report on the CoC web site
- 7) Data cleanup and holding community discussions about YTD comparison data.

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

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

3A-4a. Exits to Permanent Housing Destinations:
Fill in the chart to indicate the extent to which projects exit program participants into permanent housing (subsidized or non-subsidized) or the retention of program participants in CoC Program-funded permanent supportive housing.

	Between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015
Universe: Persons in SSO, TH and PH-RRH who exited	188
Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those exited to permanent destinations?	129
% Successful Exits	68.62%

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

	Between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015
Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH	1,154
Of the persons in the Universe above, indicate how many of those remained in applicable PH projects and how many of those exited to permanent destinations?	1,076
% Successful Retentions/Exits	93.24%

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

In Nov. 2015 the CoC Membership affirmed through a formal vote the support of HUD System Performance Measure Reports as a tool for helping our community gauge progress in preventing and ending homelessness. Since that time, we have worked to reduce the rate of individuals and families who return to homelessness by:

- 1) CoC Project Rankings - Returns to homelessness, as documented in HMIS/System Measure Reports, is evaluated and used as a factor of CoC project rankings for TH and PH programs.
- 2) Collective Impact Committee - Committee outcome measure that those exiting homelessness will have increased income.

- 3) A new Pay for Success project will begin in 2016 to decrease criminal justice involvement of persons experiencing homelessness.
- 4) Posting a copy of the System Performance Measures report on the CoC web site
- 5) Data cleanup and holding community discussions about YTD comparison data.

3A-6. Performance Measure: Job and Income Growth. Performance Measure: Job and Income Growth. Describe the CoC's specific strategies to assist CoC Program-funded projects to increase program participants' cash income from employment and non-employment non-cash sources. (limit 1000 characters)

CoC funded projects partner with the local WIA Board, DWS, to support homeless persons in obtaining mainstream benefits and expanding employment skills. Participants are connected with DWS case managers, 8 of whom are stationed among CoC funded programs, for assistance:

- accessing cash and non-cash benefits
- accessing employment resources

In addition, in 2014 Utah approved a \$2,000 tax credit incentive for employers who hire qualifying homeless individuals. DWS oversees the eligibility for this tax credit, completes the outreach for this program, and supplies information to employers.

Further 7/8 FY2016 Competition TH and PH applicant agencies partner with Advantage Services. This covers 96% (24/25) of the FY2016 competition TH and PH projects. The mission of Advantage Services is to enhance recovery and independence for people with mental health and other life challenges by providing employment through viable businesses delivering exceptional customer service.

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

The CoC coordinates with the local WIA board, Utah Dept. of Workforce Services (DWS). DWS provides job placement and job training services and also administers TANF, SNAP, GA, Medicaid eligibility and childcare subsidies. All homeless service providers are connected to DWS services such that 100% of CoC funded projects have at least a referral relationship with DWS.

In addition:

- 1) Homeless Youth providers refer to the WIOA program (a DWS initiative) which allows opportunities for disadvantaged youth ages 14 through 21 to continue their education, seek employment and gain leadership skills.
- 2) VA outreach programs for homeless veterans include referrals for employment opportunities as part of program design.
- 3) 8/8 FY2016 Competition TH and PH applicant agencies refer appropriate

clients to voc rehab assistance through the Utah State Office of Rehabilitation. This covers 100% (25/25) of the FY2016 competition TH and PH projects.

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

Outreach workers in Salt Lake County are continually searching for and engaging with persons experiencing literal homelessness. Workers have found that in many areas of the County, law enforcement and residents do not facilitate the presence of literally homeless persons, and these areas are excluded from the PIT. Other geographic barriers such as mountainous terrain, flatlands with little shelter and swamp areas also preclude human habitation, and are excluded from the PIT. Persons experiencing literal homelessness tend to stay somewhat near resources, such as intersections (panhandling) or stores and food establishments. We also find persons in undeveloped areas in the mid valley area, as well as parks and vacant lots. Outreach teams also search new areas for individuals. In consultation with law enforcement and others who would encounter these individuals, the PIT leads make decisions regarding where persons experiencing homelessness may be encountered for the Point in Time Count.

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

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

Throughout the year, service providers in Salt Lake County engage in outreach efforts with individuals experiencing literal homelessness. Outreach teams work with law enforcement, the County Health Department, community councils and other groups to help locate those living unsheltered. Locations of individuals are tracked as efforts to assess vulnerability, provide support, and prioritize for housing assistance, are undertaken. Individuals experiencing homelessness also provide valuable information to outreach workers as to the locations of additional individuals who may benefit from assistance. Outreach teams cover as completely as possible areas within the County. In preparation for the Point

in Time Count each year, these locations are evaluated and grouped in terms of population and accessibility for volunteers. Areas are assigned to groups accordingly. We expand our coverage based on these known areas, but do not routinely search unknown areas during the Point in Time Count.

