



Office of the City Manager

ACTION CALENDAR

June 9, 2015

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From:  Christine Daniel, City Manager

Submitted by: Kelly Wallace, Acting Director, Health, Housing & Community Services Department

Subject: Community Agency Funding Recommendations: Homeless Services

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution approving proposed FY2016 funding allocations for homeless services as contained in Attachment 1, Exhibit A, and base the FY2017 funding on the January to June 2016 allocated amounts.

SUMMARY

At the April 28, 2015 Council Worksession, the City Manager presented FY2016 and 2017 funding recommendations for homeless services. The recommendations included funding for a centralized access system for homeless services to support a system-wide change, prioritize literally homeless clients and promote a more streamlined way for clients to access shelter, transitional and permanent housing and other services. This report provides an amended recommendation that creates a six-month transition period from the current system to the new coordinated access system for the first six months of FY2016 during which most current homeless services programs remain funded at their FY2015 level to allow for a continuation of existing services through December 31, 2015. This report also provides further information about the rationale for the funding recommendations, including how applications were evaluated. The new homeless services system would begin in January 2016.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The recommendations in Attachment 1, Exhibit A allocate \$2,919,306 in funding for homeless programs for each of Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017. This amount includes \$2,258,825 in General Fund, \$301,978 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, \$199,179 in Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds, and \$159,324 in Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funds. At its April 28, 2015 meeting, Council approved allocations of CDBG and ESG funds for homeless programs.¹ General Fund and CSBG allocations will be considered as part of the City's budget process.

¹ See http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2015/04_Apr/City_Council_04-28-2015_-_Regular_Meeting_Annotated_Agenda.aspx

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

In December 2014, the city released a Request for Proposals for community agency funding. Forty-two applications were submitted by 16 different agencies for homeless services funding. The Homeless Commission and city staff reviewed proposals during the months of January through March, and each prepared funding recommendations for Council consideration for the April 28, 2015 Council meeting. On April 16, 2015 city officials received a letter protesting the Homeless Commission's application review process. The City Attorney concluded that the most prudent course would be for Council to consider only the City Manager's funding recommendations. City staff presented these recommendations at Council's April 28, 2015 worksession. The recommendations included the creation of a Housing Crisis Resolution Center and a re-design of the homeless service system into a coordinated access system. The funding recommendations were premised upon an immediate shift to the new design beginning July 1, 2015.

Upon further analysis of the timeline and the steps needed to implement the new system, staff has amended its recommendations to include a six-month transition period to operationalize the new system. This timeframe would also put Berkeley's implementation of a coordinated access system more in line with Alameda County's timeframe. These revised funding recommendations include a continuation of existing services for the first six months of Fiscal Year 2016, and a shift to the new system in January 2016. The funding recommendations are contained in Attachment 1, Exhibit A.

BACKGROUND

In 2014, the City of Berkeley undertook a strategic planning process to re-design its approach to addressing homelessness. From June through August, consultants facilitated one consumer focus group and four half-day stakeholder meetings. The participants in the stakeholder meetings reached consensus regarding the need for a more streamlined and efficient system that assesses and matches people to housing resources, with the goal of creating a single front door for access. Stakeholders also agreed that the new system should serve those who are least able to help themselves. Staff presented the results of this work to Council at a worksession on September 30, 2014.² Based on this planning work, the City Manager recommends funding to create a coordinated access system which will streamline access to shelter, transitional and permanent housing, and services for homeless people.

In developing these recommendations, staff understood that the re-design would require substantial changes from the current system and worked to create these changes with the least disruption to homeless service providers and the people accessing their services. The following key principles guide the recommendation:

- Maximize funding for programs and activities that will strengthen the ability of the homeless system to move people to permanent housing;
- Maintain essential basic services for homeless people;

² See http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2014/09_Sep/City_Council_09-30-2014_-_Special_Meeting_Annotated_Agenda.aspx.

- To the extent possible, ensure existing providers maintain current levels of funding in the re-designed system, even if the funding is for a different array of activities;
- Create a phased-in set of changes that will lead to a re-designed system over a period of two years.

A key feature of the new approach is the creation of a single point of entry, the Housing Crisis Resolution Center (HCRC), which will conduct a standardized process of intake, triage, assessment and referral for people who are homeless to ensure that those people with the greatest needs are prioritized for assistance.

City staff reviewed proposals in January and February utilizing standardized evaluation criteria (see Attachment 2) as the basis for their initial recommendations. The evaluation tool assigns 100 possible points for the main body of the application. Applicants for certain types of services were also required to fill out a supplemental questionnaire with varying number of possible points. The scoring results in an overall maximum score of more than 100 points for each type of service in the homeless category. Each application was scored by at least one staff member, and in most cases three. Once the applications were scored, staff applied the key principles above to further refine the recommendations. Staff presented these recommendations to the City Manager in February and March and formed the basis of the recommendations contained in Attachment 1, Exhibit A. City manager draft funding recommendations were presented to the Homeless Commission at their March 11 meeting.

