





**Office of Homeless Services**

303 E. Vanderbilt Way • San Bernardino, CA 92415

Phone: (909)386-8297 • Fax: (909)890-0868

Email: [homelessrfp@hss.sbcounty.gov](mailto:homelessrfp@hss.sbcounty.gov) • Website: <http://www.sbcounty.gov/dbh/sbchp/>

**Next ICH Meeting**

**The Chair reserves the right to call Special Meetings of the Interagency Council on Homelessness as needed.**

The next regularly scheduled Interagency Council on Homelessness meeting is scheduled for:

**January 23, 2019**

**9:00 am – 11:00 am**

**County of San Bernardino Health Services (CSBHS) Building**

**850 E. Foothill Blvd., CSBHS Auditorium**

**Rialto, CA 92376**

*Mission Statement*

*The mission of the San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership is to provide a system of care that is inclusive, well planned, coordinated and evaluated and is accessible to all who are homeless and those at-risk of becoming homeless.*

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership



**Interagency Council on Homelessness**  
Administrative Office  
303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
Office: (909) 386-8297

**FROM:** Tom Hernandez, Chief of Homeless Services

**SUBJECT:** Selection process of Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) members to review and approve the grant review committee’s recommendations for Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) funding.

**DATE:** November 28, 2018

## RECOMMENDATION

Approve the selection process and select the 15 ICH members who will serve as the quorum to review and approve the Grant Review Committee’s recommendations for HEAP funding.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On October 24, 2018, the Office of Homeless Services (OHS) presented to the ICH a recommendation to approve the appointment of five (5) ICH members to serve on the Grant Review Committee specifically for the review and recommendation of awards through the HEAP funding and the appointment of two (2) alternates.

The ICH currently has 40 membership positions in accordance with the By-Laws. Due to potential conflicts of interest as a result of the specific requirements of the HEAP funding, the OHS recommended seven (7) ICH members with no conflicts to serve as the Grant Review Committee. One of the selected appointments recused herself due to a perceived conflict, leaving six (6) GRC members left on the Committee.

In accordance with the Bylaws of ICH, a quorum consists of “One half of the Members in good standing, plus one, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The affirmative votes of at least a majority of the Members constituting a quorum at a duly scheduled meeting shall be required to take any action. A member in good standing is a Member of the ICH who has met membership and attendance requirements.”

In order to transact business, a minimum of 21 members must be able to vote to take any recommendation and/or action on behalf of the ICH. Since there are only 6 members that do not have a conflict, fifteen (15) members will still be needed as voting members to make a quorum, despite potential conflicts.

The quorum will evaluate the subcommittee’s recommendations before it makes a final determination of the applications/projects to be included in the Collaboration Application to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

### **Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness**

- |   |   |                              |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| Members of the Board of Supervisors                   | City of Barstow                             | City of Colton               |
| City of Hesperia                                      | City of Montclair                           | City of Ontario              |
| City of Rancho Cucamonga                              | City of Redlands                            | City of San Bernardino       |
| Town of Yucca Valley                                  | City of Upland                              | Department of Probation      |
| San Bernardino County Human Services                  | Department of Behavioral Health             | Department of Rehabilitation |
| Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County | Veteran Administration Loma Linda           | Chaffey Community College    |
| Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino     | Workforce Development Department            | 211 United Way               |
| San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools       | Members of the Homeless Provider Network    | Sheriff’s Department         |
| Community Development and Housing Agency              | California State University, San Bernardino | General Members-At-Large     |

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership

## Interagency Council on Homelessness

Administrative Office  
303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
Office: (909) 386-8297



Therefore, OHS recommends the following procedure in selecting 15 members to complete the quorum:

According to Government Code Section 87100 and the California Attorney General's Office Guide to Conflicts of Interest public officials at any level of state or local government are prohibited from making, participating in making or in any way attempting to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she knows or has reason to know he or she has a financial interest. (Gov't Code § 87100.) However, there are certain limited circumstances in which disqualified board or committee members may participate under a legal exception known as the Rule of Necessity, which provides, in pertinent part, that "Section 87100 does not prevent any public official from making or participating in the making of a governmental decision to the extent his participation is legally required for the action or decision to be made." (Gov't Code § 87101.)

The Fair Political Practices Commission has adopted regulations specifying the procedure to be followed to invoke the Rule of Necessity. Each member of the board or committee that has a financial interest in the governmental decision must recuse themselves from participation and may accompany the determination to recuse with an oral or written disclosure of the financial interest. (2 C.C.R. § 18707(b)(1).) (Emphasis added.) If, upon recusal by all members with a financial interest in the governmental decision to be considered, there are an insufficient number of members without a financial interest in the decision to constitute a quorum, the Rule of Necessity may be invoked.

Participation by the smallest number of officials with a conflict that are "legally required" in order for the decision to be made shall be reinstated by lot or some other impartial method. (Hudson opinion, 4 FPPC Ops. 13 (1978), 2 C.C.R. § 18708(c)(3).) The best random method of selecting which disqualified member should participate is by lot, although other impartial, equitable means of random selection may be used. (78 Ops. Atty. Gen. 332.) Whatever method is used, all disqualified officials must participate in the random selection and all must have an equal likelihood of being chosen. (Heisinger Advice Letter, No. A-95-333.)

The procedure for drawing lots is as follows:

- An officiant is selected, provided that a disqualified board/committee member may not serve as the officiant.
- The officiant takes a number of lots (or similarly long objects) equal in number to the number of disqualified board/committee members and ensures that the requisite number of them are physically shorter than the others or are marked with a distinguishing mark. The officiant then grabs all of the lots in her/his fist, such that all of them appear to be of the same length or such that the distinguishing marks are hidden from view, as the case may be.

### Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness

Members of the Board of Supervisors

City of Hesperia

City of Rancho Cucamonga

Town of Yucca Valley

San Bernardino County Human Services

Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

Community Development and Housing Agency

City of Barstow

City of Montclair

City of Redlands

City of Upland

Department of Behavioral Health

Veteran Administration Loma Linda

Workforce Development Department

Members of the Homeless Provider Network

California State University, San Bernardino

City of Colton

City of Ontario

City of San Bernardino

Department of Probation

Department of Rehabilitation

Chaffey Community College

211 United Way

Sheriff's Department

General Members-At-Large

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership



## Interagency Council on Homelessness

Administrative Office  
303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
Office: (909) 386-8297

- The officiant then offers the clenched fist to the group. Each member of the disqualified group draws a lot from the fist of the officiant. At the end of the offering, the group members who have drawn the short lots or the lots containing the distinguishing marks, as the case may be, are the members that will be added to the non-conflicted members to constitute a quorum of the board/committee and that are “legally required” for the action or decision to be made.”

OHS recommends the Grant Review Committee Chair to serve as the officiant for the drawing of lots.

### Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness

Members of the Board of Supervisors

City of Hesperia

City of Rancho Cucamonga

Town of Yucca Valley

San Bernardino County Human Services

Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

Community Development and Housing Agency

City of Barstow

City of Montclair

City of Redlands

City of Upland

Department of Behavioral Health

Veteran Administration Loma Linda

Workforce Development Department

Members of the Homeless Provider Network

California State University, San Bernardino

City of Colton

City of Ontario

City of San Bernardino

Department of Probation

Department of Rehabilitation

Chaffey Community College

211 United Way

Sheriff's Department

General Members-At-Large

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership

**Interagency Council on Homelessness**  
 Administrative Office  
 303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
 Office: (909) 386-8297



FROM: Tom Hernandez, Chief of Homeless Services

SUBJECT: Receive and consider the Grant Review Committee's recommendation of the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) funding awards, consider any appeals by applicants whose applications were rejected and not reviewed by the Grant Review Committee (GRC), and receive the Office of Homeless Services (OHS) Summary.

DATE: November 28, 2018

## RECOMMENDATION

Receive and consider the GRC's recommendation of the HEAP funding awards, consider any appeals by applicants whose applications were rejected and not reviewed by the GRC, and receive the OHS Summary.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On September 19, 2018, the San Bernardino County Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) adopted the recommendations from the Office of Homeless Services (OHS) for the State of California Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) local funding priorities (Item #7).

The recommendations were as follows and to include:

The States' guidance for HEAP proposed activities to be directly related to providing **immediate** emergency assistance to people experiencing homelessness or at imminent risk of homelessness, and that those uses are aligned with California's Housing First policy. Eligible uses included, but were not limited to:

- Services: Street outreach, health and safety education, criminal justice diversion programs, prevention services, navigation services, and operating support for short-term or comprehensive homeless services.
- Rental assistance or subsidies: Housing vouchers, rapid re-housing programs, and eviction prevention strategies.
- Capital improvements: Emergency shelter, transitional housing, drop-in centers, permanent supportive housing, small/tiny houses, and improvements to current structures that serve homeless individuals and families. Some communities are discussing solutions to address homelessness and the public health crisis by using funds for handwashing stations or public toilet and shower facilities.

### Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness

Members of the Board of Supervisors  
 City of Hesperia  
 City of Rancho Cucamonga  
 Town of Yucca Valley  
 San Bernardino County Human Services  
 Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County  
 Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino  
 San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools  
 Community Development and Housing Agency

City of Barstow  
 City of Montclair  
 City of Redlands  
 City of Upland  
 Department of Behavioral Health  
 Veteran Administration Loma Linda  
 Workforce Development Department  
 Members of the Homeless Provider Network  
 California State University, San Bernardino

City of Colton  
 City of Ontario  
 City of San Bernardino  
 Department of Probation  
 Department of Rehabilitation  
 Chaffey Community College  
 211 United Way  
 Sheriff's Department  
 General Members-At-Large

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership

## Interagency Council on Homelessness

Administrative Office  
303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
Office: (909) 386-8297



The following tenets as documented during brainstorming sessions with members of the Homeless Provider Network (HPN), ICH, several cities, and County departments to establish local funding priorities for the HEAP funding were adopted:

Guiding Principles: Immediately resolves homelessness; focus is on long-term results; encouraged to leverage resources; and be innovative.

Criteria: Proposals further countywide efforts to address homelessness; agencies must have the readiness capacity to immediately perform and administer homeless efforts through this funding; must supplement programs, not supplant; if wanting to maintain the project longer than the funding period, it must be sustainable; and must be results oriented in conjunction with State data reporting requirements.

Priorities: System improving; immediate efforts that support the long-term goal of housing permanency; holistic; provide client stability, and promotes cross jurisdictional collaboration.

### Needs (\* denotes input from more than one brainstorming session):

- Bridge Housing/Hotel-Motel Vouchers\*
- Case Management/Wrap Around Services\*
- CES Expansion/Software Integration (including hospital collaboration)\*
- Child Care Support
- Connection with Service Animals
- Diversion Activities (including Reunification)\*
- Document Readiness\*
- Education for Homeless Youth
- Family Mediation
- Flexible Subsidy Funding\*
- Furniture
- Homeless Advocacy
- Homeless Prevention/Eviction Services\*
- Hospital Discharge Strategies
- Landlord Incentives
- Low Barrier Emergency Shelter (including Extreme Weather)\*
- Portable Showers
- Rapid Re-Housing\*
- Recuperative Care\*
- Re-Entry Services
- Re-Purpose City/County Facilities
- Security Deposits\*
- Seed Money for Master Leases
- Shared Housing
- Street Outreach\*
- Transportation