3A-8. Enter the date the CoC submitted the system performance measure data into HDX. The System Performance Report generated by HDX must be attached. (mm/dd/yyyy) 07/22/2016

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

N/A

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

Objective 1: Ending Chronic Homelessness

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

	2015 (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered chronically homeless persons	180	164	-16
Sheltered Count of chronically homeless persons	172	161	-11
Unsheltered Count of chronically homeless persons	8	3	-5

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

The total number of chronically homeless persons in the CoC, as reported on the PIT Count, decreased from 2015 to 2016. The reason for decrease was due to:

- 1) Increased housing stock. The CoC increased PSH beds and non-dedicated beds prioritized for CH.
- 2) Improved housing placement. The Coordinated Assessment process for CH housing placement was also improved through technical guidance received by the Zero: 2016 campaign.

The number of unsheltered chronically homeless persons also decreased. This was due to increased community immersion of two newer outreach teams into the community.

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

	2015	2016	Difference
Number of CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded PSH beds dedicated for use by chronically homeless persons identified on the HIC.	974	995	21

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

The number CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded PSH beds dedicated for use by CH persons identified on the HIC increased by 21. This was due to the implementation of a new CoC funded PSH program as well as increases in capacity for existing budget based PSH programs.

Specific to CoC funded PSH beds dedicated for use by CH persons:

- In FY2015 the CoC was awarded funding for two new CH projects totaling 88 CH dedicated beds. The agency is currently in the contracting stages with HUD and anticipates leasing up the program in October 2016.
- For the FY2016 Competition, the CoC projects include a combined total of 764 total PSH beds. 74% (567/764) of those PSH beds are dedicated for use by CH persons.

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

Documenting Chronic Homeless Status?

3B-1.3a. If “Yes” was selected for question 3B-1.3, attach a copy of the CoC’s written standards or other evidence that clearly shows the incorporation of the Orders of Priority in Notice CPD 14-012 and indicate the page(s) for all documents where the Orders of Priority are found. Attached.

3B-1.4. Is the CoC on track to meet the goal of ending chronic homelessness by 2017? Yes

This question will not be scored.

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

Our CoC is part of the Zero: 2016 campaign. The CoC has done monitoring of CoC programs to ensure that clients in programs meet eligibility standards set forth by CoC regulations. The Continuum has adopted chronic prioritization guidance for PSH projects giving priority to those with the highest service needs and the longest histories of homelessness. Most of the PSH beds within the CoC are either dedicated or prioritized for CH. The Community Triage group is working from a named community list of individuals as they place CH persons in housing. Remaining barriers include tightening of rental market - Vacancy rate is approximately 3%. Technical guidance on marketing to and working with landlords would be helpful.

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

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

Instructions:

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

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

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

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

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

The CoC is committed to rapidly rehousing every family with children that becomes homeless within 30 days of becoming homeless on the street or entering shelter. The CoC works on this by:

- 1) Using the HUD System Measures report to monitor average and mean length of days homeless.
- 2) Holding weekly by-name housing placement triage meetings for homeless families.
- 3) VA, CoC, TANF, and ESG funding sources are used for RRH; In FY15, 797 households were rapidly re-housed.
- 4) Central RRH provider accepts referrals from DV, outreach, and other homeless assistance providers.
- 5) CoC utilizes progressive engagement to ensure housing stability; all homeless families are offered RRH assistance.
- 6) Having staff dedicated to assist clients with finding physical units.
- 7) Adding 5,000 units of affordable housing within 5 years. Initiative adopted by Salt Lake City in 2015.

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

	2015	2016	Difference
RRH units available to serve families in the HIC:	68	170	102

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

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

3B-2.5. Compare the total number of homeless households with children in the CoC as reported by the CoC for the 2016 PIT count compared to 2015

(or 2014 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2015).