The City Manager recommends:

- Funding the Berkeley Food and Housing Project to operate the HCRC;
- Preserving funding for existing shelter and transitional housing activities;
- Preserving and expanding funding for all existing case management services for clients in the Shelter Plus Care program and adding 38 new case management slots for Shelter Plus Care or Rapid Re-Housing for high needs clients referred through the HCRC;
- Preserving a basic level of funding for meals programs, showers and laundry; and
- Preserving other services, accessed through the HCRC, including drug and alcohol treatment, benefits advocacy, job search assistance, domestic violence services, and expanding representative payee services.

Since Council will not approve final funding recommendations until June 30, 2015 and it is unrealistic to transition to the new service delivery system by July 1, 2015, the City Manager further recommends that Council continue to fund homeless agencies at their current levels for existing services between July 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015. The newly designed system will be up and running and can begin serving clients beginning January 2016.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

There are no identifiable environmental impacts or opportunities associated with the subject of this report.

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Request for Proposals staff released in December 2014 for homeless services was much more directive than in past years and required agencies to submit proposals to provide specific services. The application also required the agency to commit to serving literally homeless clients referred by the HCRC in order to operationalize the system's ability to assess each client's needs and prioritize services to those most in need. A detailed discussion of the rationale for recommendations for each type of homeless service is shown below. Tables in each section show each proposal submitted and indicate the average staff score.

1. Housing Crisis Resolution Center

Creation of the Housing Crisis Resolution Center is the cornerstone of Berkeley's homeless system re-design. On any given day, in the last homeless count, there are 688 homeless people in Berkeley. The HCRC will be the new front door and each and every one of these individuals will access services through the coordinated access system. The HCRC will need to intake each client, assess their need, connect them to the appropriate housing and services, and divert those who are not literally homeless through the provision of low levels of financial assistance and mediation services to prevent them from entering the homeless service system

Two agencies submitted proposals in this category, Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS), and the Berkeley Food and Housing Project (BFHP).

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 138 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
BOSS	Housing Crisis Resolution Center	93	\$0
BFHP	Housing Crisis Resolution Center	102	\$853,606

Though more expensive, staff recommend funding BFHP's proposal. Not only did the proposal score higher than the BOSS proposal, but the BOSS proposal does not adequately address key elements of a well functioning HCRC, which were outlined in the RFP. BOSS' proposal requests funding for 8.8 staff. Their proposal includes less than a single full-time staff person to:

- triage all new clients who phone in or come to the HCRC for service,
- complete assessments for all new clients to determine their appropriate level of care,
- refer non-literally homeless patrons to other services,
- provide diversion services, which include low levels of financial assistance and mediation services to prevent non-literally homeless people from entering the homeless service system.

In their application, BOSS proposes augmenting their capacity to complete intakes by deploying housing navigators, but this approach would still not address the significant understaffing of other critical front door activities. Another example of how the BOSS proposal underfunds certain services is that it neglected to include financial assistance for the diversion component, and financial assistance for rapid re-housing, both critical functions of the HCRC. In the review, staff did not believe that the BOSS proposal adequately staffs important HCRC functions.

The BFHP application requests funding for 17.3 staff and includes three full-time intake and diversion staff and a triage team manager. Staff believes this is a realistic staffing pattern to meet the volume of new clients entering the system the HCRC can expect. The BFHP proposal includes adequate resources for diversion and rapid-rehousing.

2. Emergency Shelter

All existing shelter programs submitted applications for funding. The RFP stipulated that city funding would no longer be provided for case management at homeless shelters, since case management would be provided by the HCRC. Having one case manager assigned to the individual who works with them until their housing crisis is resolved is an important system improvement responsive to the input of homeless clients who have to start over with a new case manager every time they leave a shelter or end up on the street under the current system. Therefore the funding recommendations for the second half of FY2016 are for shelter operating and overhead costs alone. Anticipating the transition period staff recommends, the first half of FY2016 continues current funding levels, which include case management:

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 110 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
BOSS	Ursula Sherman Village Single's Shelter	65	\$101,614
BFHP	Men's Overnight Assistance Center	74	\$165,536
BFHP	Women's Shelter	72	\$116,469
Dorothy Day House	Berkeley Emergency Storm Shelter	78	\$30,101
YEAH!	Winter Shelter for Transition Age Youth	76	\$109,115

One of the key principles staff applied in developing funding recommendations was to preserve funding for Berkeley's existing shelter and transitional housing capacity. Therefore, though applications scored fairly low, staff recommend funding all existing capacity, regardless of score. Shelters have varying rates of successful housing placement which is partially reflected in the scores.

3. Transitional Housing

All currently funded transitional housing programs and one new program submitted applications:

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 112 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
BOSS	Sankofa (Family Transitional Housing)	58	\$26,253
BOSS	Ursula Sherman Village Family Transitional Shelter	67	\$27,706
BOSS	McKinley Transitional House	57	\$0
Women's Daytime Drop-In Center	Bridget Transitional House	78	\$30,777
Fred Finch Youth Center	Turning Point	87	\$86,655
Options Recovery Services	Transitional Housing – Case Management	53	\$39,311
Options Recovery Services	Transitional Housing – Operations – New service	60	\$44,000

Again, staff recommendations are again based on a key principle of preserving funding for Berkeley's existing transitional housing capacity. Therefore, though applications received fairly low scores, staff recommend funding all existing programs, regardless of their score. The city currently funds Options Recovery Services with \$39,311 for transitional housing case management. Options requested an additional \$44,000 for operating costs. To preserve the transitional housing capacity at Options, and because other agencies are funded for both case management and operating costs, staff recommend additional funding for the Options program. Staff further recommend a slight increase in funding for WDDC. Their program has high rates of placement in permanent housing, which is reflected in its relatively high score. Staff do not recommend BOSS' McKinley Transitional House for funding since it currently operates without city funding and did not score well.

