

## Confirmation of Project Operating Year

### Instructions:

The recipient must enter the operating year for this grant, as reflected in LOCCS. If there was a HUD-approved grant extension that extension period should not be included on this screen, but will be included on Q2.

**Operating Year Start Date:** The operating start date for new grants is the first day of the month in which the recipient or subrecipient begins incurring eligible costs (this is generally when the project starts serving persons). The date is set by the recipient at the time of the first draw down. For renewals, the operating start date is the day after the end of the previous grant term.

**Operating Year End Date:** The 12-month period beginning on the Operating Start Date. HUD recognizes that there are rare circumstances where the period may be shorter than 12 months, especially when there is a grant consolidation.

**Operating Year Start Date** 01/01/2015

**Operating Year End Date** 12/31/2015

## Q1. Contact Information

### Instructions:

The project information (e.g., project name, recipient and grant number) required for reporting within the APR must exactly match the grant information you submitted and received from HUD when your grant was awarded.

**Project Name:** UT-500 CoC Planning Project Application  
FY2013

**Recipient:** Salt Lake County Homeless Coordinating  
Council, Inc.

**Grant Number:** UT0095L8T001300

**Prefix:** Mr.

**First Name:** Dan

**Middle Name:**

**Last Name:** Adams

**Suffix:**

**Title:** SLCHCC Board Chair (CoC Board)

**Street Address 1:** 2001 South State Street Suite S2100

**Street Address 2:** PO Box 144575

**City:** Salt Lake City

**State:** Utah

**Zip Code:** 84114-4575  
**Format:** 12345 or 12345-1234

**E-mail Address:** danjadams@yahoo.com

**Confirm E-mail Address:** danjadams@yahoo.com

**Phone Number:** 801-450-2762  
**Format:** 123-456-7890

**Extension:**

**Fax Number:**  
**Format:** 123-456-7890

## Q2. Project Information

**Carefully select the answers to the questions on this form as they determine what questions you are required to answer for the APR. Selecting the incorrect answer will give you incorrect questions to complete. Refer to the CoC APR Guidebook at [www.hudexchange.info](http://www.hudexchange.info) for details on answering this and all questions in the APR.**

**Instructions:**

After answering questions click "Save" and review the form. New questions may appear depending on the answers you give.

Grant operating year covered by this APR: This question refers to which year the project is operating under the current grant. Because all CoC Planning grants have a 1-year grant term, this field is prepopulated "1."

Is this an APR for a grant that received a HUD-approved grant extension?: Grants approved for an extension will now only submit one APR for the grant operating year, including the extension period. If you answer "Yes" to "Is this an APR for a grant that received a HUD-approved grant extension?" you will need to select "Save" on the bottom of the screen and two new fields will become visible where you will identify the time period for your extension. The extension start date should be the day after the date the grant would have ended if HUD had not approved an extension (e.g., if the grant had a one-year term ending 01/31/2010, the extension operating start date should be 02/01/2010). The extension end date should match the grant expiration date in LOCCS.

Is this a final APR for this grant?: A recipient should answer "Yes" if the grant for which this APR is reporting is finishing its grant term. This question indicates to HUD that a recipient needs to complete its closeout process with HUD for this grant. Please note that a grant closeout does not necessarily mean a project closeout. A grant closeout means a recipient has completed a grant term and needs to close out a grant. A project closeout means that, in addition to a grant completing its term and needing to closeout, the entire project is literally closing down. A recipient should answer "no" if it is not reporting on the final operating year in its full grant term. If the answer to this question is "Yes," the recipient will be required to answer two additional questions related to the closeout of the grant. In the first question, the recipient will indicate whether it has completed its final draw in LOCCS. In the second question, the recipient will indicate whether or not it plans on renewing this project.

**Program Type CoC**

<b>CoC Number and Name</b>	UT-500 - Salt Lake City & County CoC
<b>Amount of Contract or Award</b>	\$69,372
<b>Grant operating year covered by this APR</b>	1
<b>Is this an APR for a grant that received a HUD-approved grant extension? Click save to update form.</b>	No
<b>Is this a final APR for this grant? Click save to update form.</b>	Yes
<b>Is this a corrected APR?</b>	No
<b>Have you completed your final draw in LOCCS?</b>	Yes

**Have you renewed this project?** No

### Q3. CoC Planning Actions and Outcomes

**Check the box associated with the eligible activities this CoC Planning grant was used to fund** Coordination Activities, Project Monitoring Activities, Project Evaluation

**Explain how the CoC planning grant funds were used. Additionally, describe the outcomes your CoC observed as a result of the CoC Planning grant.**