PIT Count of Homelessness Among Households With Children

	2015 (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless households with children:	243	188	-55
Sheltered Count of homeless households with children:	241	188	-53
Unsheltered Count of homeless households with children:	2	0	-2

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

The decrease in total number of sheltered homeless households with children is due to three main factors:

- Increased capacity in TANF funded RRH assistance
- Increased capacity in CoC funded RRH assistance
- Conversion of a HOME funded TH program to RRH for families

The decrease in unsheltered homeless households with children is due to:

- Increased community efforts to coordinate street outreach

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

Human trafficking and other forms of exploitation?	Yes
LGBTQ youth homelessness?	Yes
Exits from foster care into homelessness?	Yes
Family reunification and community engagement?	Yes
Positive Youth Development, Trauma Informed Care, and the use of Risk and Protective Factors in assessing youth housing and service needs?	Yes
Unaccompanied minors/youth below the age of 18?	Yes

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

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

Specific sampling methodology for enumerating and characterizing local youth trafficking:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross systems strategies to quickly identify and prevent occurrences of youth trafficking:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community awareness training concerning youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Task force developed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N/A:	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

	FY 2014 (October 1, 2013 - September 30, 2014)	FY 2015 (October 1, 2014 - September 30, 2015)	Difference
Total number of unaccompanied youth served in HMIS contributing programs who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry:	366	453	87

3B-2.8a. If the number of unaccompanied youth and children, and youth-headed households with children served in any HMIS contributing

program who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry in FY 2015 is lower than FY 2014 explain why. (limit 1000 characters)

N/A

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

	Calendar Year 2016	Calendar Year 2017	Difference
Overall funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects (CoC Program and non-CoC Program funded):	\$5,451,435.00	\$5,951,435.00	\$500,000.00
CoC Program funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects:	\$451,435.00	\$451,435.00	\$0.00
Non-CoC funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects (e.g. RHY or other Federal, State and Local funding):	\$5,000,000.00	\$5,500,000.00	\$500,000.00

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

Cross-Participation in Meetings	# Times
CoC meetings or planning events attended by LEA or SEA representatives:	12
LEA or SEA meetings or planning events (e.g. those about child welfare, juvenile justice or out of school time) attended by CoC representatives:	12
CoC meetings or planning events attended by youth housing and service providers (e.g. RHY providers):	12

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

The CoC collaborates regularly with youth housing providers, LEA, and SEA Representatives:

- 1) Educational Assurance policies - The CoC policy was drafted in consultation with youth housing and service providers as well as local education liaisons.
- 2) State-wide Homeless Planning - The State Department of Education is a member of the State Homeless Coordinating Council. The Chair of the CoC Board is also a member of the Council.
- 3) CoC Membership, CoC Grant Workgroup and Coordinated Assessment Training - School Liaisons and the local Head Start provider attend.
- 4) Coalition to End Youth Homelessness - A Coalition to End Youth Homelessness was organized within the CoCs geographical area. Members of the Coalitions include CoC funded agencies as well as local education liaisons.
- 5) CoC Membership, CoC Board, CoC Grant Workgroup, and Coordinated Assessment Training - attended by youth housing and service provider.

**3B-2.11. How does the CoC make sure that homeless individuals and families who become homeless are informed of their eligibility for and receive access to educational services? Include the policies and procedures that homeless service providers (CoC and ESG Programs) are required to follow.
(limit 2000 characters)**

The educational assurances policy adopted by the CoC has responsibilities for the CoC, providers and the McKinney-Vento School liaisons. The CoC is responsible for engaging school liaisons in planning meetings and encouraging providers to adopt policies related to M-V education services. Providers will educate staff on the rights of homeless students, maintain relationships with school officials, designate staff to see that children are enrolled in school, encourage parental involvement, work directly with the truant officers in instances of truancy and provide after-school programs on site or make referrals to other programs. School liaisons are responsible for: ensuring students are registered for school, assisting with fee waivers, providing transportation, providing school supplies, and working with case managers.

School liaisons actively track and contact students who are homeless, or those who move between school districts. Strong lines of communication exist between agencies and liaisons to ensure school aged kids are identified and enrolled as quickly as possible after shelter or housing entry. Liaisons have a strong presence in several agencies, including family shelters and the homeless youth drop in center. Shelter and housing case managers meet with liaisons weekly to review enrollment, attendance and progress of students. If students are struggling, case managers and liaisons work together to ensure special attention is given to the issue. Children are enrolled immediately after shelter entry and bussed to and from area schools. Liaison work with the schools who accept students to ensure that McKinney-Vento entitlements are communicated to families and upheld by the schools.

Both ESG and CoC funded programs are required to adhere to the Policy.

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

Yes. One HUD-funded project based PSH project for chronically homeless families in the CoC has a written agreement with Head Start to provide on-site youth programming.