4. Case Management Tied to Permanent Housing

A variety of agencies in Berkeley provide case management services for clients in permanent housing. Seven of these agencies serve clients in the Shelter Plus Care program and three provide services to clients in other permanent housing (Lifelong and Toolworks at UA Homes and Erna P. Harris Court, and BFHP at Russell Street Residence). Staff's goal in this category was to preserve funding for case management services, and add new capacity to support the ultimate aim of moving more homeless people to permanent housing.

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 114 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
Berkeley Drop-In Center (Alameda County Network of Mental Health Clients)	10 Existing Shelter Plus Care Case Management Slots	41	\$22,080
BFHP	50 Existing Shelter Plus Care Case management slots	70	\$74,339
Bonita House	18 Existing Shelter Plus Care Case Management slots	80	\$27,975
BOSS	41 Existing plus 20 new Shelter Plus Care/Rapid Rehousing Case Management slots	48	\$96,500
Lifelong Medical Care	30 Existing Case Management slots (COACH/Square One)	90	\$153,652
Options	New case management slots	53	\$0
Women's Daytime Drop-In Center	16 Existing plus 12 new Shelter Plus Care/Rapid Rehousing Case Management Slots	66	\$79,488
YEAH!	11 Existing plus 6 new Shelter Plus Care/Rapid Rehousing Case Management slots	80	\$35,000
Lifelong Medical Care	Case Management at UA Homes and Erna P. Harris Court	86	\$52,250
Toolworks	Case Management at UA Homes and Erna P. Harris Court	78	\$47,665
BFHP	Russell Street Residence Case Management	92	\$0

Funding recommendations in this category preserve all existing case management for clients in the Shelter Plus Care program and at UA Homes and Erna P. Harris Court, *and* add 38 new case management slots for future clients referred to agencies through the HCRC. Staff recommend awarding additional funding to agencies that applied for additional case management slots. Staff applied a formula³ to determine the funding level for case management and do not recommend funding agencies for this service

³ The cost for existing clients was calculated at \$2,208 per year which represents an average caseload of 1:25 at an average case manager's salary of \$45,000 plus a 15% indirect fee. The cost for future clients was calculated at \$3,680 per year, which represents an average caseload of 1:15 at the same average salary, plus the 15% indirect fee. The cost to serve future clients is more expensive because they are expected to have higher service needs.

above the requested amount of funding for existing clients. Staff recommend continued funding for BFHP's Russell Street Residence but the source of funding will shift to the Mental Health Services Act.

5. Other Services

This category contains all other types of services, to which clients accessing the HCRC will be referred:

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 108 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
Options	Day Treatment Clinic	71	\$46,200
Options	Dual Diagnosis Clinic	70	\$62,328
Newbridge Foundation	Residential Treatment	47	\$50,000
Women's Daytime Drop-In Center	Domestic Violence Services	68	\$13,416
BOSS	95 Existing Representative Payee Services	67	\$64,862
BFHP	60 Existing Representative Payee Services	82	\$33,120
Berkeley Drop-In Center	50 Existing and 8 New Representative Payee Services	41	\$32,016
Homeless Action Center	Benefits Advocacy	61	\$126,349
Rubicon	Workforce Development	75	\$35,266
Suitcase Clinic	Other Services	47	\$9,828
United for Health	Other Services	64	\$0

Staff's recommendation preserves residential alcohol and drug treatment services at Newbridge Foundation, and benefits advocacy and workforce development services at the Homeless Action Center and Rubicon. It preserves funding for representative payee services, currently provided at drop-in centers, for existing clients and based on a formula⁴ to determine the cost of this service the Alameda County Social Services Agency applies for this same service. Staff's recommendation includes additional funding for representative payee slots at BDIC. Staff recommends slightly increasing funding for Options Day Treatment and decreasing funding for the Dual Diagnosis Clinic in order to fund Options' Transitional Housing operations proposal since housing is prioritized in the system re-design. The shift in funding between Options' four programs was based on Options' service modality and the expected number of clients to be assessed, matched and referred by the HCRC. Staff recommend funding Women's Daytime Drop-In Center (WDDC) to provide domestic violence services. This would be the first time the City of Berkeley funds the agency to provide this service. Approximately half of the clients WDDC currently serves are fleeing domestic violence.

⁴ Representative payee services are recommended to be funded at a level commensurate with Social Services Agency rates, plus a 15% administrative fee, amounting to \$552 per client per year.

This new funding would support activities the agency currently provides as part of its drop-in service. Staff recommend providing \$9,828 to fund the Suitcase Clinic originally recommended for United for Health for acupuncture treatments. All of these City of Berkeley funded services will be reserved for referrals from the HCRC.