**Maximum characters: 5000**

Several positive activities and outcomes occurred in the CoC as a result of the CoC Planning Grant. Highlights included the following:

- 1) Ranking – CoC Collaborative Applicant Staff conducted coordination, evaluation and monitoring activities related to the FY2015 HUD CoC Competition. Those activities included the collection and review of APRs for all renewal applicants and planning and conducting evaluation/monitoring visits with all renewal applicant agencies. This information was disseminated for used by the Ranking Committee (locally known as the Prioritization Committee) in scoring, tiering, and making funding recommendations. The CoC Application was stronger due to being able to affirm both APR and monitoring information was used to rank applications.
- 2) Timing - CoC Collaborative Applicant Staff conducted coordination, evaluation and monitoring activities related to the FY2015 HUD CoC Competition. Those activities included development of materials for applicant and Ranking Committee members, staffing multiple meetings for applicants and Ranking Committee members, as well as gathering and coordinating materials from sources including the NAEH, CSH, USICH, and HUD. The local ranking and review process was begun in advance of the competition allowing the applicants and ranking committees increased time to prepare for the NOFA release. Feedback from the Ranking Committee and Applicants both affirmed this was helpful.
- 3) Grant Assumption - CoC Collaborative Applicant Staff conducted coordination, evaluation and monitoring for grant compliance. Through monitoring and evaluation a grantee was identified with grant compliance issues; serving ineligible households. The grantee voluntarily agreed to turn the grants over to another agency in the CoC. An RFP was released and a new grantee was identified, resulting in better used of existing resources to serve CH persons. The assumed grants serve a combined total of 35 CH persons.
- 4) CoC Web site – CoC Collaborative Applicant staff conducted coordination activities related to communicating key information to CoC stakeholder. This included helping develop a CoC web site. The web site was used to communicate with CoC members about the CoC Governance Charter, HMIS SOP, CoC Reports (AHAR, PIT, HIC), and the FY2015 HUD CoC Competition (including posting copies of meeting presentations). The result was increased transparency and openness with CoC members. Collaborative Applicant staff have shared web site information during several community meetings as well as one on one meetings with agencies.

5) Early Submission – CoC Collaborative Applicant staff conducted coordination activities related to preparing for the FY2015 HUD CoC Competition. This included working with stakeholder groups to identify areas where prep work could be done in advance of the competition. For example: providing information during HMIS coordination meetings related to the grant, advising CoC Board members about timing and needed activities, and providing several timelines to CoC members about the grant competition. The result was an application that was submitted to HUD two days prior to the close of the competition, thus qualifying for bonus points.

6) Alignment with National Guidance – CoC Collaborative Applicant staff conducted coordination activities related to helping the local CoC align with national guidance from HUD and the USIACH. In the most recent update of the Federal Strategic Plan, Collective Impact is a model for change highlighted as a useful tool for working on system wide homeless goals and measures. Collaborative Applicant staff conducted research on collective impact and provided information to Salt Lake County, CoC Board, and CoC Membership about Collective Impact. This activity was one of many efforts made by many different stakeholders that resulted in the convening of the Salt Lake County Collective Impact Steering Committee on Homelessness. This group has adopted 14 local outcomes on homelessness. In regards to the FY2015 HUD CoC Competition, it was helpful on several questions to provide answers that reference the local use of Collective Impact. In addition, the CoC Membership also approved support of HUD goals, system performance measures and PSH Prioritization. The request for these voting items was made by CoC Collaborative Applicant Staff.

7) Evaluation and Recommendation – As committed in the planning grant application, CoC Collaborative Applicant staff prepared and evaluation and recommendation presentation which responded to three key questions identified in the Planning Grant application. CoC Collaborative applicant staff shared this with the CoC Board. A copy is attached to this APR.

## Q4. CoC Expenditures – CoC Planning

**Instructions:**

Report all CoC Program funds expended for this CoC Planning grant during this operating year.

In the CoC Program Funds Expenditures column, list all CoC Program funds expended during the operating year on each line item.

### CoC Program Funds Expended During the Operating Year – CoC Planning

Expenditure Type	CoC Program Funds Expenditures
Coordination Activities	\$23,506.13
Project Evaluation	\$22,000.00
Project Monitoring Activities	\$22,000.00
Participation in the Consolidated Plan	
CoC Application Activities	
Determining Geographical Area to be Served by the CoC	
Developing a CoC System	
HUD Compliance Activities	
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$67,506.13</b>
Cash Match	
In-Kind Match	\$19,627.00
<b>Total Match</b>	<b>\$19,627.00</b>
<b>Match %</b>	<b>29.07%</b>
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$87,133.13</b>

## Q5. Additional Comments

**Please provide any additional comments on other areas of the APR that need explanation, such as a difference in anticipated and actual program outputs or bed utilization.  
Maximum characters: 2000**

N/A



## Submission Certification

**Instructions:**

Before submitting your APR, an authorized recipient official must certify that the statement below is true by placing a check mark in the box. Your APR will not be reviewed if the check mark is not completed.