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

Objective 3: Ending Veterans Homelessness

Instructions:

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

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

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

	2015 (for unsheltered count, most recent year conducted)	2016	Difference
Universe: Total PIT count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless veterans:	288	275	-13
Sheltered count of homeless veterans:	278	268	-10
Unsheltered count of homeless veterans:	10	7	-3

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

The total number of homeless veterans decreased from 2015 to 2016 due to:

- Use of by name list of homeless veterans pulled from the HMIS database
- Technical Guidance and Coaching received through participation in the Zero: 2016 campaign

The number of sheltered homeless veterans decreased from 2015 to 2016 due to:

- Improved housing referral and placement process. This was the result of participating in the Zero:2016 campaign and receiving technical guidance from CSH
- Attendance by VASH, SSVF, and GPD grantees as well as VA staff at a weekly housing placement meeting

The number of unsheltered homeless veterans decreased from 2015 to 2016 due to:

- Increased collaboration between community street outreach teams and the VA outreach teams
- Attendance by VASH, SSVF, and GPD grantees as well as VA staff at a weekly housing placement meeting

3B-3.2. Describe how the CoC identifies, assesses, and refers homeless veterans who are eligible for Veterean's Affairs services and housing to appropriate reources such as HUD-VASH and SSVF. (limit 1000 characters)

Stakeholders work together to quickly to assess homeless veterans for housing options. Housing is available for every Veteran and the community agrees on a goal of housing placement within 30 days. A weekly housing placement meeting is held.

Outreach teams maintain a listing of all Veterans, regardless of status and provide documentation of eligibility or non-eligibility for VA homeless assistance. This list acts as our coordinated access point and is reviewed weekly at a weekly housing placement meeting for homeless veterans.

Vets who enter the homeless housing and service delivery system through interaction with any HMIS participating agencies are assessed using the VI-SPDAT. When housing resources are limited, those with highest vulnerability/length of time homeless are prioritized for housing. Currently, we have multiple housing options available for eligible Veterans such as GPD, SSVF, and VASH.

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

	2010 (or 2009 if an unsheltered count was not conducted in 2010)	2016	% Difference
Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless veterans:	222	275	23.87%
Unsheltered Count of homeless veterans:	22	7	-68.18%

3B-3.4. Indicate from the dropdown whether you are on target to end Veteran homelessness by the end of 2016. Yes

This question will not be scored.

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

Our CoC is part of the Zero: 2016 campaign. The CoC holds a weekly Veteran Housing Meeting to discuss housing needs and placement possibilities for these individuals as they are ready for housing. Specialized outreach teams are in contact with the unsheltered Veterans. A recent landlord fair held a special session to engage landlords about housing preferences for veterans. In addition, Salt Lake City has launched an affordable housing creation campaign called "5,000 doors." Barriers remaining include the classification of GPD units as Transitional Housing that counts as homeless. Technical assistance on how to request a re-classification would be helpful.

4A. Accessing Mainstream Benefits

Instructions:

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

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

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

FY 2016 Assistance with Mainstream Benefits

Total number of project applications in the FY 2016 competition (new and renewal):	25
Total number of renewal and new project applications that demonstrate assistance to project participants to obtain mainstream benefits (i.e. In a Renewal Project Application, "Yes" is selected for Questions 2a, 2b and 2c on Screen 4A. In a New Project Application, "Yes" is selected for Questions 5a, 5b, 5c, 6, and 6a on Screen 4A).	25
Percentage of renewal and new project applications in the FY 2016 competition that have demonstrated assistance to project participants to obtain mainstream benefits:	100%

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

The CoC collaborates with the following Healthcare organization on healthcare enrollment:

- 1) Valley Behavioral Health - Administers 1 CoC grant and is a referral/service partner on several other CoC grants. All case manager staff are trained on insurance enrollment.
- 2) Volunteers of America - Administers 2 CoC grants. Staff includes insurance enrollment specialists. Any CoC provider can refer participants for assistance with insurance enrollment.

- 3) State Dept. of Health - Administer's Utah's federally funded Navigator program, Take Care Utah. Contracts with Department of Workforce Services to enroll individuals in insurance. Both have programs targeted to homeless persons.
- 4) 4th Street Clinic - Referral/Service Partner on multiple CoC grants. Assisted 1,584 clients with enrollment and 106 clients were newly enrolled (source: Sept 2014 National Health Care for Homeless Policy Brief on HCH Grantees)

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

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

4B. Additional Policies

Instructions:

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

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

FY 2016 Low Barrier Designation

Total number of PH (PSH and RRH), TH and non-Coordinated Entry SSO project applications in the FY 2016 competition (new and renewal):	25
Total number of PH (PSH and RRH), TH and non-Coordinated Entry SSO renewal and new project applications that selected "low barrier" in the FY 2016 competition:	24
Percentage of PH (PSH and RRH), TH and non-Coordinated Entry SSO renewal and new project applications in the FY 2016 competition that will be designated as "low barrier":	96%