6. Basic Needs Services

City funds would continue to support meals, showers and laundry services:

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 106 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
BOSS	Showers / Laundry	52	\$12,351
BFHP	Quartermeal	77	\$35,786
Dorothy Day House	Breakfast Program	90	\$41,223
Women's Daytime Drop-In Center	Lunch	54	\$14,397

Staff recommend continued funding to BOSS to provide showers and laundry services at 1931 Center street basement, though on a reduced schedule, and at a level more consistent with the funding for this services as contained in their current contract budget. The recommendation includes funding for Dorothy Day House, including payment of rent at Christ Church, WDDC and BFHP to continue serving breakfast, lunch (now part of the drop-in service at WDDC) and dinner. BFHP's dinner program would be reduced, but funding for Dorothy Day House would continue at its current level.

7. Outreach

The RFP requested proposals for outreach services, but the City Manager does not recommend funding for either applicant at this time. Neither application scored well, and there was overlap between these proposed programs and existing outreach efforts. Development of the coordinated access system will require phasing. The next two years will be devoted to building and refining the work of the HCRC and handling existing referrals from other agencies such as the Berkeley Mental Health Division Homeless Outreach worker for services before increasing outreach efforts.

Agency	Program	Average Staff Score (of a possible 114 points)	Proposed FY2016 Funding
BOSS	Outreach	57	\$0
YEAH!	Outreach	50	\$0

8. Transition Period

The recommendations contained in Attachment 1, Exhibit A contain funding recommendations that reflect a six-month transition period. From July through December 2015, shelters and drop-in centers will continue to be funded at existing levels until the HCRC is fully functional. This ensures a minimum level of disruption to clients. The HCRC will be funded during this initial six-month period to allow time to work closely with city staff to establish operations and open its doors in January, fully functional. Since Berkeley's HCRC will be closely coordinated with other centers in Alameda County, it allows for more time to develop joint assessment tools and other policies and procedures that will be utilized county-wide.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

The City Manager's initial recommendation was to shift to a new system beginning July 1, 2015. As explained above, a six-month transition period is more realistic. Staff originally contemplated funding additional outreach services, since the main goal of the newly redesigned system is to serve chronically homeless clients living on the streets with the highest service needs. It is anticipated, however, that establishing the HCRC and developing procedures to quickly move existing clients into permanent housing will be necessary before adding outreach capacity.

CONTACT PERSON

Kristen Lee, Housing & Community Services Manager, HHCS, 981-5427

Attachments:

1: Resolution

Exhibit A: Homeless Services Funding Recommendations

2: Evaluation Criteria

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

COMMUNITY AGENCY FY2016-2017 FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS: HOMELESS SERVICES

WHEREAS, in December 2014, the city released a Request for Proposals for community agency funding, including specifically the solicitation of proposals to create a new homeless services system with centralized access for clients through a Housing Crisis Resolution Center; and

WHEREAS, City staff reviewed proposals during the months of January through March; and presented recommendations for funding at a Worksession for Council on April 28, calling for the creation of a Housing Crisis Resolution Center that would begin operating on July 1, 2015 and an immediate shift of our homeless services system to a new design; and

WHEREAS, upon further reflection, the City Manager is submitting revised funding allocations for homeless services that call for a continuation of existing services for the first six months of Fiscal Year 2016, and a shift to the new system on January 1, 2016; and

WHEREAS, a listing of the proposed FY2016 funding allocations is contained in Exhibit A.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the City Manager is authorized to execute any resultant agreements and amendments for agencies receiving funding as contained in Exhibit A in accordance with the proposal approved hereunder. A record copy of said contracts and any amendments are on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that funding for FY2017 for homeless services would continue based on the January to June 2016 allocated amounts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager is authorized to use the following invoicing/reporting system in contract administration, but maintains the discretion of requiring more frequent invoices and reports from new grantees or in contracts deemed to require closer scrutiny:

Fiscal Reports:

- All agencies, regardless of funding level, are required to submit quarterly statements of expense and quarterly requests for advance payment. The final statement of expense for each fiscal year must be accompanied by a copy of the agency's General Ledger and a Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for each program.

Program Reports:

- Agencies funded with non-federal funding: End-of-year narrative summary of accomplishments for the following types of programs, due by July 31: 1) Drop-In Services only with no intensive case management attached, 2) Meal Programs, and 3) Recreation Services.
- All other agencies with non-federal funding: Two program reports, due by January 31 and July 31;
- Agencies with federal funding (any amount): Four program reports due by October 31, January 31, April 30, and July 31.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager is authorized to refuse to execute a contract with any agency that has not provided required contract exhibits and documentation within 90 days of award of funding.