To seek proposals that:

- Encourage a minimum application request of \$100,000 per application
- Encourage a minimum youth proposal of \$470,000 (region-wide service area)
- Are aligned with California's and the CoC's Housing First policy
- Ask cities, county, and provider proposals to prioritize programs and projects

### Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness

Members of the Board of Supervisors  
City of Hesperia  
City of Rancho Cucamonga  
Town of Yucca Valley  
San Bernardino County Human Services  
Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County  
Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools  
Community Development and Housing Agency

City of Barstow  
City of Montclair  
City of Redlands  
City of Upland  
Department of Behavioral Health  
Veteran Administration Loma Linda  
Workforce Development Department  
Members of the Homeless Provider Network  
California State University, San Bernardino

City of Colton  
City of Ontario  
City of San Bernardino  
Department of Probation  
Department of Rehabilitation  
Chaffey Community College  
211 United Way  
Sheriff's Department  
General Members-At-Large

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership

## Interagency Council on Homelessness

Administrative Office  
303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
Office: (909) 386-8297



- Encourage multijurisdictional collaboration (to include bonus points in scoring mechanism for regions that collaborate)
- Require provider proposals to obtain a letter of support from a city or the county that has declared an emergency shelter crisis
- Allow the grant review committee to be reorganized (in consultation with Counsel relative to conflict of interest), to score, rank, and prioritize funding for each application received through the CoC (the number of projects selected for submission will be dependent upon the funding requested and approved by the CoC for each project)
  - Prioritization of all funding request to allow for CoC to quickly apply for round 2 of HEAP funds
- Authorize OHS as the Collaborative Applicant to retain five percent of the allocation to administer funding and ensure reporting requirements as set by the State of California Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency

On October 24, 2018, the ICH approved the appointment of five (5) ICH members and two (2) alternates to serve as members of the Grant Review Standing Committee (Item #3). The following members were appointed:

- Dr. Eric Bishop, Chaffey Community College
- Edwin Broadnax, Veterans Administration Loma Linda Medical Center
- Dr. Nicole Henley, California State University, San Bernardino
- Barbara Murphy, Kaiser Permanente Fontana
- Julie Reay, Home Aid Inland Empire

### Alternates:

- Julie Bjork, City of Ontario
- Connie Boring, State Department of Rehabilitation

Ms. Bjork was recused due to a potential conflict. Lorena Corona, the alternate designee for Dr. Bishop at Chaffey Community College served in his stead, and Alfonso Jimenez, the alternate designee for Ms. Boring at the State Department of Rehabilitation served in her stead.

On October 31, 2018, the Grant Review Committee met to approve the timeline for the HEAP application review process (Item #3) and to approve the 2018 San Bernardino County Continuum of Care HEAP Scoring Guidelines and Rubric (Item #4).

See attached Scoring Guidelines and Scoring Rubric (Item #2a)

### Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness

#### Members of the Board of Supervisors

City of Hesperia  
City of Rancho Cucamonga  
Town of Yucca Valley  
San Bernardino County Human Services  
Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County  
Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino  
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools  
Community Development and Housing Agency

City of Barstow  
City of Montclair  
City of Redlands  
City of Upland  
Department of Behavioral Health  
Veteran Administration Loma Linda  
Workforce Development Department  
Members of the Homeless Provider Network  
California State University, San Bernardino

City of Colton  
City of Ontario  
City of San Bernardino  
Department of Probation  
Department of Rehabilitation  
Chaffey Community College  
211 United Way  
Sheriff's Department  
General Members-At-Large

# San Bernardino County Homeless Partnership

**Interagency Council on Homelessness**  
 Administrative Office  
 303 E. Vanderbilt Way, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0026  
 Office: (909) 386-8297



On November 8 and 9, 2018, the Grant Review Committee met to review and score the HEAP applications, and to rank and assign dollar amounts to HEAP applications that are to be recommended for funding by the full ICH.

See the following attached lists:

Total applications received (Item #2b)

List of applications scored (Item #2c)

List of prioritized applications, order of announcement, and dollar amount assigned (Item #2d)

The OHS would like to thank the Grant Review Committee members for their commendable service in reviewing the large number of applications received, the time dedicated to this immense task, and for their commitment in ensuring that all applications were given open-minded deliberation.

The following is a summary from OHS for consideration:

1. The amount that the Grant Review Committee recommended for award is over the maximum award provided to the Continuum of Care. The total amount recommended was **\$11,497,897.00**. The total amount available is **\$8,450,171.30** with 5% set aside for youth proposals in the amount of **\$470,000**. The amount recommended for funding exceeds the amount available by **\$2,577,725.70**. The Grant Review Committee recommended more funding than what was available in the event that projects drop out, however the direction for reassessment of funding was not provided.
2. Some of the projects that received high(er) scores were not recommended for funding.
3. Some of the projects that were recommended for funding received partial allocation well below the requested amounts.
4. Some of the placed-based projects that were recommended for funding are located in areas where there is not a shelter crisis declaration resolution on file. The following jurisdictions have resolutions on file: Barstow, Colton, Montclair, Redlands, Rialto, San Bernardino, Upland and the County of San Bernardino.
5. Some of the projects within the applications were not scored because the projects were deemed below the \$100,000 minimum application request.

Before final consideration, the ICH may want to have a discussion with applicants to ensure that they can complete their proposed projects with the amount of funding that has been recommended.

