

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: MI-506 - Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC

1A-2. Collaborative Applicant Name: Heart of West Michigan United Way

1A-3. CoC Designation: CA

1A-4. HMIS Lead:

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)	No	No	No
Hospital(s)	Yes	No	No
EMT/Crisis Response Team(s)	No	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	Yes	No
School Administrators/Homeless Liaisons	Yes	Yes	No
CoC Funded Victim Service Providers	Yes	Yes	Yes
Non-CoC Funded Victim Service Providers	Yes	Yes	No
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	Yes	Yes
Homeless or Formerly Homeless Persons	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mainstream Benefits Entity- Dept Health and Human Services		Yes	Yes

Applicant must select Yes, No or Not Applicable for all of the listed organization/person categories in 1B-1.

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.

New members are always welcome to join the CoC and the membership form is available continuously on the website. Annually there is a concerted effort to recruit new members with a public posting, email, and personal appeals to agencies we would like to have join. Committees are also open to any member to join, with some exceptions for those requiring a vote. The CoC uses the voices of the many youth providers both CoC, RHY funded, and not to help guide the efforts in serving youth. Collectively, this group decided to apply for the FY15 bonus project and secured it. They have also guided conversation on Coordinated Entry best practice with youth. The two local victim service agencies also participate and work closely with Coordinated Entry to improve practices, submitting a joint new project application in FY16. They regularly attend Coordinated Entry committee meetings and provide DV data to augment HMIS data.

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.
Arbor Circle	Yes	Yes	Yes
3-11 Youth Housing	No	Yes	No
HQ Youth Drop In Center	No	Yes	No
Fosters Forward	No	Yes	No
Bethany Christian Services	No	Yes	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	Yes	Yes
Safe Haven Ministries	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)

In the FY2016 competition, a notice was sent out to the CoC email distribution list and posted on the website to announce that the CoC was accepting applications for new and bonus project applicants. It was clear in the announcement and instructions that an applicant for these projects did not have to be a current/previously HUD funded entity. In FY2013 we did have a previously never CoC funded applicant submit two applications, both of which were included on that year's priority listing. This year, an application was submitted for a bonus project by a currently funded entity, although it included a partnership/sub-grantee with an agency that has never received CoC Program funding before. This was also the case in the FY2015 bonus project that was awarded, and included three sub-grantees that had never before applied for CoC funding. New applicants are scored according to HUD threshold criteria and their ability to demonstrate capacity to reach the projected outcomes.

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	3
How many Con Plan jurisdictions did the CoC participate with in their Con Plan development process?	3
How many Con Plan jurisdictions did the CoC provide with Con Plan jurisdiction level PIT data?	3
How many of the Con Plan jurisdictions are also ESG recipients?	1
How many ESG recipients did the CoC participate with to make ESG funding decisions?	1
How many ESG recipients did the CoC consult with in the development of ESG performance standards and evaluation process for ESG funded activities?	1

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)

The CoC has regular interaction with all three Con Plan jurisdictions: Kent County, Grand Rapids and Wyoming. Each of these entities has a seat on the CoC governance board, the Steering Council. The current Chair of the CoC is the Wyoming representative. As such, the CoC has monthly meetings with all three jurisdictions and an additional monthly meeting with Wyoming. These three entities worked collaboratively to submit one joint Con Plan this year, and they involved the CoC Steering Council and other members in their planning processes. The CoC has multiple meetings, emails and phone calls each month with each of the jurisdictions. The three entities have a great deal of input and influence in the CoC, its plans and its actions.

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 City of Grand Rapids is the only current jurisdiction receiving ESG funds at this time. They work with the CoC Funding Review committee to review the outcomes of current and past awardees according to the locally established performance standards of the CoC. The City of Grand Rapids consults the CoC Funding Review committee in award decisions and takes the funding recommendations of the CoC to their Board of Commissioners for final approval. The CoC also works with the City of Grand Rapids to provide data for the CAPER report and provides PIT and HMIS data as needed.

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)

Within the CoC, the domestic violence (DV) providers work closely in the Coordinated Entry system and with the coordinated intake agency, The Salvation Army. Depending on the level of lethality a survivor may be served in either mainstream or DV specific shelters as necessary. There have been additional partnerships between DV providers and other CoC housing providers to quickly move more survivors into permanent housing. The DV provider agencies also maintain a portfolio of housing options for survivors, including a CoC-funded transitional housing project. Although the DV providers are prohibited from using HMIS, they regularly provide data to help guide CoC discussions on planning and strategy.