Exhibit

A: FY2016 Homeless Program Funding Allocations

FY2016 Community Agency Funding - Homeless Services

Exhibit A

Agency / Program Name	Current Funding (FY2015)	July - Dec. 2015	Jan - June 2016	TOTAL FY2016
Alameda County Homeless Action Center (HAC)				
<i>Benefits Advocacy</i>	\$ 126,349	\$ 63,175	\$ 63,175	\$ 126,349
Berkeley Drop-In Center (Alameda Cty Network of Mental Health Clts)				
<i>Daytime Drop-In</i>	\$ 89,817	\$ 17,861	\$ -	\$ 17,861
<i>Case Management (11 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ 11,040	\$ 11,040	\$ 22,080
<i>Representative Payee Services (58 slots)</i>	\$ -	\$ 16,008	\$ 16,008	\$ 32,016
	\$ 89,817			\$ 71,957
Berkeley Food and Housing Project (BFHP)				
<i>Housing Crisis Resolution Center (Includes Rental Assistance below)</i>	\$ -	\$ 355,156	\$ 498,450	\$ 853,606
<i>Daytime Drop-In (Multi-Service Center)</i>	\$ 236,996	\$ 64,768	\$ -	\$ 64,768
<i>Centralized Shelter Reservation Program</i>	\$ 34,103	\$ -	\$ -	
<i>Homeward Bound</i>	\$ 7,130	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<i>Rental Assistance (Rapid Re-housing, Homeless Prevention)</i>	\$ 236,130	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<i>Men's Overnight Assistance Center/Shelter (12 beds)</i>	\$ 180,986	\$ 90,493	\$ 75,043	\$ 165,536
<i>Women's Shelter (9 beds)</i>	\$ 116,469	\$ 58,235	\$ 58,235	\$ 116,469
<i>Case Management (50 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ 37,170	\$ 37,170	\$ 74,340
<i>Russell Street Residence</i>	\$ 13,045	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<i>Representative Payee Services (60 slots)</i>	\$ -	\$ 16,560	\$ 16,560	\$ 33,120
<i>Quartermeal</i>	\$ 45,786	\$ 17,893	\$ 17,893	\$ 35,786
	\$ 870,645			\$ 1,343,625
Bonita House				
<i>Case Management (18 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ 18,151	\$ 9,076	\$ 9,076	\$ 18,151
Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency (BOSS)				
<i>Daytime Drop-In (MASC)</i>	\$ 226,725	\$ 42,361	\$ -	\$ 42,361
<i>Ursula Sherman Village Singles Shelter (23 beds)</i>	\$ 110,277	\$ 55,139	\$ 46,475	\$ 101,614
<i>Sankofa Family Transitional Housing (7 beds)</i>	\$ 26,253	\$ 13,127	\$ 13,127	\$ 26,253
<i>Ursula Sherman Village Family Transitional Housing (7 beds)</i>	\$ 27,706	\$ 13,853	\$ 13,853	\$ 27,706
<i>Case Management (41 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ 32,431	\$ 32,431	\$ 64,862
<i>NEW Case Management (20 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,820	\$ 15,820
<i>Representative Payee Services (95 slots)</i>	\$ -	\$ 26,220	\$ 26,220	\$ 52,440
<i>Showers / Laundry</i>	\$ -	\$ 12,351	\$ 12,351	\$ 24,702
<i>Outreach</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 390,961			\$ 355,757
Dorothy Day House				
<i>Berkeley Emergency Storm Shelter</i>	\$ 30,101	\$ 15,051	\$ 15,050	\$ 30,101
<i>Breakfast Program</i>	\$ 41,223	\$ 20,612	\$ 20,611	\$ 41,223
	\$ 71,324			\$ 71,324
Fred Finch Youth Center				
<i>Turning Point Transitional House</i>	\$ 86,655	\$ 43,328	\$ 43,327	\$ 86,655
Lifelong Medical Care				
<i>COACH/Square One</i>	\$ 153,652	\$ 76,826	\$ 76,826	\$ 153,652
<i>Case Management at UA Homes Erna P. Harris Court</i>	\$ 52,250	\$ 26,125	\$ 26,125	\$ 52,250
	\$ 205,902			\$ 205,902
Newbridge Foundation				
<i>Residential Treatment</i>	\$ 50,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 50,000

FY2016 Community Agency Funding - Homeless Services

Exhibit A

Agency / Program Name	Current Funding (FY2015)	July - Dec. 2015	Jan - June 2016	TOTAL FY2016
Options Recovery Services				
<i>Transitional Housing</i>	\$ 39,311	\$ 41,655	\$ 41,656	\$ 83,311
<i>Daytime Treatment</i>	\$ 38,132	\$ 23,100	\$ 23,100	\$ 46,200
<i>Dual Diagnosis Clinic</i>	\$ 114,396	\$ 31,164	\$ 31,164	\$ 62,328
	\$ 191,839			\$ 191,839
Rubicon				
<i>Workforce Development</i>	\$ 35,266	\$ 17,633	\$ 17,633	\$ 35,266
Toolworks				
<i>Case Management at UA Homes Erna P. Harris Court</i>	\$ 47,665	\$ 23,833	\$ 23,832	\$ 47,665
United For Health				
<i>Suitcase Clinic</i>	\$ 9,828	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Women's Daytime Drop-In Center (WDDC)				
<i>Bridget Transitional House</i>	\$ 23,838	\$ 15,389	\$ 15,389	\$ 30,777
<i>Daytime Drop-In Services</i>	\$ 140,643	\$ 22,420	\$ -	\$ 22,420
<i>Homeward Bound</i>	\$ 1,750	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<i>Case Management (16 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ 17,664	\$ 17,664	\$ 35,328
<i>NEW Case Management (12 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,080	\$ 22,080
<i>Domestic Violence Services</i>	\$ -	\$ 13,416	\$ 13,416	\$ 26,832
<i>Lunch Program</i>	\$ -	\$ 14,397	\$ 14,397	\$ 28,794
	\$ 166,231			\$ 166,231
YEAH!				
<i>TAY Winter Shelter</i>	\$ 109,115	\$ 54,558	\$ 54,557	\$ 109,115
<i>Case Management (11 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ 12,144	\$ 12,144	\$ 24,288
<i>NEW Case Management (6 slots) Tied to Permanent Housing</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,356	\$ 5,356
<i>Outreach</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 109,115			\$ 138,759
The Suitcase Clinic				
<i>Suitcase Clinic Services</i>	\$ -	\$ 4,914	\$ 4,914	\$ 9,828
GRAND TOTALS*	\$ 2,469,748			\$ 2,919,306