#### Members of the Interagency Council on Homelessness

Members of the Board of Supervisors

City of Hesperia

City of Rancho Cucamonga

Town of Yucca Valley

San Bernardino County Human Services

Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County

Housing Authority of the County of San Bernardino

San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

Community Development and Housing Agency

City of Barstow

City of Montclair

City of Redlands

City of Upland

Department of Behavioral Health

Veteran Administration Loma Linda

Workforce Development Department

Members of the Homeless Provider Network

California State University, San Bernardino

City of Colton

City of Ontario

City of San Bernardino

Department of Probation

Department of Rehabilitation

Chaffey Community College

211 United Way

Sheriff's Department

General Members-At-Large

### San Bernardino County Continuum of Care 2018-HEAP Project Scoring Guideline

The Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) received projects will be reviewed by the San Bernardino County Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) Grant Review Committee. All projects will be reviewed and scored by the ICH Grant Review Committee for recommendation to the full Council based on the following:

- The extent to which the proposed project meets the CoC's HEAP Project Eligibility threshold.
- The extent to which the proposed project addresses the eligible population: persons who are literally homeless or imminent risk of homelessness.
- The extent to which the proposed project furthers the countywide efforts to address homelessness.
- The applicant's ability to immediately resolve an individual or family's housing crisis.
- The applicant's readiness to immediately perform and administer the proposed homeless efforts through this funding source.
- The extent to which the proposed project supplements and does not supplant current programs.
- The extent to which the proposed project is oriented with State of California, Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency data reporting requirements.
- Requirements as noted in the HEAP Request for Applications (RFA) and HEAP Application Form <http://wp.sbcounty.gov/dbh/sbchp/coc-heap/>.

#### A. Housing First Emphasis (25 points)

- The extent to which applicant conforms to California and the CoC's Housing First policy.
- Housing Emphasis-The extent to which applicant is a Housing First organization. Housing First practices include rapid placement and stabilization for housing permanency and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions.

#### B. Project Focus (25 points)

- The extent to which the project is for eligible services.
- The extent to which the project improves the current homeless services system.
- The applicant's ability to focus on long-term sustainable results, if wanting to maintain the project past the funding period.
- The extent to which the project addresses the fundamental underlying issues of homelessness rather than only addressing its symptoms.
- The extent to which measurable outcomes will be tracked and reported.

#### C. Experience and Capacity (25 points)

- The jurisdiction's and/or agency's experience, capacity, and innovation in providing services to the public, the quality of outreach/programs/services it provides, and the experience level of key staff.
- The applicant's ability to adequately describe the target population and address the requirements set out in the CoC HEAP RFA.

#### D. Budget Detail (10 points)

- The applicant's proposed budget costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.
- Fifty percent of project funds will be obligated by 12/31/19.
- One hundred percent of project funds will be expended by 5/30/21.

#### E. Collaboration (15 points)

- The applicant's ability to collaborate with other agencies and/or municipalities.

#### F. Bonus Points (5 points)

- The applicant demonstrates multijurisdictional collaboration.

Name of Agency Project:

--

Reviewer Number:

--

Applications received for the Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) will be reviewed by the San Bernardino County Interagency Council on Homelessness (ICH) Grant Review Committee. All proposed projects will be reviewed and scored by the ICH Grant Review Committee for recommendation to the full Council based on the following:

- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project meets the CoC's HEAP Project Eligibility threshold.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project addresses the eligible population: persons who are literally homeless or imminent risk of homelessness.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project furthers the countywide efforts to address homelessness.
- ✓ The applicant's ability to immediately resolve an individual or family's housing crisis.
- ✓ The applicant's readiness to immediately perform and administer the proposed homeless efforts through this funding source.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project supplements and does not supplant current programs.
- ✓ The extent to which the proposed project is oriented with State of California, Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency data reporting requirements.
- ✓ Requirements as noted in the HEAP Request for Applications (RFA) and HEAP Application Form
- ✓ <http://wp.sbcounty.gov/dbh/sbchp/coc-heap/>.

**A. Housing First Emphasis (25 points)**

(15 pts [15 Excellent] [10-14 Good] [5-9 Fair] [1-4 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])

- Excellent: Housing First emphasis is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the Housing First model. Description is clearly based on the tenets of the Housing First model.
- Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the Housing First emphasis.
- Fair: Housing First emphasis is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will ensure Housing First services.
- Poor: Housing First emphasis is vague and poorly described. Housing First emphasis appears to have been an afterthought.
- Unacceptable: Housing First emphasis is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of applying the tenets of the Housing First model.

California’s Housing First Legislation: In 2016, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 1380 (Mitchell). It required all housing programs to adopt the Housing First model<sup>1</sup>. The Legislation defined Housing First as:

- Tenant screening and selection practices promote accepting applicants regardless of their sobriety or use of substances, completion of treatment, or participation in services.
- Applicants are not rejected on the basis of poor credit or financial history, poor or lack of rental history, criminal convictions unrelated to tenancy, or behaviors that indicate a lack of "housing readiness."
- Housing providers accept referrals directly from shelters, street outreach, drop-in centers, and other parts of crisis response systems frequented by vulnerable people experiencing homelessness.
- Supportive services emphasize engagement and problem solving over therapeutic goals and service plans that are highly tenant-driven without predetermined goals.
- Participation in services or program compliance is not a condition of housing tenancy.
- Tenants have a lease and all the rights and responsibilities of tenancy.
- The use of alcohol or drugs in and of itself, without other lease violations, is not a reason for eviction.
- Funding promotes tenant selection plans for supportive housing that prioritize eligible tenants based on criteria other than "first-come-first-serve," including, but not limited to, the duration or chronicity of homelessness, vulnerability to early mortality, or high utilization of crisis services.
- Case managers and service coordinators are trained in and actively employ evidence-based practices for engagement, including motivational interviewing and client-centered counseling.
- Services are informed by a harm-reduction philosophy that recognizes drug and alcohol use and addiction as a part of tenants' lives, where tenants are engaged in nonjudgmental communication regarding drug and alcohol use, and where tenants are offered education regarding how to avoid risky behaviors and engage in safer practices, as well as connected to evidence-based treatment if the tenant so chooses.
- The project and specific apartment may include special physical features that accommodate disabilities, reduce harm, and promote health and community and independence among tenants.