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
Kent County Housing Commission	75.67%	No
Grand Rapids Housing Commission	4.00%	Yes-Public Housing
Wyoming Housing Commission	4.00%	No
Rockford Housing Commission	0.00%	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)

Scattered site single and multi family rental housing is utilized and funded through several sources including the Department of Community Health, Michigan Prisoner Re-entry, and Private non profits. Additionally, some local private landlords have a preference to serve homeless populations. Some of these units specifically serve homeless persons while others may have a preference. The CoC advocates with landlords and property managers to encourage homeless preferences. Other low-income and subsidized housing projects in the community have established relationships with the homeless outreach teams to connect those who are unsheltered with readily available housing in projects such as Exodus and Shepherds of Independence. These projects operate independently from the CoC systems but also prioritize those most vulnerable persons.

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 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 type="checkbox"/>
Health Care:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health Care:	<input 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)**

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's Coordinated Entry (CE) process utilizes the county's information and referral hotline, 211, to capitalize on the visibility that program has within the community. The coordinated intake agency, The Salvation Army, receives referrals from 211 as well as other agencies, community groups, or self-referrals. This includes law enforcement, mental health agencies, early childhood providers and school liaisons. The intake process is available in person or by phone to be available to those with limited transportation. Households are assessed using the VI-SPDAT and eligibility information and prioritized based on acuity for the appropriate housing intervention. If a resource is available they will be paired immediately, allowing for participant choice. If one is not they will be placed on the housing registry, a by-name list, prioritized by severity of needs and length of homelessness. Those in need will be able to be paired with the best resource as quickly as possible through CE.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CDBG/HOME/Entitlement Jurisdiction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law Enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Jail(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hospital(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EMT/Crisis Response Team(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Substance Abuse Service Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Housing Authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-CoC Funded Youth Homeless Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School Administrators/Homeless Liaisons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-CoC Funded Victim Service Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Street Outreach Team(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"/>
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"/>
Mainstream Benefits Entity- Dept Health and Human Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local Foundations	<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"/>

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?	17
How many of the renewal project applications are first time renewals for which the first operating year has not expired yet?	1
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?	16
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)

In determining project application priority, the CoC considered areas of on the Annual Performance Report (APR) that could provide insight into the severity of needs a person or household might present with. These areas specifically were households with zero or extremely low income, and how many households served had one, two, or three and more known disabilities. The CoC also considered population areas such as domestic violence survivors and chronically homeless. Each of these criteria were assigned point values in the local application process. The CoC also scored projects according to if they are low barrier and housing first, using the same questions from HUD's FY2015 eSnaps application. Each of these areas are given special consideration, along with if the project is effectively serving these vulnerable populations. These consideration informed the ranking process, such as not having a transitional housing project rank at the bottom because it is the only DV project funded.

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)

The CoC posted the local renewal application online and sent it out to a mailing list of more than 95 individuals on June 29, 2016. The local new and bonus project application was also posted online and sent to the same mailing list on July 18, 2016. The application included instructions for completion as well as an outline of funding priorities and the application scorecard, so that applicants could score their own applications prior to submission. The Funding Review committee met on July 20, 2016 and August 3, 2016. The minutes from these meetings were emailed and posted online on August 18, 2016.

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.) 08/02/2016

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 a formal monitoring process that is embedded in the review and renewal and reallocation of applications on an annual basis. This monitoring is carried out by CoC staff and designated committees who review applicant APR's and answer to required application questions. Additionally, HMIS data and quality is monitored by HMIS Administrator, and committees. The CoC maintains up-to-date and thorough information on projects. While more formal policies and procedures are planned to be created in the upcoming year current monitoring includes review of utilization rates, increases in housing stability, participant eligibility length of time homeless, destination upon program exit, increases in participant income, connection to mainstream benefits and timely draws from ELOCCS as well as a few other areas.

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

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.