* FY2016 total funding includes funding from the HHCS budget for homeless programs that will shift to the HCRC.

	Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
A.	Organizational Capacity (24 pts)								
1	Does the answer to Question A.5 adequately address potential funding risks, including projecting shortfalls and having a clear plan or multiple scenarios?	Question A.5	Risks identified and not addressed.		Risks identified and addressed somewhat.		No risks foreseen or risks addressed very well.		
2	Is the number of Board members compliant with the agency's By-Laws?	Questions A.6, A.7	No		Partially		Yes		
3	Does the applicant demonstrate the the board of directors and agency staff have engaged effectively in fundraising activities?	Question A.6 and Attachment 8	no evidence		Some evidence: Board is either engaged in fundraising and-or overall governanc e.		Strong evidence: Active board engagement in both fundraising and governance.		
4	Is the funding for the agency sufficiently diversified so that it is not overly reliant on one source of funding or solely reliant on public funding?	Question A.8. and A.3. Agency Budget	Heavy reliance on one or two funding sources		Funding is moderately diversified		Agency has multiple funding sources to spread risk		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
5	How well does applicant serve one or more LEP populations?	Question A.9. No evidence of services		Some evidence of services/available services limited.		strong evidence of services/Includes training and/or staffing for linguistic access		
6	How well does applicant address and provide culturally competent services?	Questions A.9., A.10. No evidence of services		Some evidence of services/available services limited.		strong evidence of services/Includes training and/or staffing for linguistic access		
B. Program Design (48 pts)								
1	Is the description of the program clear and is the program appropriate for the target population?	Question B.3 very poorly articulated and not appropriate		Fair: Services may be somewhat vaguely defined and are somewhat appropriate.		Excellent articulation of services: Provides a clear understanding of program and services are clearly appropriate for population.		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
2	Does the program address a need outlined in the City Manager's letter regarding City priorities? Question B.4	Does not address a need	poor description of City needs and how City needs are addressed	Fair description of either how needs will be addressed OR of City needs	good description of local needs and plan will address multiple needs or one need very well	Excellent description and addresses City manager needs and shows deep understanding of local context and services		
3	Is the description of the target population clear and is the target population appropriate? Question B.5.a and c	very poorly articulated /not	poorly articulated and/or	fair articulation of	good articulation of	excellent description of targeted		
4	Does the program focus on serving people with the lowest incomes? Question B.5.c	more than 50% of clients have incomes above 80% of AMI		More than 50% of clients have incomes between poverty and 80% of AMI		more than 50% of clients have incomes below the poverty level		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
5	Are the outreach efforts to the target population appropriate?	Question B.6 Agency does not provide outreach at all	Agency provides minimal outreach	Outreach efforts described but with insufficient detail	outreach efforts are good but seem perfunctory	outreach efforts described appear to be innovative/excellent and focused on serving targeted population		
6	Are the services, service measures and outcomes to be delivered clearly articulated?	Question B.7, Detailed narrative very poorly articulated including misalignment of services, units and outcomes and/or very low number of Berkeley residents	poorly articulated: some units and services measures and outcomes may not be fully understood and a small percentage of Berkeley clients served	fair articulation of services in chart but service descriptions narrative are not completely clear.	good articulation of services, outcomes, and narrative provides some understanding of program.	excellent articulation of services: each item in the table is fully complete and clearly aligned. A high proportion of Berkeley residents to be served by program.		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
7	Is there evidence that innovative or best practices are incorporated into the program design? Question B.8	agency does not identify any research-based or evidence-based practices.	agency identified evidence-based/arch-based practices, but no evidence they are in program design	agency identified evidence-based/arch-based practices fairly well and incorporates them somewhat into program design	agency states evidence/research-based practices and incorporates one or the other clearly in program design	agency clearly demonstrates incorporation of clearly stated evidence-based and/or research-based practices and innovative program design		
8	Are Hours of Operation appropriate for the service? Question B.9	not at all appropriate to services		somewhat appropriate		very appropriate		
9	Are key program staff qualified (related degrees, certificates or hands-on experience in the field)? Question B.10	Key program staff not qualified		Key program staff are adequate		All program staff highly trained and experienced in program area		
10	Is the Staff to client ratio appropriate? Question B.11	no		adequate		best practice ratio		
11	Is staff supervision and training appropriate? Question B.12	no		Cycle of training and supervision described		Cycle of training and supervision reflects best practices		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
12	Does that applicant have a clear and compelling strategy to promote continuous improvement?	Question B.13 No plan at all	poorly articulated plan	adequate plan: Includes some data collection systems	good plan: some data collected and some system of data reflection embedded	clearly innovative plan: Includes data reflection for continuous improvement and data collection systems.		
C.	Past Performance - Existing Agencies (12 pts)							
1	Did the agency meet its contract requirements in providing services in the past?	Question B.14 Actual services delivered were not at all related to planned services	Less than half of the service measures were achieved, and no explanation provided	Half or more of the service measures were achieved, and no explanation provided	All service measures were achieved.	Service measures achieved were exemplary and exceeded all other similar programs		
2	Insert Community Agency Monitoring Assessment Results here	CAMA						
3	Did the agency achieve the outcome measures contained in its contract in the past?	Question B.14. Outcomes planned were not achieved at all	Less than half of the outcome measures were achieved	Half or more of the outcome measures were achieved	All outcome measures were achieved.	Outcome measures achieved were exemplary and exceeded all other similar programs		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
Experience Score - New Agencies (12 pts.)		0 pts.	3 pts.	6 pts.	9 pts.	12 pts.		
4 Does the agency have experience implementing a similar project?	B.14.	No experience	Some experience, vaguely described	Some experience, well described	History of experience, but no description of results.	Long history of experience implementing like program with results described.		
D. Program Budget (16 pts)								
1 How well does the agency leverage other funding for this program?	Program Budget	Heavy reliance on one or two funding sources		funding is moderately diversified		Agency has multiple funding sources to spread risk		
2 How does the cost per successful outcome compare with other agencies providing similar services? Is the cost per successful outcome reasonable?	Program Budget	Cost per client not reasonable by industry standards.		Cost per client reasonable but higher than other providers		Cost per client reasonable and lower than other providers		
3 Does the budget narrative describe a clear and appropriate use of City funds?	Program Budget Narrative	Poor narrative and inappropriate use of City funds.		Sufficient narrative and use of funds.		Excellent narrative and use of funds.		