<sup>1</sup>Codified as California Welfare & Institutions Code § 8255.

**Points**

<input type="checkbox"/> The extent to which applicant conforms to California and the CoC’s Housing First policy.	<b>15 points</b>	
<p><b>(10 pts [10 Excellent] [7-9 Good] [4-7 Fair] [1-3 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])</b></p> <p>Excellent: Housing First practices are thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as housing preconditions. Description is clearly based on the tenets of the Housing First model.</p> <p>Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the Housing First practices.</p> <p>Fair: Housing First practices are stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will ensure Housing First practices.</p> <p>Poor: Housing First practices are vague and poorly described. The practice of Housing First appears to have been an afterthought.</p> <p>Unacceptable: Housing First practices are not stated. The description does not have any evidence of applying the tenets of the Housing First model.</p>		
		<b>Points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing First practices include rapid placement and stabilization for housing permanency and does not have service participation requirements or preconditions.	<b>10 points</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		<b>Total</b>

<b>B. Project Focus (25 points)</b>		
<p><b>(5 pts [5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])</b></p> <p>Excellent: Project focus is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the purpose of the program. Description indicates a well-planned project focus.</p> <p>Good: Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the project focus.</p> <p>Fair: Project focus is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will be providing services through this funding.</p> <p>Poor: Project focus is vague and poorly described. Description of the project appears to have been an afterthought.</p> <p>Unacceptable: Project focus is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear project intent.</p>		
		<b>Points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> The extent to which the project is for eligible services.	<b>5 points</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The extent to which the project improves the current homeless services system.	<b>5 points</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The applicant’s ability to focus on long-term sustainable results.	<b>5 points</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The extent to which the project addresses the fundamental underlying issues of homelessness rather than only addressing its symptoms.	<b>5 points</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The extent to which measurable outcomes will be tracked and reported.	<b>5 points</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		<b>Total</b>

--	--

<b>C. Experience and Capacity (25 points)</b>		
<b>(5 pts [5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])</b>		
Excellent:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the organization’s ability to administer the program.	
Good:	Similar to above, but could provide more detail about the organization’s experience/capacity/innovation.	
Fair:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding the organization’s ability to administer the program.	
Poor:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is vague and poorly described.	
Unacceptable:	Project experience/capacity/innovation is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear experience/capacity/innovation in administering the program.	
		<b>Points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The jurisdiction’s and/or agency’s experience in providing services to the public.	<b>5 points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The jurisdiction’s and/or agency’s capacity in providing services to the public.	<b>5 points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The jurisdiction’s and/or agency’s innovation in providing services to the public.	<b>5 points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The applicant’s experience level of key staff.	<b>5 points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The applicant's ability to adequately describe the target population and address the requirements set out in the CoC HEAP RFA.	<b>5 points</b>
<b>Comments:</b>	<b>Total</b>	

<b>D. Budget Detail (10 points)</b>		
<b>(5 pts [5 Excellent] [3-4 Good] [2 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])</b>		
Excellent:	Project budget is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to extent of expenditures. Description indicates a well-planned budget.	
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the budget costs.	
Fair:	Project budget is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will expend the funding.	
Poor:	Project budget is vague and poorly described. Budget appears to have been an afterthought.	
Unacceptable:	Project budget is not stated. The description of the budget costs unrealistic.	
		<b>Points</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	The applicant’s proposed budget costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project.	<b>5 points</b>
<b>(2.5 pts [2.5 Excellent] [2 Good] [1.5 Fair] [1 Poor] [0 unacceptable])</b>		
Excellent:	Project funding obligation is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to the date of expenditures.	
Good:	Similar to above, but could provide more detail about the funding obligation.	
Fair:	Project funding obligation is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will obligate the funds.	
Poor:	Project funding obligation is vague and poorly described.	
Unacceptable:	Project funding obligation is not stated.	

		Points
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fifty percent of project funds will be obligated by 12/31/19.	2.5 points
<input type="checkbox"/>	One hundred percent of project funds will be expended by 5/30/21.	2.5 points
<b>Comments:</b>		<b>Total</b>

<b>E. Collaboration (15 points)</b>		
(15 pts [15 Excellent] [10-14 Good] [5-9 Fair] [1-4 Poor] [0 Unacceptable])		
Excellent:	Project collaboration is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to extent of collaborative partners. Description indicates a well-planned collaborative project.	
Good:	Similar to above, but description could provide more detail about the project collaboration and partners.	
Fair:	Project collaboration is stated, but description limited, leaving some questions regarding how the agency will collaborate with its partners.	
Poor:	Project collaboration is vague and poorly described. Collaboration appears to have been an afterthought.	
Unacceptable:	Project collaboration is not stated. The description does not have any evidence of clear collaboration with other agencies or municipalities.	
		Points
<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant’s evidence of its ability to collaborate with other agencies and/or municipalities.	15 points
<b>Comments:</b>		<b>Total</b>

<b>F. Bonus (5 points)</b>		Points
<input type="checkbox"/>	• Only to applicants that demonstrate multijurisdictional collaboration.	5 points

