



CALIFORNIA

HOMELESS COORDINATING
AND FINANCING COUNCIL

Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency
Gavin Newsom, Governor | Lourdes M. Castro Ramírez, Secretary

Encampment Resolution Funding Program

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

October 29th, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. GRANT OVERVIEW	3
A. Authority	3
B. Background	3
C. Objectives.....	4
D. Key Action Dates.....	4
II. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES	5
III. APPLICATION	6
A. Programmatic Scope	6
B. Fiscal Scope.....	6
C. Application Requirements.....	6
D. Format Requirements.....	9
E. Submission Requirements.....	10
IV. REVIEW AND AWARD	10
A. Funding Priorities	10
B. Review and Scoring.....	11
C. Award	12
V. AGREEMENT	12
A. Performance.....	12
B. Reporting.....	12
C. Additional Requirements	12
VI. ATTACHMENTS	14
ATTACHMENT 1 (Application Checklist)	14
ATTACHMENT 2 (Cover Page Sheet).....	15
ATTACHMENT 3 (Benchmarks)	16
ADDENDUM 1 (Applicant Conferences).....	25
ADDENDUM 2 (Q&A).....	27
ADDENDUM 3 (Edits).....	35

CALIFORNIA HOMELESS COORDINATING AND FINANCING COUNCIL

Encampment Resolution Funding Program

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS (RFA)

I. GRANT OVERVIEW

A. Authority

Under the authority of Chapter 7 of Part 1 of Division 31 of the California Health and Safety Code (sections 50250 et seq.), the Encampment Resolution Funding (ERF) Program was established to increase collaboration between the Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council, local jurisdictions, and continuums of care to accomplish the following:

- Assist local jurisdictions in ensuring the wellness and safety of people experiencing homelessness in encampments, including their immediate physical and mental wellness and safety needs arising from unsheltered homelessness and their longer-term needs addressed through a path to safe and stable housing.
- Provide encampment resolution grants to local jurisdictions and continuums of care to support innovative and replicable efforts to resolve critical encampment concerns and to support individuals to access safe and stable housing, using Housing First approaches.
- Encourage a data-informed, coordinated approach to address unsheltered homelessness at encampments by establishing, through the encampment resolution grants, effective, scalable, and replicable demonstration projects.

B. Background

The Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council (HCFC) was created in 2017 to oversee the implementation of Housing First policies, guidelines, and regulations to reduce the prevalence and duration of homelessness in California. The Council's mission is to develop policies, identify resources, benefits, and services to prevent and work toward ending homelessness in California. In addition to interagency coordination and policy development, HCFC is mandated to coordinate funding while also promoting systems integration to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the homelessness response system at the state and local level.

The ERF grants awarded through this RFA will support HCFC's mandates by funding local demonstration projects that provide services to address

the immediate crisis of experiencing unsheltered homelessness in encampments, to support people living in encampments onto paths to safe and stable housing and result in sustainable restoration of public spaces to their intended uses while safeguarding the needs of unhoused people seeking shelter. This program is established in recognition of a need to develop effective, scalable, and replicable strategies that meet the specific complex needs of individuals living in encampments. The total funding available to be awarded is \$47.5 million divided amongst selected grantees through the competitive RFA process.

C. Objectives

Statute provides three express purposes for the ERF Program. This RFA incorporates those purposes into two, interdependent objectives.

First, the ERF Program will fund local demonstration projects for innovative service delivery models and cross systems collaborations that support individuals experiencing homelessness in encampments towards a meaningful path to safe and stable housing, using non-punitive, low-barrier, person-centered, Housing First approaches. These projects must comply with the principles of Housing First as defined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 8255, must serve a specific encampment site (See *below*, “III. C. Part 2: Prioritized Encampment.”), and must be designed to achieve sustainable outcomes for both recipients of services and the encampment site to be resolved.

Second, HCFC will analyze awarded demonstration projects to evaluate activities and outcomes for the purpose of sharing scalable and replicable encampment resolution models that may be implemented across the state.

D. Key Action Dates

Event	Responsible Party	Due Date
RFA Release Date	HCFC	10/29/2021
Submit Questions for Applicants Conference	Applicant	11/12/2021
Applicants Conference	HCFC	11/19/2021 See addendum1
FAQ posted to HCFC Website	HCFC	12/3/2021
Application Submission Deadline	Applicant	12/31/2021
Application Scoring and Ranking	HCFC	Jan/Feb 2022
Notice of Intent to Award	HCFC	3/1/2022

II. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Successful grantees will design a demonstration project that builds capacity to provide services that are relevant and responsive to the needs of individuals experiencing homelessness in encampments. The project activities will support new or enhanced cross-systems collaboration and service strategies to help people experiencing homelessness transition out of encampments and onto pathways towards safe and stable housing. Project activities will also support efforts to restore encampment sites to their original state and intended purposes, but must prioritize protecting the health, safety, and well-being of the individuals who had been living in those encampments.