**Name of Authorized Recipient Official:** Dan Adams

**Title/Position:** SLCHCC Board Chair

**I hereby certify that all the information stated herein is true and accurate. I understand that HUD will prosecute false claims and statements and that conviction may result in criminal and/or civil penalties (pursuant to 18 USC 1001, 1010, 1012; 31 USC 3729, 3802).**

**Check for Certification:**

## Attachments

Document Type	Required?	Document Description	Date Attached
Match Documentation	No		
Other Attachment	No	Evaluation and Re...	02/12/2016

## Attachment Details

**Document Description:**

## Attachment Details

**Document Description:** Evaluation and Recommendation Presentation

## Submission Summary

Page	Last Updated
<b>Confirmation of Project Operating Year</b>	03/29/2016
<b>Q1. Contact Information</b>	03/29/2016
<b>Q2. Project Information</b>	02/12/2016
<b>Q3. CoC Planning Actions and Outcomes</b>	02/12/2016
<b>Q4. CoC Financial – Services</b>	03/03/2016
<b>Q5. Additional Comments</b>	No Input Required
<b>Submission Certification</b>	03/30/2016
<b>Attachments</b>	02/12/2016

# 2015 HUD Planning Grant

## Evaluation and Recommendations

Presented to the SLCHCC Executive Committee

February 2, 2016

## I. Background - HUD

## HUD Background

### Vision:

No one should experience homelessness for more than 30 days

### Goals:

- 2015 End Veteran Homelessness
- 2017 End Chronic Homelessness
- 2020 End Youth Homelessness
- 2020 End Family Homelessness

## HUD Background

### System Measures:

“Homelessness is rare, brief and one-time”

### Policy Priorities:

- Goals
- Housing First (PH and TH)
- Strategic Resource Allocation

## HUD Background

### Funding:

- Both ESG and CoC are funded under the HEARTH Act
- HUD also funds CDBG, SSBG, HOME and HOPWA
- Project Based Section 8
- Coordination with VA, CNCS, and HHS
- **Continuum of Care is a competitive source of funding not a formula allocation**

## II. Background – Planning Grant

## Planning Grant Scope of Activities

The HUD planning dollars application identifies three activities that will be conducted with grant:

- Coordination
- Project Evaluation
- Monitoring

## Planning Grant Application and Timeline

- In November 2013 the SLCHCC applied for planning dollars through an application in the FY2013 HUD Continuum of Care Competition.
- The grant application was selected for funding by HUD. It covered the operating year of January 2015 – December 2015.
- As described in the application, an agreement was executed with the SLCHCC for SLCO to perform the grant activities



## III. Background- HUD CoC Funding

### CoC Application

- FY2015 applied for a total of \$7.5 million; \$5.5 in Tier 1 and \$2 million in Tier 2
- Tier 2 is highly competitive and 60 of the 100 points that projects can receive comes directly from the Collaborative Application Score
- This not only impacts projects in Tier 2, but also the future ability to locally reallocate funds
- Emphasis on: HUD System Performance Measures, Goals, Policy Priorities, Collaboration and Data

## CoC Application

Collaborative Application (200 points possible):

- 1) CoC Coordination and Engagement – 49 points
- 2) Project Ranking, Review and Capacity – 26 points
- 3) HMIS – 18 points
- 4) PIT Count – 9 points
- 5) System Performance – 38 points
- 6) Performance and Strategic Planning – 60 points
- 7) Bonus Points – 3 points

*More quantitative data, numeric fill-ins, drop down menus, checkbox selections. Fewer narratives and open-ended questions*

## CoC Application

- NOFA is released and usually a 45 – 60 day turnaround
- Score is reflective of year round work
- FY2015 was the most competitive NOFA ever

## IV. Intro - Evaluation and Recommendation

### Audience

- In addition to activities, the planning application also states three corresponding **evaluation and recommendations** will be drafted and presented to SL County Supervisor and the CoC governing board
- May be beneficial for Salt Lake County to present evaluation and recommendations to additional groups as well. For example: SLCHCC Membership, ESG Funders.
- In addition, could be posted on Salt Lake County's Continuum of Care web site

## Centered on Three Questions

- 1) How the planning and organization structure is working along with recommendations for improvement
- 2) How the continuum should plan and prioritize the use of resources and beds to better meet the goals and priorities of HUD and the local community
- 3) How to improve collaboration with ESG funding partners to systematically support homeless efforts in the CoC