**Total Points Awarded** \_\_\_\_\_

# RFA OHS - HEAP #18-01

## Applications Received

Agency	Emailed	Hard copy	Complete	Incomplete	Proj #1 Amount	Proj #2 Amount	Proj #3 Amount	Proj #4 Amount	Proj #5 Amount	Proj #6 Amount	Proj #7 Amount
Avector Inc.	X			X							
Cathedral of Praise International Ministries	X	X		X	\$951,160						
Catholic Charities	X	X	X		\$668,084						
Citadel Community Development	X			X							
City of Barstow	X	X	X		\$3,740,730	\$940,730	\$283,620				
City of Colton	X	X		X	\$611,189						
City of Montclair	X	X	X		\$234,000	\$493,019					
City of Redlands	X	X	X		\$1,155,953						
City of Rialto	X	X		X	\$1,248,804						
City of Upland	X	X		X	\$127,825	\$550,000	\$66,800	\$15,000	\$180,000		
Clay Counseling Foundation	X	X		X	\$604,200						
Community Action Partnership	X	X		X	\$550,000	\$425,000					

County of San Bernardino	X	X	X		\$2,240,396	\$1,077,700	\$200,000	\$222,550	\$2,676,089	\$1,782,805	\$2,559,719
Desert Haven Victorville	X	X	X		\$2,222,250						
Desert Manna	X	X	X		\$338,288	\$437,640					
Family and Kids foundation	X			X							
Family Assistance Program	X	X		X	\$110,528	\$70,000	\$525,600	\$65,000			
High Desert Homeless Services	X	X	X		\$105,480						
House of Hope	X	X	X		\$319,698						
Housing Authority	X	X	X		\$100,000	\$100,000					
Inland Empire United Way	X			X							
Inland Valley Hope Partners	X	X	X		\$192,934	\$114,236					
Keys	X	X	X		\$1,200,000						
Kingdom Culture Community Development		X		X	\$500,000						
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	X	X	X		\$150,000	\$150,000					
Mental Health Systems	X	X	X		\$520,160	\$718,771					
Mercy House	X	X	X		\$399,574	\$200,214	\$137,340				
Morongo Basin ARCH	X	X		X	\$171,000	\$213,000	\$14,400				
Morongo Unified School District	X	X		X	\$260,000						

New Generation for Jesus Christ	X	X		X	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$200,000				
Permanent Supportive Housing Foundation	X	X		X	\$1,238,760						
SAC Health System	X	X		X	\$278,978						
San Bernardino County Fire District	X	X		X	\$530,454						
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Dept	X	X		X	\$1,630,712						
San Bernardino Valley College		X		X	\$773,165						
Social Science Services, Inc. dba Cedar House	X	X	X		\$250,000	\$150,000					
St Mary Medical Center	X	X	X		\$250,368						
Step Up on Second, Inc.	X	X	X		\$599,500	\$364,005	\$393,600	\$104,400	\$865,000		
The Chance Project / SBC Pathways to Housing Network	X	X	X		\$1,400,000						
The Salvation Army	X	X	X		\$938,622	\$309,039	\$572,103	\$981,100			
US Vets	X	X	X		\$3,031,446						
Victor Valley Family Resource Center	X	X	X		\$757,600						
Water of Life Community Church	X	X	X		\$371,096	\$202,808					

## List of Applications Scored

Agency	Proj #1 Amount	Proj #2 Amount	Proj #3 Amount	Proj #4 Amount	Proj #5 Amount	Proj #6 Amount	Proj #7 Amount	Grand Total	Alfonso Jimenez	Julie Reay	Dr. Nicole Henley	Lorena Corona	Edwin Broadnax	Barbara Murphy	Average Score
County of San Bernardino	\$2,240,396							\$2,240,396	103.0	92.0	98.0	69.0	102.0	90.0	92.3
County of San Bernardino		\$1,077,700						\$1,077,700	72.0	97.0	102.0	90.0	103.0	94.0	93.0
County of San Bernardino			\$200,000					\$200,000	91.0	98.0	100.0	89.0	95.0	89.0	93.7
County of San Bernardino				\$222,550				\$222,550	77.0	103.0	101.0	95.0	96.0	89.0	93.5
County of San Bernardino					\$2,676,089			\$2,676,089	74.0	90.0	102.0	77.0	89.0	90.0	87.0
County of San Bernardino						\$1,782,805		\$1,782,805	81.0	95.0	102.0	86.0	98.0	88.0	91.7
County of San Bernardino							\$2,559,719	\$2,559,719	78.0	92.0	99.0	90.0	99.0	92.0	91.7
Step Up on Second, Inc.	\$599,500							\$599,500	74.0	94.0	97.0	76.0	97.0	88.0	87.7
Step Up on Second, Inc.		\$364,005						\$364,005	70.0	86.0	92.0	74.0	95.0	80.0	82.8
Step Up on Second, Inc.			\$393,600					\$393,600	73.0	99.0	94.0	80.0	92.0	86.0	87.3
Step Up on Second, Inc.				\$104,400				\$104,400	66.0	96.0	97.0	80.0	102.0	78.0	86.5
Step Up on Second, Inc.					\$865,000			\$865,000	84.0	99.0	100.0	86.0	103.0	90.0	93.7
High Desert Homeless Services	\$105,480							\$105,480	71.0	98.0	91.0	101.0	97.0	91.0	91.5
Social Science Services, Inc. dba Cedar House	\$250,000							\$250,000	71.0	93.0	101.0	60.0	91.0	80.0	82.7
Social Science Services, Inc. dba Cedar House		\$150,000						\$150,000	89.0	65.0	87.0	79.0	83.0	87.0	81.7
Housing Authority	\$100,000							\$100,000	73.0	62.0	87.0	25.0	103.0	78.0	71.3
Housing Authority		\$100,000						\$100,000	73.0	62.0	89.0	31.0	99.0	79.0	72.2
Desert Haven Victorville	\$2,222,250							\$2,222,250	88.0	103.0	99.0	86.0	102.0	92.0	95.0
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	\$150,000							\$150,000	67.0	72.0	88.0	84.0	89.0	80.0	80.0
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino		\$150,000						\$150,000	67.0	76.0	90.0	86.0	97.0	82.0	83.0
City of Redlands	\$1,155,953							\$1,155,953	65.0	100.0	98.0	95.0	96.0	88.0	90.3
The Chance Project / SBC Pathways to Housing Network	\$1,400,000							\$1,400,000	78.0	104.0	104.0	80.0	94.0	88.0	91.3
Keys	\$1,200,000							\$1,200,000	78.0	94.0	95.0	102.0	101.0	90.0	93.3
St Mary Medical Center	\$250,368							\$250,368	90.0	105.0	98.0	103.0	103.0	86.0	97.5
City of Barstow	\$3,740,730							\$3,740,730	75.0	96.0	101.0	83.0	86.0	92.0	88.8