All ERF Program activities must comply with Housing First and HDIS data submission requirements. Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 8256, all recipients of ERF funding shall comply with the core components of Housing First, as defined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 8255.

Additionally, Health and Safety Code Section 50254 mandates that all ERF funding recipients participate in the statewide Homeless Data Integration System (HDIS) by entering data and information regarding individuals served by this funding, and services and housing options provided, into their local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Health and Safety Code Section 50254 and Welfare and Institutions Code section 8256 (as amended by AB 1220) detail specifications related to the data elements to be provided to the statewide HDIS.

Eligible Applicants:

- Local Jurisdiction – a city or charter city, a county or charter county, or a city and county, including a charter city and county.
- Continuum of Care – as defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Grant funds may be used for activities that advance the goal of the proposed project in any one of the following four categories:

Direct Services and Housing Options: activities to address immediate crisis needs and paths towards safe and stable housing for people living in encampments including, but not limited to, street outreach and engagement, housing and/or systems navigation, interim housing, and permanent housing.

Capacity Building: activities to enhance the systems carrying out the demonstration project including, but not limited to, service coordination efforts, establishing and strengthening cross-system partnerships, and workforce development including specialized training and contracting with providers of culturally specific interventions.

Sustainable Outcomes: activities and interventions to ensure sustained outcomes for the people served and to support sustained restoration of encampment sites to their intended or original state.

Administration: up to 5% of grant funds may be applied to administrative costs.

III. APPLICATION

A. Programmatic Scope

Each application must identify and focus on one encampment site; however, the encampment site may be broadly defined. *See below*, “C. Part 2: Prioritized Encampment Site.” The Application must identify the number and demographics of individuals living in the encampment site who will be served through this program and how outcomes for those individuals will be tracked.

B. Fiscal Scope

This grant is not intended to be the sole funding source for a new encampment resolution project. Awarded grant funding should be used to accelerate promising programs and practices that are in development and that enhance partnerships and leverage other resources, including initiatives funded by other HCFC grants.

C. Application Requirements

Applications are required to include seven parts described in a Work Plan. The seven parts are as follows:

1. Part 1: *Implementation Unit Structure and Capacity*

- Describe the specific unit or office within your organization that will implement the ERF Program grant. Please identify the implementing unit’s mission, goals, values, geographic service area, and existing efforts and practices related to serving people living in encampments.
- Describe your organization’s relevant existing partnerships and ability to develop new partnerships and collaborations in support of services to people experiencing homelessness in encampments.
- Describe how the entity’s structure and partnerships will lead to efficient and effective implementation of the proposed ERF Program.

2. Part 2: *Prioritized Encampment Site and Population to be Served*

- In detail, describe the specific encampment site, section of an encampment, or closely linked community of encampments, being resolved. The description must include the specific location, physical size of the area to be served, the types of structures people are

residing in at the site, and any other relevant or notable physical characteristics of the site to be served.

- Provide the number of the individuals living in the area that the applicant is requesting funding to serve, any available demographic information, and how this information was determined, including the extent to which estimates were used.
- In detail, describe why *this* specific encampment site is being prioritized for resolution support. This may include concerns related to public health, safety, and environmental hazards that pose a particular risk to the people living in the target area as compared to other encampments, or demographic factors related to addressing racial equity or serving populations disproportionately impacted by homelessness. This may also include the environmental, health, and safety impact of the encampment site to the community at large.

3. *Part 3: Core Service Delivery and Provision of Housing Options*

- In detail, describe the proposed services and interim and permanent housing options that will be provided to individuals experiencing homelessness in this specific encampment site and describe how the proposed services will be aligned with Housing First principles, tailored to meet the specific needs of the people served and address the health and safety challenges posed by the specific encampment site.
- State how many individuals experiencing homelessness will be served by the proposed project and how the services and interim and permanent housing options to be provided will prioritize the physical and mental health and wellness of the people served while supporting their transition out of the encampment and onto meaningful pathways to safe and stable housing.
- Describe how the proposed activities will result in sustainable restoration of the encampment site to its original state or intended use while prioritizing the health and wellness of people experiencing homelessness.

4. *Part 4: Coordination of Services and Housing Options*

- In detail, describe how the entity will coordinate with other systems and describe any new or innovative partnerships established in support of this program. This may include partnerships with healthcare, behavioral health, workforce development, long term services and supports, interim and permanent housing options, and other systems of service delivery.
- Describe any new, enhanced, or innovative partnerships the entity intends to carry out with State entities and/or philanthropy to create new or enhanced models of service delivery in support of this project.

- Describe how these new or enhanced partnerships will mitigate risk and address safety concerns, while ensuring a pathway for individuals living in encampments to move into safe and stable housing.
- Describe how the applicant will implement a coordinated approach that is data-informed to assist individuals in the encampment and ensure future outcomes can be measured.
- Provide Two Letters of Support from at least two different partners demonstrating support and collaboration on the encampment resolution strategy. Note: Letters of Support will not count towards the application page limit described in section D below.