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 ServicePoint

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

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

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: Single CoC

*** 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	\$100,000
ESG	\$0
CDBG	\$0
HOME	\$0
HOPWA	\$0
Federal - HUD - Total Amount	\$100,000

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	\$21,058
Private - Total Amount	\$21,058

2B-2.5 Funding Type: Other

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

2B-2.6 Total Budget for Operating Year	\$121,058
---	------------------

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): 05/02/2016

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	618	53	565	100.00%
Safe Haven (SH) beds	0	0	0	
Transitional Housing (TH) beds	228	109	119	100.00%
Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) beds	236	0	236	100.00%
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) beds	981	0	981	100.00%
Other Permanent Housing (OPH) beds	205	0	205	100.00%

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)

NA

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

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

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	5%	3%
3.3 Date of birth	2%	0%
3.4 Race	2%	0%
3.5 Ethnicity	2%	0%
3.6 Gender	2%	0%
3.7 Veteran status	2%	0%
3.8 Disabling condition	0%	0%
3.9 Residence prior to project entry	14%	0%
3.10 Project Entry Date	0%	0%
3.11 Project Exit Date	0%	0%
3.12 Destination	27%	2%
3.15 Relationship to Head of Household	5%	0%
3.16 Client Location	0%	0%
3.17 Length of time on street, in an emergency shelter, or safe haven	5%	0%

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?

Monthly

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)

NA

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)** 05/02/2016

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HMIS plus extrapolation:	<input 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)

All CoC emergency shelter and transitional housing programs maintain Entry and Exit information on an ongoing basis in HMIS. Users receive regular training and access to reports within HMIS to ensure data accuracy and

completion so HMIS is a reliable methodology. Housing providers received several reminders about count night and were asked to verify their PIT night count with other records. As an extra measure, volunteers helped count and collect a short, written survey on count night at the CoC's largest shelter for single men. VAWA-restricted agencies (DV providers) provided client deidentified data on paper forms that was entered into HMIS. This methodology is recommended as best practice by the State HMIS lead organization, MI Coalition Against Homelessness, and is supported with annual training.

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)

No changes

2F-5. Did your CoC change its provider coverage in the 2016 sheltered count? No

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

NA

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)

NA

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): 05/02/2016

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 checked="" 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)

Planning began 3 months prior. The planning team included outreach workers, including those focused on youth and VA staff. A list of known locations was developed. Teams were organized to include a lead outreach worker and volunteer professionals with experience in this field. The teams were assigned locations to visit, over a 24-hour period around PIT count night to identify unsheltered individuals. Standard forms were used to collect data in interviews. A team including CoC staff and a formerly homeless individual visited free breakfast and lunch sites, following PIT Count night, to interview those who were likely unsheltered. CoC staff entered de-duplicated data into HMIS and solicited additional information from the school district's MKV Homeless Liaisons. These efforts were to identify everyone who slept in a place unfit for human habitation. This methodology is recommended as best practice by the State HMIS Lead and was modified through outreach participation in PIT planning.

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)

NA

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)

NA

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 checked="" 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)

In addition to visiting known locations, outreach staff focused on individuals who were known to be unsheltered, from their ongoing work, and attempted to contact them during the 24 hour period that included the night of the PIT count.

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	912	800	-112
Emergency Shelter Total	408	594	186
Safe Haven Total	0	0	0
Transitional Housing Total	478	165	-313
Total Sheltered Count	886	759	-127
Total Unsheltered Count	26	41	15

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	2,814
Emergency Shelter Total	2,376
Safe Haven Total	0
Transitional Housing Total	545

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)

The CoC has worked to reduce the number of people becoming homeless beginning years ago when local funders and HPRP funded prevention services. Then a review of HMIS data allowed targeting of prevention services based on risk factors such as large family size, protective service involvement, recent and sudden loss of income etc., identified through a local HMIS entry assessment. Recently HMIS has been used to update these factors and identify community needs. The CoC is currently working to ensure that prevention and diversion services are consistently available to reduce entry into the homeless system despite a loss of funding to prevention. Other efforts to help prevent entries into the homeless system include a court supported eviction prevention program, rental unit certification to ensure safe affordable housing stock, coordination with workforce development services and mainstream support benefits through state TANF. These and other key partnerships help prevent homelessness.