City of Barstow		\$940,730						\$940,730	68.0	96.0	102.0	71.0	95.0	78.0	85.0
City of Barstow			\$283,620					\$283,620	63.0	71.0	90.0	53.0	89.0	72.0	73.0
House of Hope	\$319,698							\$319,698	69.0	93.0	92.0	98.0	99.0	88.0	89.8
Desert Manna	\$338,288							\$338,288	81.0	95.0	98.0	105.0	95.0	92.0	94.3
Desert Manna		\$437,640						\$437,640	87.0	95.0	99.0	95.0	95.0	88.0	93.2
The Salvation Army	\$938,622							\$938,622	79.0	100.0	98.0	99.0	103.0	89.0	94.7
The Salvation Army		\$309,039						\$309,039	67.0	92.0	95.0	79.0	96.0	88.0	86.2
The Salvation Army			\$572,103					\$572,103	69.0	95.0	93.0	81.0	103.0	82.0	87.2
The Salvation Army				\$981,100				\$981,100	75.0	100.0	96.0	85.0	98.0	88.0	90.3
US Vets	\$3,031,446							\$3,031,446	87.0	98.0	101.0	101.0	99.0	90.0	96.0
Victor Valley Family Resource Center	\$757,600							\$757,600	84.0	97.0	102.0	100.0	100.0	92.0	95.8
Catholic Charities	\$668,084							\$668,084	86.0	97.0	101.0	99.0	99.0	88.0	95.0
Inland Valley Hope Partners	\$192,934							\$192,934	83.0	97.0	99.0	85.0	97.0	91.0	92.0
Inland Valley Hope Partners		\$114,236						\$114,236	74.0	97.0	99.0	80.0	97.0	93.0	90.0
Mercy House	\$399,574							\$399,574	87.0	102.0	99.0	105.0	103.0	92.0	98.0
Mercy House		\$200,214						\$200,214	86.0	102.0	96.0	80.0	103.0	89.0	92.7
Mercy House			\$137,340					\$137,340	80.0	97.0	93.0	90.0	100.0	90.0	91.7
Water of Life Community Church	\$371,096							\$371,096	81.0	102.0	98.0	105.0	98.0	88.0	95.3
Water of Life Community Church		\$202,808						\$202,808	73.0	102.0	94.0	105.0	98.0	86.0	93.0
Mental Health Systems	\$520,160							\$520,160	87.0	102.0	98.0	80.0	104.0	91.0	93.7
Mental Health Systems		\$718,771						\$718,771	77.0	101.0	96.0	83.0	104.0	89.0	91.7
City of Montclair	\$234,000							\$234,000	84.0	102.0	93.0	85.0	97.0	88.0	91.5
City of Montclair		\$493,019						\$493,019	88.0	102.0	94.0	90.0	100.0	90.0	94.0
City of Upland	\$127,825							\$127,825	69.0	98.0	90.0	80.0	98.0	88.0	87.2
City of Upland		\$550,000						\$550,000	70.0	93.0	93.0	85.0	98.0	90.0	88.2
City of Upland			\$66,800					\$66,800	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
City of Upland				\$15,000				\$15,000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

City of Upland					\$180,000			\$180,000	51.0	48.0	80.0	90.0	96.0	78.0	<b>73.8</b>
Family Assistance Program	\$110,528							\$110,528	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Family Assistance Program		\$70,000						\$70,000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Family Assistance Program			\$525,600					\$525,600	83.0	97.0	95.0	80.0	101.0	89.0	<b>90.8</b>
Family Assistance Program				\$65,000				\$65,000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Cathedral of Praise International Ministries	\$951,160							\$951,160	79.0	100.0	99.0	90.0	101.0	88.0	<b>92.8</b>
City of Colton	\$611,189							\$611,189	86.0	98.0	101.0	95.0	85.0	88.0	<b>92.2</b>
City of Rialto	\$1,248,804							\$1,248,804	85.0	90.0	100.0	89.0	101.0	90.0	<b>92.5</b>
San Bernardino County Fire District	\$530,454							\$530,454	87.0	70.0	87.0	88.0	101.0	80.0	<b>85.5</b>
Morongo Basin ARCH	\$171,000							\$171,000	78.0	95.0	90.0	90.0	94.0	90.0	<b>89.5</b>
Morongo Basin ARCH		\$213,000						\$213,000	84.0	95.0	91.0	87.0	95.0	88.0	<b>90.0</b>
Morongo Basin ARCH			\$14,400					\$14,400	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Dept	\$1,630,712							\$1,630,712	84.0	79.0	97.0	81.0	101.0	94.0	<b>89.3</b>
SAC Health System	\$278,978							\$278,978	70.0	76.0	91.0	74.0	86.0	75.0	<b>78.7</b>
Morongo Unified School District	\$260,000							\$260,000	80.0	105.0	99.0	100.0	100.0	92.0	<b>96.0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$27,106,829</b>	<b>\$6,091,162</b>	<b>\$2,193,463</b>	<b>\$1,388,050</b>	<b>\$3,721,089</b>	<b>\$1,782,805</b>	<b>\$2,559,719</b>	<b>\$44,843,117</b>							