5. Part 5: *Ensuring Dignity, Safety, and Wellness*

- Describe how people with lived experience were included or consulted in the planning of this project and how people with lived experience will be involved in implementing and/or assessing the impact of the project. Describe the extent to which the people living in the encampment to be served will be engaged in the implementation and assessment of the proposed project.
- Briefly describe how the proposed project and strategies exemplify Housing First values and will be non-punitive, trauma-informed, and culturally appropriate.
- Briefly describe any local laws, ordinances, and current or planned responses to community concerns regarding the encampment to be served, including any existing local encampment resolutions plans that may impact the project site. Describe how the entity will implement the proposed project and navigate potentially conflicting intentions, to ensure that the proposed activities support the dignity, safety, and wellness of people experiencing homelessness within the encampment site.

6. Part 6: *Personnel*

- Provide a list of all positions (both administrative and programmatic) which are integral to providing services under this proposal, including their title, a brief description of their duties, and the approximate full-time equivalent (FTE) of staffing for the grant project.
- Briefly describe any factors that make the key staff for this project uniquely qualified to carry out this grant successfully. This may include specialized training, cultural competency, lived expertise, and demonstrable past success with similar projects.
- Include a resume or, if the position is currently vacant, a duty statement for all positions (both administrative and programmatic) which are integral to providing services under this proposal. Note: resumes and duty statements will not count towards the application page limit described in section D below.

7. *Part 7: Proposed Budget and Fiscal Planning*

- Briefly explain how the award amount requested from the available funds was determined for the size of the proposed project and number of people to be served and how this project could be scaled if more or less than the requested funds are available.
- Identify all the funds currently being used or anticipated to be used in support of the proposed project, including all federal, state, philanthropic and/or local funds, and the proportion of the project cost that will be supported directly through this grant.
- Describe how the proposal will maximize use of resources for program services and how the funds requested through this grant and other leveraged funds reflect an efficient use of public dollars for the intended activities and outcomes.
- Describe the strategies to ensure that 50% of allocated funds are expended by June 30, 2023, and 100% by June 30, 2024, as required in Health and Safety Code Section 50253.
- Provide a budget narrative and line-item budget that demonstrate how resources made available through this grant will be allocated. Note: The budget narrative and line-item budget will not count towards the application page limit described in section D below.

D. Format Requirements

The **Work Plan** must be in the following format:

- 20 page maximum, double spaced, typed, Word document that uses Arial 12-point font with 1-inch margins and standard spacing between letters
- Utilizes the same Nomenclature as this RFA (e.g., Part 6: Personnel)
- Each prompt must be organized and answered separately

A Work Plan submitted that deviates from these requirements may be considered nonresponsive and may be disqualified from the evaluation.

The required **Attachments** must be in the following format:

- Application Checklist (Attachment 1), as instructed on the Cognito portal
- Application Cover Page (Attachment 2), as instructed on the Cognito portal
- Two Letters of Support

- Each letter is limited to 2 pages, one-sided
- The letter's heading must clearly indicate the Eligible Applicant
- Work Plan Budget

Attachments that deviate from these requirements may be considered nonresponsive and may be disqualified from the evaluation.

E. Submission Requirements

Applicants will utilize the Cognito platform to submit which can be found at <https://www.cognitofrms.com/HomelessCoordinatingAndFinancingCouncil/EncampmentsRFA>

A complete Application is required to be submitted and received by 5:00 p.m. on December 31, 2021 as reflected on the Cognito portal. Because HCFC does not have control over the platform's timing apparatus and uploading speed, and to mitigate for unforeseen occurrences, applicants are strongly encouraged to submit by noon on December 31, 2021.

HCFC may not consider any submission that is timestamped 5:01 pm or later as indicated on the Cognito platform. Unless there are *extraordinary* circumstances that have been documented, HCFC will not consider submissions by email. Applicants are permitted to submit a "Test" Submission at a time of their choosing to familiarize their understanding of the Platform. The Cognito platform will instruct applicants how to navigate this process.

General questions and requests for assistance may be submitted by email to HHAP@bcsh.ca.gov, heading "Encampment Resolution Funding Program"; please know that HCFC will likely respond to any inquiries through official channels that are directed to the entire eligible applicant pool.

HCFC cannot guarantee a response before the Application deadline to general questions or requests for assistance submitted after December 20, 2021.

IV. REVIEW AND AWARD

A. Funding Priorities

When determining grant awards, funding shall be prioritized for:

- Jurisdictions that can demonstrate a commitment to cross-systems collaboration and innovative efforts to resolve encampment issues, while focusing on protecting the health and well-being of the individuals living in those encampments.