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)

One of the most effective strategies pursued to reduce the length of time homeless is focus and funding of Housing First projects. Transitional housing (TH) programs have been reduced to special population projects and the number of Housing First and rapid rehousing (RRH) programs available increased. CoC funded projects that were TH have been reallocated to permanent housing. Local RRH projects funded by the CoC have set goals to rapidly rehouse households within 20 days. This goal was achieved by the largest provider of RRH services in 2015. Another strategy is using coordinated entry (CE) to quickly assess and prioritize those most in need, to quickly link them to housing. Recent efforts have been to ensure that PSH providers are taking referrals from CE following the orders of priority. ESG, CoC funded projects, SSVF and other funded PSH projects ensure that households who need PSH that may not be available immediately can utilize bridge housing to end homelessness quickly.

*** 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**

FY2016 CoC Application	Page 35	09/08/2016
------------------------	---------	------------

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	1,370
Of the persons in the Universe above, how many of those exited to permanent destinations?	822
% Successful Exits	60.00%

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	1,567
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?	1,494
% Successful Retentions/Exits	95.34%

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)

The CoC tracked recidivism rate as part of HPRP in 2012 in partnership with the state of MI which provided critical data on the effectiveness of RRH; reporting that only 6% of HPRP recipients in the state returned to homelessness. The strategies used then remain essential today. Providers track return entries into the homeless system through coordinated entry and HMIS. The HUD System Performance Measures helped to identify the projects/project types with the greatest retention and seek to replicate these outcomes. The CoC uses data to identify potential risk factors for those who may have higher risk of returning to homelessness and provide additional supports there. Those exiting from PSH and RRH projects tend to have higher housing retention rates than those exiting to PH from street outreach (SO) or emergency shelter (ES). Having the case management training used in RRH and PSH available for SO and ES providers should help improve retention rates for these project types as well.

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)**

Strategies to increase program participants' income include: Partnership with the MI Dept of Health and Human Services to implement the MI Bridges Navigation Partnership. In this, providers have been trained to assist households to apply for bundled benefits through the MDHHS. This has increased access to cash assistance, SSI, TANF funds and other programs and contributed to the more than 50% increases in income for program participants. Another strategy has been to encourage SOAR training among providers to increase access to disability income. Finally, the organizational structure of the CoC makes it a subcommittee of the Essential Needs Task Force. This structure links the CoC with community efforts to reduce food, transportation, utility and employment disparity. This results in system wide coordination and facilitates access to other system supports. This systems collaboration helps providers stay abreast of resources and initiatives to better link households to resources.

**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)**

100% of the CoC funded projects link households to employment assistance and benefits. CoC projects vary in their approach and most have partnerships that include workforce development organizations, schools, colleges, temporary jobs, job training and employment preparation as well as access to mainstream workforce systems. The CoC recognizes the opportunity to further enhance its partnerships with state and local organizations that administer programs covered by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. Through coordination with the County's Essential Needs Task Force the CoC will actively pursue collaboration with the Workforce Development Board to inform about the barriers faced by homeless persons seeking employment and increase the number of successful referrals from the CoC providers to job centers. The CoC plans to share ideas about how workforce boards can effectively work with CoC programs and consumers and specifically meet the needs of homeless youth in our community.

**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)**

No specific geographic areas were excluded. All areas identified by law enforcement, park staff and county-wide service providers were included in the count effort.

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 No

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)?

**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)**

NA

**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)** 08/15/2016

**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)**

NA

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	50	63	13
Sheltered Count of chronically homeless persons	43	59	16
Unsheltered Count of chronically homeless persons	7	4	-3

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 overall numbers of chronic homelessness reflect the amount of energy the CoC has invested into community wide training on documenting homelessness. By training outreach and shelter staff on proper identification and documentation of homeless status, more people are being identified earlier in the process. Previously, a large amount of the documentation was not gathered until a person was referred to a permanent housing project. The CoC has invested time in ensuring that more outreach is done, and that these efforts are documented in HMIS. The decrease in unsheltered persons may be due to many external factors, but are in line with the efforts the CoC has taken in prioritizing persons with higher vulnerability, who are often those who are unsheltered.

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 homelessness persons identified on the HIC.	329	282	-47

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 of chronically homeless dedicated beds for 2016 was incorrectly reported in the 2016 HIC. Two projects counted in 2015 were inadvertently omitted in 2016, one with 80 beds and another with 73 beds, that would have added 153 beds to the 2016 HUC total. This would have reflected an increase in dedicated beds of 106 if it were accurately reported as 433 beds in the 2016 HIC.