## RFA OHS - HEAP #18-01

### Prioritized Applications, Order of Announcement, and Dollar Amount Assigned

Ranking	Agency	Requested Funding	Recommended Round One Funding	Priority/Order of Announcement	
1	93.7	County of San Bernardino Project 3	\$200,000	\$ 200,000.00	1
2	92.5	City of Rialto	\$1,248,804	\$ 600,759.00	2
5	92.2	City of Colton	\$611,189	\$ 400,000.00	3
6	91.5	City of Montclair Project 1	\$234,000	\$ 115,000.00	4
8	90.3	City of Redlands	\$1,155,953	\$ 600,000.00	5
9	88.8	City of Barstow Project 1	\$3,740,730	\$ 376,580.00	6
10	87.2	City of Upland Project 1	\$127,825	\$ 127,825.00	7
11	98.0	Mercy House Project 1	\$399,574	\$ 327,184.00	
12	97.5	St Mary Medical Center	\$250,368	\$ 140,350.00	
13	96.0	US Vets	\$3,031,446	\$ 100,000.00	
14	96.0	Morongo Unified School District	\$260,000	\$ 195,000.00	
15	95.8	Victor Valley Family Resource Center	\$757,600	\$ 150,000.00	
16	95.3	Water of Life Community Church Project 1	\$371,096	\$ 268,000.00	
17	95.0	Desert Haven Victorville	\$2,222,250	\$ 100,000.00	
18	95.0	Catholic Charities	\$668,084	\$ 362,000.00	
19	94.7	The Salvation Army Project 1	\$938,622	\$ 487,000.00	
20	94.3	Desert Manna Project 1	\$338,288	\$ 338,288.00	
21	93.7	Step Up on Second, Inc. Project 5	\$865,000	\$ 720,000.00	
22	93.7	Mental Health Systems Project 1	\$520,160	\$ 520,160.00	
23	93.3	Keys	\$1,200,000	\$ 320,000.00	
24	93.0	County of San Bernardino Project 2	\$1,077,700	\$ 584,500.00	
25	93.0	Water of Life Community Church Project 2	\$202,808	\$ 125,000.00	
26	92.8	Cathedral of Praise International Ministries	\$951,160	\$ 285,030.00	
27	92.7	Mercy House Project 2	\$200,214	\$ 128,000.00	
28	92.0	Inland Valley Hope Partners Project 1	\$192,934	\$ 192,934.00	
29	91.7	Mercy House Project 3	\$137,340	\$ 130,000.00	
30	91.7	Mental Health Systems Project 2	\$718,771	\$ 718,771.00	
31	91.5	High Desert Homeless Services	\$105,480	\$ 105,480.00	

32	91.3	The Chance Project / SBC Pathways to Housing Network	\$1,400,000	\$ 1,400,000.00	
33	90.8	Family Assistance Program Project 3	\$525,600	\$ 525,600.00	
34	90.3	The Salvation Army Project 4	\$981,100	\$ 527,200.00	
35	90.0	Inland Valley Hope Partners Project 2	\$114,236	\$ 114,236.00	
36	90.0	Morongo Basin ARCH Project 2	\$213,000	\$ 213,000.00	
37	94.0	City of Montclair Project 2	\$493,019	\$ -	
38	93.5	County of San Bernardino Project 4	\$222,550	\$ -	
39	93.2	Desert Manna Project 2	\$437,640	\$ -	
40	92.3	County of San Bernardino Project 1	\$2,240,396	\$ -	
41	91.7	County of San Bernardino Project 6	\$1,782,805	\$ -	
42	91.7	County of San Bernardino Project 7	\$2,559,719	\$ -	
43	89.8	House of Hope	\$319,698		
44	89.5	Morongo Basin ARCH Project 1	\$171,000		
45	89.3	San Bernardino County Sheriff's Dept	\$1,630,712		
46	88.2	City of Upland Project 2	\$550,000		
47	87.7	Step Up on Second, Inc. Project 1	\$599,500		
48	87.3	Step Up on Second, Inc. Project 3	\$393,600		
49	87.2	The Salvation Army Project 3	\$572,103		
50	87.0	County of San Bernardino Project 5	\$2,676,089		
51	86.5	Step Up on Second, Inc. Project 4	\$104,400		
52	86.2	The Salvation Army Project 2	\$309,039		
53	85.5	San Bernardino County Fire District	\$530,454		
54	85.0	City of Barstow Project 2	\$940,730		
55	83.0	Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino Project 2	\$150,000		
56	82.8	Step Up on Second, Inc. Project 2	\$364,005		
57	82.7	Social Science Services, Inc. dba Cedar House Project 1	\$250,000		
58	81.7	Social Science Services, Inc. dba Cedar House Project 2	\$150,000		
59	80.0	Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino Project 1	\$150,000		
60	78.7	SAC Health System	\$278,978		
61	73.8	City of Upland Project 5	\$180,000		
62	73.0	City of Barstow Project 3	\$283,620		
63	72.2	Housing Authority Project 2	\$100,000		
64	71.3	Housing Authority Project 1	\$100,000		

65	0.0	City of Upland Project 3	\$66,800		
66	0.0	City of Upland Project 4	\$15,000		
67	0.0	Family Assistance Program Project 1	\$110,528		
68	0.0	Family Assistance Program Project 2	\$70,000		
69	0.0	Family Assistance Program Project 4	\$65,000		
73	0.0	Morongo Basin ARCH Project 3	\$14,400		
		<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$44,843,117</b>	<b>\$ 11,497,897.00</b>	