- Jurisdictions that have 50 or more individuals living in the encampment that they are seeking to support with these funds.
- Awarding grants that, to the extent feasible, reflect a range of applicants that represent the diversity of communities across the state, including rural, urban, and suburban communities.

B. Review and Scoring

Phase 1 – Administrative Review: Applications will be reviewed and evaluated for timeliness and completeness of RFA specifications. In this review stage, reviewers will compare the contents of each application to the Required Documents Checklist ensuring that all required items are received. Applications that do not contain all the required items listed on the Required Documents Checklist will be considered non-responsive and may be disqualified from the evaluation. Any materials that are not required by the RFA will not be used for scoring purposes, will be separated from the application, and returned to applicant.

Phase 2 – Evaluation Panel: An Evaluation Panel will be convened comprised of qualified individuals who have knowledge and experience with the state grantmaking process and the subject matter of this RFA. The Evaluation Panel will review and score the Applications in accordance with the RFA scoring criteria and the RFA scoring matrix (Attachment 3).

Rating/Scoring Criteria	Maximum Possible Points
<i>Part 1: Implementation Unit Structure and Capacity</i>	10
<i>Part 2: Prioritized Encampment and Population to be Served</i>	15
<i>Part 3: Core Service Delivery and Provision of Housing Options</i>	20
<i>Part 4: Coordination of Services and Housing Options</i>	20
<i>Part 5: Ensuring Dignity, Safety, and Wellness</i>	15
<i>Part 6: Personnel</i>	10
<i>Part 7: Proposed Budget and Fiscal Planning</i>	10
Total Possible Points	100

C. Award

A Notice of Intent to Award shall be posted on the HCFC website and shall be sent by email to intended awardees.

If a bidder declines to accept an award, the HCFC reserves the right to make an award to subsequent applicants per the evaluation process.

V. AGREEMENT

A. Performance

Performance shall start no later than 30 days, or on the express date set by HCFC and the grantees, after all approvals have been obtained and the Grant Agreement is fully executed. Should the grantee fail to commence work at the agreed upon time, HCFC, upon five (5) days written notice to the grantee, reserves the right to terminate the Agreement. All performance under the Agreement shall be completed on or before the termination date of the Agreement.

B. Reporting

The Grantee shall submit an annual report to HCFC by December 31st each year following award with fiscal and programmatic data reflecting the progress of the grantee in a format provided by HCFC. The grantee shall also submit quarterly expenditure reports to HCFC on a form and method provided by HCFC that includes the ongoing tracking of funds. Grantees may also receive ad hoc requests for information from HCFC or its contractors in support of program monitoring, research, and evaluation.

At the end of the grant period, or upon request by HCFC, all grantees shall provide information and products developed with grant funds on service delivery models in support of the overall program goal to mitigate risk and address safety concerns in encampments, including any materials that may be necessary to study the program or replicate it for implementation across the state.

C. Additional Requirements

Once grants have been awarded, grantees will be required to adhere to the following additional requirements:

CONTRACTING PROCESS

Once awards have been determined by HCFC, a contract packet including the Standard Agreement and Request for Funds Form (RFF) form will be prepared and sent to the Grantee. The Grantee will return the signed Standard Agreement and RFF which will initiate the process to execute the final contract and disburse funding. Funds will be disbursed to the

Grantee upon receipt, review and approval of the completed Standard Agreement and RFF by HCFC, the Department of General Services (DGS) and the State Controller's Office (SCO). The RFF must include the proposed eligible uses and the amount of funds proposed for expenditure under each eligible use. Grant funds will be disbursed via mailed check once the RFF has been received by the SCO. Checks will be mailed to the address and contact name listed on the RFF.

INSURANCE

Applicants must provide proof of insurance coverage. Coverage needs to be in force for the complete term of the Grant Agreement. If insurance expires during the term of the grant, applicants may be required to provide a new certificate to the State prior to the expiration of this insurance. Any new insurance must still comply with the original terms of the grant.

In the event Grantee fails to keep in effect at all times the specified insurance coverage, the State may, in addition to any other remedies it may have, terminate this Grant upon the occurrence of such event, subject to the provisions of this Grant.

Deductible – Grantee is responsible for any deductible or self-insured retention contained within their insurance program.

Primary Clause – Any required insurance contained in this grant shall be primary, and not excess or contributory, to any other insurance carried by the State.

Insurance Carrier Required Rating – All insurance companies must carry a rating acceptable to the Department of General Services Office of Risk and Insurance Management. If the Grantor is self-insured for a portion or all of its insurance, review of financial information including a letter of credit may be required.

Inadequate Insurance – Inadequate or lack of insurance does not negate the grantee's obligations under the grant.

PROHIBITION ON TAX DELINQUENCY

Any Agreement that a state agency enters into after July 1, 2012, is void if the grant is between a state agency and a grantee, or subcontractor, whose name appears on either list of the 500 largest tax delinquencies pursuant to Section 7063 or 19195 of the Revenue and Taxation Code. (Public Contract Code section 10295.4). In accordance with Public Contract Code section 10295.4, agencies are required to cancel Agreements with entities that appear on either list.