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
4	Does the budget seem appropriate to the type and amount of service proposed? Program Budget	Budget not reasonable by industry standards.		Budget reasonable but higher than other providers		Budget reasonable and lower than other providers		
H. Homeless Specific Evaluation Criteria								
	Emergency Shelter (10 pts.)							
1	What is the percentage of Chronically Homeless Clients served in the past year? Question B.13	0-30% chronically homeless	30-60% chronically homeless	more than 60% chronically homeless				
2	What is the percentage of beds allocated to City of Berkeley? Question 1.a.	0-40%	41-70%	71-100%				
3	Is this an increase in capacity for people who are chronically homeless and referred through the HCRC? Question 1.a.	no		yes				
4	Is the agency's plan to reconfigure staffing clearly defined? Will essential shelter services (e.g. basic operations, safety, janitorial, etc.) be adequately staffed? Question 1.b.	not clearly defined / not appropriate	adequately defined / appropriate	very clear / very appropriate				
5	Is agency willing to take all referrals from the HCRC? Question 1.c.	No		yes				
	Other Services (8 pts.)							
1	What is the percentage of Chronically Homeless Clients served in the past year? Question B.13	0-30% chronically homeless	30-60% chronically homeless	more than 60% chronically homeless				

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
2 Does the agency have experience working with chronically homeless clients?	Question 2.a.	no experience	some experience	strong experience				
3 Does the agency propose specific services and supports that will help clients secure and maintain housing?	Question 2.c.	None	some	strong				
4 Is agency willing to take all referrals from the HCRC?	Question 2.d.	No		yes				
Targeted Outreach / Engagement (14 pts.)								
1 Does the agency have experience doing targeted outreach to a chronically homeless population?	Question 3.a.	no experience	some experience	strong experience				
2 Do the identified outreach area(s) seem consistent with known locations where unsheltered people live or can be found?	Questions 3.b. and 3.c.	no	somewhat	yes				
3 Does the proposed method, timing and frequency of outreach seem appropriate to reach the identified population?	Questions 3.b. and 3.c.	no	somewhat	yes				
4 Does the outreach plan include having staff with direct experience of being homeless and/or engaging with people who are homeless?	Questions 3.b. and 3.c.	no	somewhat	yes				

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
5 Does the applicant identify specific strategies/techniques staff will use for engagement (e.g. motivational interviewing)	Question 3.c.	no	somewhat	yes				
6 What is the agency's capacity for doing intakes in the field and for using latest technology?	Question 3.d.	none	some	good				
7 What is the agency's ability to bill MediCal to leverage funding for services?	Question 3.f.	none	fair description or future plan	Already able to bill MediCal				
Meals Programs (6 pts.)								
1 Does the agency reach out to the surrounding community to maintain positive relationships?	Question 4.a.	no		yes				
2 Are meals healthy? Has the agency made efforts to improve the nutritional value of meals?	Question 4.b.	no	some effort	good effort / healthy meals				
3 Does the agency have a clear plan to engage clients and refer to HCRC?	Question 4.d.	no	fair plan	good plan				
Case Management Tied to Permanent Housing (14 pts.)								
1 Is the cost of current and future case management services appropriate? *	Question 5.a.	no		yes				