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 Documenting Chronic Homeless Status? Yes

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 1-3

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.

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)

The CoC has made ending chronic homelessness a top priority for the community. By using the organizing methods and By-Name list process developed through the work to end Veteran homelessness, the CoC has a strong roadmap for what it will take to reach the goal of ending chronic homelessness by 2017. The CoC will need additional permanent supportive housing increases to ensure the goal is reached, and is exploring alternative ways to increase the supply.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bad credit or rental history (including not having been a leaseholder):	<input checked="" 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 has invested a significant portion of the resources into rapid rehousing for families, helping us to house families quickly. In addition to six CoC funded projects for rapid rehousing, and two ESG funding sources, the CoC uses HOME funds to maximize the amount of rapid rehousing available to the community. The CoC uses a coordinated entry process to rapidly assess households and match them to the most appropriate and available resource to allow them to find housing of their choice quickly. Housing Resource Specialists assist families in locating and negotiating the lease in housing. Their training and skill expedites the process. As housing stock within the core city has shrunk, projects have begun to increase their search for additional affordable housing units. One important component of this work has been strengthening relationships with landlords.

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:	44	58	14

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 checked="" 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 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:	136	83	-53
Sheltered Count of homeless households with children:	136	83	-53
Unsheltered Count of homeless households with children:	0	0	0

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)

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 type="checkbox"/>
Specific sampling methodology for enumerating and characterizing local youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Cross systems strategies to quickly identify and prevent occurrences of youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Community awareness training concerning youth trafficking:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input 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, 2105)	Difference
Total number of unaccompanied youth served in HMIS contributing programs who were in an unsheltered situation prior to entry:	59	25	-34

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)

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):	\$1,277,248.00	\$1,997,976.00	\$720,728.00
CoC Program funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects:	\$65,248.00	\$782,976.00	\$717,728.00

Non-CoC funding for youth homelessness dedicated projects (e.g. RHY or other Federal, State and Local funding):	\$1,212,000.00	\$1,215,000.00	\$3,000.00
---	----------------	----------------	------------

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:	8
LEA or SEA meetings or planning events (e.g. those about child welfare, juvenile justice or out of school time) attended by CoC representatives:	2
CoC meetings or planning events attended by youth housing and service providers (e.g. RHY providers):	22

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 McKinney-Vento staff in the community are highly involved within the CoC. The MKV Lead attends all CoC meetings and is an active member of the Funding Review Committee, a role that requires a great deal of commitment and involvement. CoC staff have, just over a year ago, addressed the entire group off school liaisons and since have had contact with the lead and individual liaisons throughout the year, these liaisons often attend CoC meetings as well. Individual projects also have relationships with MKV Liaisons as they work collaboratively to ensure that all families are aware of and exercise their rights under the McKinney Vento legislation. The CoC is an active partner and workgroup member of KConnect, the collective impact group focusing on development needs of county residents. Through this partnership, basic needs such as housing are woven into the KConnect workgroups focused on particular age ranges: pre-natal-3rd grade, 4th grade-high school, and high school to career.

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 CoC has policy that all projects serving families with children shall ensure that they are aware of their rights under McKinney-Vento and are assisted in exercising them. CoC policy is applicable to projects that are funded under both CoC Program and ESG funding. Each agency providing housing to homeless families with children is encouraged to have their own internal policies and procedures that align with the CoC policy and McKinney-Vento guidance.

**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)**

No

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:	95	76	-19
Sheltered count of homeless veterans:	91	71	-20
Unsheltered count of homeless veterans:	4	5	1

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 CoC has invested a great deal of effort into building a By-Name list that accurately reflects homeless veterans in the county. This list was built in partnership with the Veterans' Affairs office and outreach partners. As the CoC works to house veterans, the efforts in outreach continue as well. While the overall count of homeless veterans has decreased in the PIT count, one addition veteran was identified in the unsheltered count. This may be due to improved PIT count efforts, using only volunteers with established outreach relationships or formerly homeless persons that were more easily able to build trust and get full and correct information from persons encountered on the count night.