(Franchise Tax Board)

https://www.ftb.ca.gov/aboutFTB/Delinquent_Taxpayers.shtml,

(Board of Equalization) <http://www.boe.ca.gov/cgi-bin/deliq.cgi>

VI. ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 1

Application Organization and Required Document Checklist

A complete application package must consist of the items identified below. Complete this checklist to confirm the items are included in your application. Place a check mark or "X" next to each item that you are submitting to the State. For your application to be responsive, **all required documents listed below must be returned with bid**. This checklist must also be returned with your bid package.

Name/Description

- _____ Required Attachment Check List (Attachment 1)
- _____ Cover Sheet (Attachment 2) signed by authorized representative
- _____ Work Plan (maximum of 20 pages)
- _____ Work Plan Budget
- _____ Proof of insurance coverage
- _____ Two Letters of Support
- _____ Staff resumes or Duty Statements for key personnel or position identified who will provide RFA related duties during the grant period

ATTACHMENT 2

Cover page sheet

1. Applicant and Implementing Organization:

Applicant: _____

Implementing Organization: _____

Specific unit or office within the implementing organization:

Imp. Org's Address _____

City _____ County _____ ZIP Code _____

Imp. Org's Tax ID Number _____

2. Project Director:

Name _____

Title _____

Telephone _____

Email _____

3. Grant Administrator:

Name _____

Title _____

Telephone _____

Email _____

4. Contact person for application, if different than Project Director:

Name _____

Title _____

Telephone _____

Email _____

The applicant certifies that, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, the data in this application are true and correct.

Name of Authorized Official

Print _____

Signature _____ Date _____

ATTACHMENT 3

Benchmarks for Scoring ERF Program Work Plan Sections

Evaluators will use a 5-point rating scale to score the narrative responses. 0 is the lowest value and 5 is the highest value. The evaluators are guided by a benchmark for each category that explains a well-qualified response, a somewhat qualified response, and an unqualified response. Each score will be weighted to align with the total points possible for each section of the grant narrative (for example, section 1 is worth 10 points so a raw score of 3 out of 5 would translate to a weighted score of 6 out of 10.)

Raw score	Benchmark range
4-5	Well-qualified
2-3	Somewhat Qualified
0-1	Unqualified

#	Response	Possible total per section
1	Implementation Unit Structure/Capacity	10
2	Encampment Site & Population to be Served	15
3	Core Services Delivery & Provision of Housing	20
4	Coordination of Services & Housing Options	20
5	Ensuring Dignity, Safety, and Wellness	15
6	Personnel	10
7	Proposed Budget and Fiscal Planning	10
Total possible Score		100

Part 1: Implementation Unit Structure and Capacity

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides *detailed* descriptions of the specific unit or office that will implement the grant. *Clearly identifies* the implementing unit’s mission, goals, values, geographic service area, and existing efforts and practices related to serving people living in encampments and *how these elements tie to the success* of the proposed project.
- Provides *clear and detailed* descriptions of the organization’s relevant existing partnerships and their ability to *effectively* develop new partnerships and collaborations. *Clearly connects* the new and existing partnership to success in support of services to people experiencing homelessness in encampments.
- Provides *clear and detailed* descriptions for how the entity’s structure and partnerships will specifically lead to efficient and effective implementation of the proposed project.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least two elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- *Generally* describes the specific unit or office that will implement the proposed project. *Partially* describes the implementing unit's mission, goals, values, geographic service area, and existing efforts and practices related to serving people living in encampments.
- *Generally* describes relevant existing partnerships and ability to develop new partnerships and collaborations in support of services to people experiencing homelessness in encampments. *Does not provide specific details* of how those partnerships will further the goals of the proposed project.
- *Generally* describes how the entity's structure and partnerships will support implementation of the proposed ERF Program *but lacks specificity* on the impact of those structures and partnerships on the proposed program.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- *Omits* a description of the unit or office that will implement the grant or provides a description that is *vague and unclear*. *Does not identify or fully omits* the implementing unit's mission, goals, values, geographic service area, and existing efforts and practices related to serving people living in encampments.
- Fails to describe or fully omits the organization's relevant existing partnerships. *Omits or inadequately describes* their ability to develop new partnerships and collaborations in support of services to people experiencing homelessness in encampments.
- *Omits* or provides a description that is *vague or confusing* of, how the entity's structure and partnerships will lead to efficient and effective implementation of the proposed ERF Program.