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

FY 2016 Projects Housing First Designation

Total number of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, and TH project applications in the FY 2016 competition (new and renewal):	25
Total number of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, and TH renewal and new project applications that selected Housing First in the FY 2016 competition:	24
Percentage of PSH, RRH, non-Coordinated Entry SSO, and TH renewal and new project applications in the FY 2016 competition that will be designated as Housing First:	96%

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

Direct outreach and marketing:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

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

	2015	2016	Difference
RRH units available to serve all populations in the HIC:	334	650	316

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

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

N/A

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

4B-7a. If "Yes", to question 4B-7, describe how the use of grant funds to serve such persons is of equal or greater priority than serving persons

defined as homeless in accordance with 24 CFR 578.89. Description must include whether or not this is listed as a priority in the Consolidated Plan(s) and its CoC strategic plan goals. CoCs must attach the list of projects that would be serving this population (up to 10 percent of CoC total award) and the applicable portions of the Consolidated Plan. (limit 2500 characters)

N/A

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

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

N/A

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

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

This response does not affect the scoring of this application.

CoC Governance:	<input type="checkbox"/>
CoC Systems Performance Measurement:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordinated Entry:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data reporting and data analysis:	<input type="checkbox"/>
HMIS:	<input type="checkbox"/>

Homeless subpopulations targeted by Opening Doors: veterans, chronic, children and families, and unaccompanied youth:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maximizing the use of mainstream resources:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Retooling transitional housing:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rapid re-housing:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under-performing program recipient, subrecipient or project:	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not applicable:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

4C. Attachments

Instructions:

Multiple files may be attached as a single .zip file. For instructions on how to use .zip files, a reference document is available on the e-snaps training site:
<https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3118/creating-a-zip-file-and-capturing-a-screenshot-resource>

Document Type	Required?	Document Description	Date Attached
01. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Evidence of the CoC's communication to rejected participants	Yes	UT500 Communicati...	09/08/2016
02. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Public Posting Evidence	Yes		
03. CoC Rating and Review Procedure (e.g. RFP)	Yes	UT500 Rating and ...	09/08/2016
04. CoC's Rating and Review Procedure: Public Posting Evidence	Yes	UT500 Rating and ...	09/08/2016
05. CoCs Process for Reallocating	Yes	UT500 Reallocating	09/08/2016
06. CoC's Governance Charter	Yes	UT500 Governance ...	09/08/2016
07. HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual	Yes	UT500 HMIS Polici...	09/08/2016
08. Applicable Sections of Con Plan to Serving Persons Defined as Homeless Under Other Fed Statutes	No		
09. PHA Administration Plan (Applicable Section(s) Only)	Yes	UT500 PHA Homeles...	09/08/2016
10. CoC-HMIS MOU (if referenced in the CoC's Governance Charter)	No	UT500 HMIS MOU	09/08/2016
11. CoC Written Standards for Order of Priority	No	UT 500 Placement ...	09/08/2016
12. Project List to Serve Persons Defined as Homeless under Other Federal Statutes (if applicable)	No		
13. HDX-system Performance Measures	Yes	UT500 System Meas...	09/08/2016
14. Other	No		
15. Other	No		

Submission Summary

Ensure that the Project Priority List is complete prior to submitting.

Page	Last Updated
1A. Identification	08/24/2016
1B. CoC Engagement	09/06/2016
1C. Coordination	09/08/2016
FY2016 CoC Application	Page 60
	09/09/2016

1D. CoC Discharge Planning	08/16/2016
1E. Coordinated Assessment	09/04/2016
1F. Project Review	09/08/2016
1G. Addressing Project Capacity	08/31/2016
2A. HMIS Implementation	09/07/2016
2B. HMIS Funding Sources	09/06/2016
2C. HMIS Beds	09/08/2016
2D. HMIS Data Quality	09/01/2016
2E. Sheltered PIT	09/04/2016
2F. Sheltered Data - Methods	09/08/2016
2G. Sheltered Data - Quality	08/16/2016
2H. Unsheltered PIT	09/04/2016
2I. Unsheltered Data - Methods	09/01/2016
2J. Unsheltered Data - Quality	09/08/2016
3A. System Performance	09/08/2016
3B. Objective 1	09/08/2016
3B. Objective 2	09/09/2016
3B. Objective 3	09/08/2016
4A. Benefits	09/08/2016
4B. Additional Policies	09/08/2016
4C. Attachments	Please Complete
Submission Summary	No Input Required