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)

The group leading the CoC effort to end veteran homelessness conducts regular outreach to missions and shelters, encampments and street locations to identify veterans. There is coordination with the VA service centers and formerly homeless veterans have assisted in referring other veterans they know. Veterans are assessed using a housing referral assessment tool and the VI-SPDAT. There is a survey completed with the veteran to determine if they are connected with VA benefits and healthcare. Any who are not are referred as appropriate. This work is highly coordinated with the local VA Health Care for Homeless Veterans office.

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:	2	76	3,700.00%
Unsheltered Count of homeless veterans:	0	5	0.00%

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)

In an effort to reach the goal of housing all Veterans, CoC agencies have been asked to pledge resources to the effort and by preferencing veterans when possible for resources. In the earlier months of the year, we saw many veterans housed through these efforts. As the resources become more scarce, the work continues, but at a slowed pace. To address this, we have begun using Move Up program vouchers in the community to free up additional PSH units, however this resource has been split to meet a community need in keeping participants from a reallocated PSH project in their existing units as the project

closes. We remain committed to ending veteran housing and continue seeking out resources, but balancing this with the need to house and keep housing for chronically homeless persons has been challenging.

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):	16
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).	16
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)

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 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):	16
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:	14
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":	88%

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):	16
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:	13
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:	81%

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:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 0 auto;">X</div>
--------------------------------	---

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:	89	87	-2

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)

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)

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)

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 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		
02. 2016 CoC Consolidated Application: Public Posting Evidence	Yes		
03. CoC Rating and Review Procedure (e.g. RFP)	Yes		
04. CoC's Rating and Review Procedure: Public Posting Evidence	Yes		
05. CoCs Process for Reallocating	Yes		
06. CoC's Governance Charter	Yes		
07. HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual	Yes		
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		
10. CoC-HMIS MOU (if referenced in the CoC's Governance Charter)	No		
11. CoC Written Standards for Order of Priority	No		
12. Project List to Serve Persons Defined as Homeless under Other Federal Statutes (if applicable)	No		
13. HDX-system Performance Measures	Yes	2016 System Perfo...	09/08/2016
14. Other	No		
15. Other	No		

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description: 2016 System Performance Measures MI506

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Attachment Details

Document Description:

Submission Summary

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

Page	Last Updated
1A. Identification	Please Complete
1B. CoC Engagement	08/26/2016
1C. Coordination	08/26/2016
FY2016 CoC Application	Page 61
	09/08/2016

1D. CoC Discharge Planning	Please Complete
1E. Coordinated Assessment	09/06/2016
1F. Project Review	08/26/2016
1G. Addressing Project Capacity	08/26/2016
2A. HMIS Implementation	Please Complete
2B. HMIS Funding Sources	09/06/2016
2C. HMIS Beds	09/06/2016
2D. HMIS Data Quality	09/06/2016
2E. Sheltered PIT	09/06/2016
2F. Sheltered Data - Methods	09/06/2016
2G. Sheltered Data - Quality	09/06/2016
2H. Unsheltered PIT	09/06/2016
2I. Unsheltered Data - Methods	09/06/2016
2J. Unsheltered Data - Quality	09/06/2016
3A. System Performance	09/08/2016
3B. Objective 1	08/26/2016
3B. Objective 2	Please Complete
3B. Objective 3	09/08/2016
4A. Benefits	Please Complete
4B. Additional Policies	09/06/2016
4C. Attachments	Please Complete
Submission Summary	No Input Required

Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Summary Report for MI-506 - Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County CoC

Measure 1: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

This measures the number of clients active in the report date range across ES, SH (Metric 1.1) and then ES, SH and TH (Metric 1.2) along with their average and median length of time homeless. This includes time homeless during the report date range as well as prior to the report start date, going back no further than October, 1, 2012.

Metric 1.1: Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES and SH projects.

Metric 1.2: Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES, SH, and TH projects.

a. This measure is of the client's entry, exit, and bed night dates strictly as entered in the HMIS system.

	Universe (Persons)		Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)			Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)		
	Previous FY	Current FY	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
1.1 Persons in ES and SH		2357		76			45	
1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH		2762		98			58	

b. Due to changes in DS Element 3.17, metrics for measure (b) will not be reported in 2016.