Part 2: Prioritized Encampment Site and Population to be Served

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides a *clear and detailed* description of the specific encampment site (as defined in RFA) and population to be served. The description *clearly describes all of the following*: the specific location, physical size of the area to be served, the types of structures people are residing in at the site, and any other relevant or notable physical characteristics of the site to be served.
- Provides the number of the individuals living in the area that the applicant is requesting funding to help resolve, any available demographic information or relevant shared characteristics of the people to be served, and a *clear and logical* description of the methodology used to determine this demographic information.
- Describes *clearly and thoroughly* why the selected encampment is being prioritized for resolution support including all relevant factors considered such as public health, safety, environmental hazards, demographic factors related to addressing racial equity or serving populations disproportionately impacted by homelessness, and/or impact of the encampment to the community at large.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least two elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Describes the specific encampment site (as defined within the RFA) and population to be served. The description *does not include* all of or *lack details* for the following factors: the specific location, physical size of the area to be served, the types of structures people are residing in at the site, and any other relevant or notable physical characteristics of the site to be served.
- Provides *only general* information on the number and demographics of the individuals living in the area that the applicant is requesting funding to serve. Provides a brief description of the methodology used to determine this demographic information, but the information may be vague or not well supported
- Generally describes why *this* specific encampment is being prioritized for resolution support and only *partially* addresses factors considered such as public health, safety, environmental hazards, demographic factors related to addressing racial equity or serving populations disproportionately impacted by homelessness, and/or impact of the encampment to the community at large.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- *Fails to* describe the specific encampment site (as defined in the RFA) and population to be served. The description *lacks most, or all* required factors including the specific location, physical size of the area to be served, the types of structures people are residing in at the site, and any other relevant or notable physical characteristics of the site to be served.
- *Omits or does not clearly* describe the number of the individuals living in the area that the applicant is requesting funding to serve. *Lacks meaningful* data on demographic information or relevant shared characteristics of the people to be served. *Omits* a description of the methodology used to determine this demographic information or describes a methodology that *does not make sense*.
- *Omits or fails* to describe and provide details for why the encampment is being prioritized for resolution support. *Mostly or entirely omits* factors considered such as public health, safety, environmental hazards, demographic factors related to addressing racial equity or serving populations disproportionately impacted by homelessness, and/or impact of the encampment to the community at large.

Part 3: Core Service Delivery and Provision of Housing Options

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- *Thoroughly* describes the proposed services, interim, and permanent housing solutions to be offered through the proposed project and how those services and housing options will be *tailored to effectively* meet the *specific* needs of the people served and address the health and safety challenges posed by the specific encampment site.

- Provides a *clear* description of how many individuals experiencing homelessness will be served by the proposed services and housing interventions and *specifically describes* how those services will *effectively* prioritize the health and wellness of the people served while supporting their transition out of the encampment site and into safe and stable housing.
- Provides a *clear and specific* description of how the proposed activities will *effectively* result in sustainable restoration of the encampment site to its original state or intended use *and* how this will be achieved while prioritizing the health and wellness of people experiencing homelessness.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least two elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- The response *lacks the detail* of a well-qualified responses but provides a *general and logical* description of the proposed services, interim, and permanent housing solutions to be offered through the proposed project and *generally* describes how those services and housing options will be tailored to meet the *overall* needs of the people served.
- Describes how many individuals experiencing homelessness will be served by the proposed services and housing options and but *lacks specificity* on how services will prioritize the health and wellness of the people served while support their transition out of the encampment site and into safe and stable housing.
- Provides a *general* description of how the proposed activities will result in sustainable restoration of the encampment site to its original state or intended use but *lacks specificity* on how this will be achieved while prioritizing the health and wellness of people experiencing homelessness.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- *Does not* include a description of a plan that provides all of the proposed services, interim, and permanent housing solutions to be offered through the proposed project or provides a description that *is not relevant* or *clearly tied to outcomes* for the population to be served.
- *Does not* address how many individuals experiencing homelessness will be served by the proposed services and housing options. *Omits* details on how the proposed services and housing options will be tailored to meet the specific needs of the people served and address the health and safety challenges posed by the specific encampment site.
- *Omits or fails* to describe of how the proposed activities will result in restoration of the encampment site to its original state or intended use or how this will be achieved while prioritizing the health and wellness of people experiencing homelessness.