## Purpose and Context

### Purpose:

- Transparency
- Continuity
- Ensure follow up that reflects lessons learned
- Develop plan for future actions

### Context:

- Assignments for follow up should connect with roles and responsibilities in [CoC Governance Charter](#)

## Staffing

- Beginning in January 2015, HUD provided planning dollars
- In the FY2015 competition, HUD allowed CoC's to increase the amount of planning dollars requested (operational in mid to late 2016)
- For two years (Nov 2016 – Feb 2018) Salt Lake County will have additional capacity of two full-time AmeriCorps members
- State has also provided dollars for Grant Writing and HEARTH implementation; amount has varied

## V. Evaluation and Recommendations

How the planning and organization structure is working along with recommendations for improvement

## Context

- CoC Regulations require [Governance Charter](#) which includes identification of at least three roles (Board, HMIS Lead, Collaborative Applicant) and responsibilities.
- CoC Regulations also require a consumer sits on the CoC Board
- Governance Charter annually approved by CoC membership
- CoC Application – Coordination and Engagement section

## Status

- Governance Charter was adopted by CoC membership
- Has been posted on web site
- Have been reviewing with CoC Grantees to assure understanding
- [Collective Impact Steering Committee](#) is a separate but aligned body; have set community outcomes on homelessness
- CoC Board has two representatives on the Collective Impact Steering Committee

## Recommendations

Lead	Action	Timeframe
CoC Board and CoC Collaborative Applicant	Meet with HMIS Team to review Charter	
CoC Board	Develop job descriptions for board members	
CoC Collaborative Applicant and CoC Board	Meet with CoC Collective Impact representatives to review HUD goals, system measures, and policy priorities	
CoC Board, CoC Collaborative Applicant, and HMIS Lead	Begin process of reviewing Governance Charter at least one quarter prior to renewal	
CoC Board, CoC Collaborative Applicant, and HMIS Lead	Provide activity updates to CoC Membership	
CoC Board	Consumer representation on Board	

## VI. Evaluation and Recommendations

How the continuum should plan and prioritize the use of resources and beds to better meet the goals and priorities of HUD and the local community

## Context

- Points on CoC Application for increasing PSH for CH and for RRH for families.
- HUD has established Goals, System Measures and Policy Priorities
- Collective Impact Steering Committee has adopted [14 local outcomes for homelessness](#)

## Status

- Reviewed HUD goals, system performance, and policy priorities with CoC applicants and asked for feedback on prioritization process
- Will have ability to pull system performance measure reports from HMIS
- Buy in from CoC Grantees to move to quarterly review of performance and fiscal information
- Technical Guidance, Monitoring, and Evaluation have been implemented for local CoC grantees
- FY2015 Competition began work prior to NOFA – beneficial to Prioritization Committee and Applicants



## Recommendations

Lead	Action	Timeframe
CoC Collaborative Applicant	Review info with Prioritization Committee and develop scoring guidelines for FY2016 competition	
CoC Collaborative Applicant	In conjunction with CTG and Zero:2016 Campaign implement metrics for CH Coordinated Assessment Process	
CoC Collaborative Applicant	Meet with ESG Funders to review HUD regulations requirement for Coordinated Assessment	
CoC Collaborative Applicant and CoC Board	CoC Board Representatives on Collective Impact Steering Committee to receive additional training on HUD goals, system performance measures, and policy priorities	
HMIS Lead, CoC Collaborative Applicant, and CoC Board	Continue development of canned reports from HMIS for APRs (all programs), System Performance Measures, and Prioritization lists and disseminate information	

## VII. Evaluation and Recommendations

How to improve collaboration with ESG funding partners to systematically support homeless efforts in the CoC

## Context

- The HEARTH Act requires collaboration between CoC and ESG recipients.
- Multiple points on the CoC Collaborative Application for coordination with ESG funders on monitoring, evaluation, reporting, coordinated access, and funding recommendations

## Status

- In FY2015 Competition, all 3 ESG funders participated on CoC Prioritization Committee
- Community formed Collective Impact Steering Committee, members include all 3 ESG funders (agencies), representation from the CoC Board and HMIS Lead
- HMIS Steering Committee includes representation from CoC as well as all 3 ESG funders
- Grants Coordination Committee (jurisdictions) meets quarterly/semi-annually

## Recommendations

Lead	Action	Timeframe
CoC Collaborative Applicant	Quarterly joint meeting with ESG funders and CoC Collaborative Applicant.	
CoC Collaborative Applicant	Develop a timeline for CAPER and ESG funding applications	
CoC Collaborative Applicant	Provide input on ESG funding recommendations	