This measure includes data from each client's "Length of Time on Street, in an Emergency Shelter, or Safe Haven" (Data Standards element 3.17) response and prepends this answer to the client's entry date effectively extending the client's entry date backward in time. This "adjusted entry date" is then used in the calculations just as if it were the client's actual entry date.

	Universe (Persons)		Average LOT Homeless (bed nights)			Median LOT Homeless (bed nights)		
	Previous FY	Current FY	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
1.1 Persons in ES and SH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 2: The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness

This measures clients who exited SO, ES, TH, SH or PH to a permanent housing destination in the date range two years prior to the report date range. Of those clients, the measure reports on how many of them returned to homelessness as indicated in the HMIS for up to two years after their initial exit.

	Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior)	Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months (0 - 180 days)		Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months (181 - 365 days)		Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months (366 - 730 days)		Number of Returns in 2 Years	
		# of Returns	% of Returns	# of Returns	% of Returns	# of Returns	% of Returns	# of Returns	% of Returns
Exit was from SO	23	4	17%	4	17%	2	9%	10	43%
Exit was from ES	576	62	11%	45	8%	35	6%	142	25%
Exit was from TH	243	19	8%	29	12%	7	3%	55	23%
Exit was from SH	0	0		0		0		0	
Exit was from PH	732	44	6%	41	6%	60	8%	145	20%
TOTAL Returns to Homelessness	1574	129	8%	119	8%	104	7%	352	22%

Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons

Metric 3.1 – Change in PIT Counts

This measures the change in PIT counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless person as reported on the PIT (not from HMIS).

	Previous FY PIT Count	2015 PIT Count	Difference
Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons	793	912	119
Emergency Shelter Total	345	408	63
Safe Haven Total	0	0	0
Transitional Housing Total	415	478	63
Total Sheltered Count	760	886	126
Unsheltered Count	33	26	-7

Metric 3.2 – Change in Annual Counts

This measures the change in annual counts of sheltered homeless persons in HMIS.

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons		2814	
Emergency Shelter Total		2376	
Safe Haven Total		0	
Transitional Housing Total		545	

Measure 4: Employment and Income Growth for Homeless Persons in CoC Program-funded Projects

Metric 4.1 – Change in earned income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)		355	
Number of adults with increased earned income		26	
Percentage of adults who increased earned income		7%	

Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Metric 4.2 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)		355	
Number of adults with increased non-employment cash income		171	
Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income		48%	

Metric 4.3 – Change in total income for adult system stayers during the reporting period

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults (system stayers)		355	
Number of adults with increased total income		183	
Percentage of adults who increased total income		52%	

Metric 4.4 – Change in earned income for adult system leavers

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)		235	
Number of adults who exited with increased earned income		43	
Percentage of adults who increased earned income		18%	

Metric 4.5 – Change in non-employment cash income for adult system leavers

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)		235	
Number of adults who exited with increased non-employment cash income		84	
Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income		36%	

Metric 4.6 – Change in total income for adult system leavers

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers)		235	
Number of adults who exited with increased total income		119	
Percentage of adults who increased total income		51%	

Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 5: Number of persons who become homeless for the 1st time

Metric 5.1 – Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, and TH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period.		2426	
Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.		670	
Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time)		1756	

Metric 5.2 – Change in the number of persons entering ES, SH, TH, and PH projects with no prior enrollments in HMIS

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH, TH or PH during the reporting period.		3471	
Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year.		967	
Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.)		2504	

Measure 6: Homeless Prevention and Housing Placement of Persons defined by category 3 of HUD’s Homeless Definition in CoC Program-funded Projects

This Measure is not applicable to CoCs in 2016.

Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Measure 7: Successful Placement from Street Outreach and Successful Placement in or Retention of Permanent Housing

Metric 7a.1 – Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Persons who exit Street Outreach		325	
Of persons above, those who exited to temporary & some institutional destinations		30	
Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations		76	
% Successful exits		33%	

Metric 7b.1 – Change in exits to permanent housing destinations

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Persons in ES, SH, TH and PH-RRH who exited		2445	
Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations		1185	
% Successful exits		48%	

Metric 7b.2 – Change in exit to or retention of permanent housing

	Previous FY	Current FY	Difference
Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH		1567	
Of persons above, those who remained in applicable PH projects and those who exited to permanent housing destinations		1494	
% Successful exits/retention		95%	