Part 4: Coordination of Services and Housing Options

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Describes *clearly and specifically* how the entity will coordinate with local partners and align with other systems and *including* any new or innovative partnerships established in support of this program. *Clearly articulates how* those partnerships support the success of the proposed project.
- Provides *clear and specific* descriptions of new, enhanced, or innovative partnerships with State entities and/or philanthropy makes a *compelling and relevant* case for how they will result in new or enhanced models of service delivery in support of this project.
- Provides a *clear, relevant and logical* description of the intended coordinated approach and *specifically describes how* the approach is data-informed to assist individuals in the encampment and ensuring future outcomes can be measured.
- Provides Two Letters of Support from at least two different partners. The Letters of Support provide *clear, specific, and relevant* information demonstrating support and collaboration on the proposed project.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least two elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- *Generally* describes how the entity will coordinate with local partners and align with other systems but *may lack specificity* on any new or innovative partnerships established in support of this program. *Clearly articulates how* those partnerships support the success of the proposed project.
- *Generally* describes proposed partnerships with State entities and/or philanthropy and how they will result in new or enhanced models of service delivery in support of this project, but may be *less clear or compelling* than a well-qualified response.
- Provides a *logical but only general* description of the intended coordinated approach and *generally addresses* how the approach is data-informed to assist individuals in the encampment and ensuring future outcomes can be measured.
- Provides Two Letters of Support from at least two different partners. The Letters of Support provide *relevant but only general* information demonstrating support and collaboration on the proposed project.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- *Omits or fails* to describe how the entity will coordinate with local partners and align with other systems and *lacks details* on any new or innovative partnerships established in support of this program. *Lacks or provides irrelevant information* on how those partnerships support the success of the proposed project.
- *Omits* a description of proposed partnerships with State entities and/or philanthropy and how they will result in new or enhanced models or provides a description that is *vague, illogical, or not relevant* to the project.
- *Omits or fails* to describe the intended coordinated approach and *does not address* how the approach is data-informed to assist individuals in the

- encampment and ensuring future outcomes can be measured. *Lacks specific or relevant* data-informed method towards a sustainable solution.
- *Fails to* provides two Letters of Support from at least two different partners or provides letters that *do not provide relevant* information demonstrating support and collaboration on the proposed project.

Part 5: Ensuring Dignity, Safety, and Wellness

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides a *clear and detailed* description of how people with lived experience were included or consulted in the planning of this project. Describes *specific and relevant* activities that will support engagement with the people living in the encampment site in the implementation and assessment of the proposed project.
- Provide *clear and specific examples* for how the proposed project and activities exemplify Housing First values and how the proposed services and interventions will be non-punitive, trauma-informed and culturally appropriate.
- Provides a *clear and relevant* description of any local laws, ordinances, current or planned responses to community concerns regarding the encampment to be served, including any existing local encampment resolutions plans that may impact the intended project site. Describe any possible *specific* impacts on the proposed project and *clearly articulates* how they will navigate potentially conflicting intentions, to ensure that the proposed activities support the dignity, safety, and wellness of people experiencing homelessness within the encampment site.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least two elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides a *general* description of how people with lived experience were included or consulted in the planning of this project and the activities that will support engagement with the people living in the encampment site in the implementation and assessment of the proposed project.
- Provide a *general but relevant and clear* description for how the proposed project and activities exemplify Housing First values and how the proposed services and interventions will be non-punitive, trauma-informed and culturally appropriate.
- Provides a *broad* description of any local laws, ordinances, current or planned responses to community concerns regarding the encampment to be served, including any existing local encampment resolutions plans that may impact the intended project site, but may *lack specific details* on impacts to the proposed project and how they will navigate potentially conflicting intentions, to ensure that the proposed activities support the dignity, safety, and wellness of people experiencing homelessness within the encampment site.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- *Omits or provides a vague and irrelevant* description of how people with lived experience were included or consulted in the planning of this project. *Fails to describe meaningful activities* to support engagement with the people living in the encampment site in the implementation and assessment of the proposed project.
- *Omit a response or demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding* for Housing First, trauma-informed, culturally appropriate, and non-punitive strategies.
- *Omits or provides a vague and irrelevant* of local laws, ordinances, current or planned responses to community concerns regarding the encampment to be served. *Fails to describe relevant* possible impacts on the proposed project or how they will navigate potentially conflicting intentions, to ensure that the proposed activities support the dignity, safety, and wellness of people experiencing homelessness within the encampment site.

Part 6: Personnel

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides a *clear* list of all *relevant* administrative and programmatic positions serving under this proposal, including *all* of the following elements: their title, a brief description of their duties, and their approximate FTE for the grant project.
- Provides a *clear and relevant* description of factors that make the key staff for this project uniquely qualified to carry out this grant successfully, including factors such as specialized training, cultural competency, lived expertise, and demonstrable past success with similar projects.
- Includes a resume or, if the position is currently vacant, a duty statement for all positions providing services under this proposal.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least two elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provide a list of all administrative and programmatic positions serving under this proposal, though the connection of the positions to this project make be *less clear* than in a well-qualified response. Includes *all* the following elements: their title, a brief description of their duties, and their approximate FTE for the grant project.
- Provides a *general* description of factors that make the key staff for this project qualified to carry out this grant successfully but *may lack details* including factors such as specialized training, cultural competency, lived expertise, and demonstrable past success with similar projects.
- Includes a resume or, if the position is currently vacant, a duty statement for all positions providing services under this proposal.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- Minimum qualifications or duty statements are *missing or insufficient detailed*.
- Staff training and/or qualifications are not detailed.