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
* <i>Future case management ratio for chronically homeless clients should be in the range of 1 case manager to 15 clients.</i>								
2 Has the applicant described a clear and specific approach to helping clients retain housing and prevent eviction? Did they include data on their track record in preventing housing loss?	Question 5.b.	no	fair	good				
3 What is the agency's ability to bill MediCal to leverage funding for services?	Question 5.c.	none	fair description or future plan	Already able to bill MediCal				
4 Is agency willing to take all referrals from the HCRC?	Question 5.d.	No		yes				
5 Is the agency willing to participate in Shelter Plus Care Operations Board?	Question 5.e.	No		yes				
6 Does the agency have experience in providing case management services to clients who are chronically homeless and medically fragile?	Question 5.f.	no	some experience	extensive experience				
7 Does the agency follow a housing first and harm reduction model for clients with active substance use and who may also have a mental illness?	Question 5.g.	no		yes				
Transitional Housing (12 pts.)								

AGENCY NAME: _____
PROGRAM NAME: _____
COMMISSIONER NAME: _____

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
1 What is the percentage of Chronically Homeless Clients served in the past year?	Question B.13	0-30% chronically homeless	30-60% chronically homeless	more than 60% chronically homeless				
2 What percentage of beds will be allocated to City of Berkeley?	Question 6.b.	0-40%	41-70%	71-100%				
3 Is there a proposed increase in capacity for people who are chronically homeless and referred through the HCRC?	Question 6.b.	no		yes				
4 Does the agency develop a transition plan with clients soon after entering the program? Does the transition plan include plan for exiting to housing as quickly as possible? Do the staff support the client's housing search?	Question 6.d.	no	somewhat	yes				
5 What is the agency's ability to bill MediCal to leverage funding for services?	Question 6.e.	none	fair description or future plan	Already able to bill MediCal				
6 Is agency willing to take all referrals from the HCRC?	Question 6.f.	No		yes				
HCRC (38 pts.)								

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
1 Will the space proposed accommodate the needs of the HCRC? Does it include waiting area, private interview rooms, and meeting/classroom space?	Question 1a1	No	Somewhat	Yes				
2 Does the proposed number of daily intakes and assessments seem sufficient? Is the staffing plan adequate to handle the number of intake/assessments proposed?	Question 1a2	No	Somewhat	Yes				
3 Does the applicant have experience in providing homeless prevention or diversion assistance?	Question 1a3	No	Some	Yes				
4 Does the applicant have experience handling walk-ins and scheduling appointments?	Question 1a4	None	Some	Yes				
5 Does the applicant have experience working with chronically homeless people in a drop-in setting?	Question 1a5	None	Some	Yes				
6 Has the applicant provided a clear and specific explanation of how they will conduct real time data entry from intake and assessment and what technology will be needed to support this activity.	Question 1a6	No	Somewhat	Yes				

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
7 Does the applicant have experience assessing clients and matching to an appropriate type of housing intervention or level of service?	Question 1a7	No	Some	Yes				
8 Has the applicant provided a clear and specific explanation of how they will manage "frequent users" of the HCRC? Have they described how they will ensure everyone who visits has a clear reason to be there? How will they prevent people from using HCRC as a place to hang out?	Question 1a8	No	Somewhat	Yes				
9 Has the applicant provided a realistic timeframe for startup?	Question 1a9	No	Somewhat	Yes				
10 Has the applicant provided a clear and specific description of how they will operate the proposed system? Description should cover how clients will access the system (phone, walk in, computer), how staff will manage the system (dedicated call center, database), how real time information about vacancies will be obtained).	Question 1b1	No	Somewhat	Yes				

AGENCY NAME: _____
PROGRAM NAME: _____
COMMISSIONER NAME: _____

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
11	Has the applicant provided a clear and specific description of how they make referrals to other service providers?	Question 1b2 No	Somewhat	Yes				
12	Does the applicant have experience in providing case management using critical time intervention and progressive engagement models to people who are unsheltered or living in shelter and/or after they are housed?	Question 1c1 No	Some	Yes				
13	What is the agency's ability to bill MediCal to leverage funding for services?	Question 1c2 none	fair description or future plan	Already able to bill MediCal				
14	Does the applicant have experience in outreach to and cultivation of landlords who are willing to house homeless people?	Question 1d1 None	Some	Yes				
15	Does the applicant have experience administering housing assistance payments, especially federal funding, to landlords?	Question 1d2 None	Some	Yes				
16	Does the applicant have experience in providing housing locator and navigation services?	Question 1d3 None	Some	Yes				

AGENCY NAME: _____
PROGRAM NAME: _____
COMMISSIONER NAME: _____

Question	Documentation	Point Score 0	1	2	3	4	Score	Commissioner Comments to Support Score (Optional)
17	Has the applicant provided a clear and specific description of the housing search assistance resources that will be offered at the HCRC? Description should include printed materials, workshops, one-on-one help. Do services described appear adequate to ensure all clients of HCRC receive some level of assistance in securing housing?	None	Somewhat	Yes				
18	Is applicant willing to participate in future CoC meetings?	Question 1E No		yes				
19	Is applicant willing to work with City/County to link to future county system?	Question 1E No		yes				