- Narrative fails to provide evidence to show the organization’s personnel are qualified or how their time will be used.
- *Does not* include a resume or a duty statement for all positions providing services under this proposal.

Part 7: Proposed Budget and Fiscal Planning

Well Qualified (4-5)

Fully addresses all elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides a *clear, logical, and relevant* explanation of how the award amount requested was determined for the size of the proposed project and number of people to be served and a *clear and specific* description of how the project budget could be scaled up or down if more or fewer funds than the requested funds are available.
- *Clearly* identifies all the funds currently being used or anticipated to be used in support of the proposed project, including all federal, state, philanthropic and/or local funds, and the proportion of the project cost to be supported through this grant.
- Provides a *clear, relevant, and compelling* explanation of how the proposal will maximize use of resources for program services and how the funds requested through this grant and other leveraged funds reflect an efficient use of public dollars for the intended activities and outcomes.
- Describes *clear, specific, and relevant* strategies to ensure that 50% of allocated funds are expended by June 30, 2023, and 100% by June 30, 2024.
- Provides a *clear, relevant, and logical* budget narrative and line-item budget that demonstrates how resources made available through this grant will be allocated.

Somewhat Qualified (2-3)

Addresses at least three elements under this category in the RFA, as described below:

- Provides a *general but clear and relevant* explanation of how the award amount requested was determined for the size of the proposed project and number of people to be served. Provides a description of how the project budget could be scaled up or down if more or fewer funds than the requested funds are available but *lacks specificity*.
- *Clearly* identifies all the funds currently being used or anticipated to be used in support of the proposed project, including all federal, state, philanthropic and/or local funds, and the proportion of the project cost to be supported through this grant.
- Provides a *broad* explanation of how the proposal will maximize use of resources for program services but is *less detailed and compelling* in their case for how the funds requested through this grant and other leveraged funds reflect an efficient use of public dollars for the intended activities and outcomes.
- *Generally* describes *relevant* strategies to ensure that 50% of allocated funds are expended by June 30, 2023 and 100% by June 30, 2024.

- Provides a *clear, relevant, and logical* budget narrative and line-item budget that demonstrates how resources made available through this grant will be allocated.

Not Qualified (0-1)

Fails to adequately address at least two elements under this category in the RFA:

- *Omits or provides a vague, illogical, or not relevant* explanation of how the award amount requested was determined for the size of the proposed project and number of people to be served and how the project budget could be scaled up or down if more or fewer funds than the requested funds are available.
- *Fails to identify* all the funds currently being used or anticipated to be used in support of the proposed project, including all federal, state, philanthropic and/or local funds, and the proportion of the project cost to be supported through this grant.
- *Omits or provides a vague, illogical, or not relevant* explanation of how the proposal will maximize use of resources for program services and how the funds requested through this grant and other leveraged funds reflect an efficient use of public dollars for the intended activities and outcomes.
- *Omits* strategies to ensure that all funds will be spent by the required timelines or submits strategies that are *illogical or not relevant* to the requirement.
- *Omits* budget narrative and line-item budget or provides submission that *does not* demonstrate how resources made available through this grant will be allocated.

**HOMELESS COORDINATING AND FINANCING COUNCIL (HCFC)
Encampment Resolution Funding (ERF) Program**

915 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 651-2820
www.hcfc.ca.gov



November 2, 2021

**Encampment Resolution Funding (ERF) Program
Applicant Conference**

ADDENDUM #1

To all Prospective Applicants:

This addendum hereby revises the RFA for the Encampment Resolution Funding (ERF) program released on 10/29/2021. The revision are as follows:

1. HCFC has added the following item under Section II. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:

- Local Jurisdiction – a city or charter city, a county or charter county, or a city and county, including a charter city and county.
- Continuum of Care – as defined in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

2. HCFC has added the following details for the Applicant Conference as follows:

HCFC is excited to announce that there will be two ERF Applicant Conferences on November 19, 2021. Applicants can choose to attend the first conference at 9:30 am or the second conference at 1:00 pm. These conferences will last an hour each and are for informational purposes only, attendance is not mandatory. Please email all questions to hnap@bcsh.ca.gov by 5pm November 12, 2021. See next page for conference registration information.

Conference Agenda:

- I. Welcome and Introduction
- II. RFA Overview
- III. Answer questions submitted to HCFC
- IV. Live Question (if time permits)

Register for the session you would like to attend conference by clicking the links below.
Register before November 19, 2021.

Session 1: November 19, 2021 @ **09:30 AM** Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Register in advance for this webinar:

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_nwhj5IYyQhSPMSHv8PIZAq

Session 2: November 19, 2021 @ **01:00 PM** Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Register in advance for this webinar:

https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_INrWdRdsSqC1O39xNPT9hg

ERF RFA Addendum 2 - Questions and Answers

The following questions were submitted by email or asked during the Applicant's Conferences on November 19, 2021. The answers that follow are part of the Request for Applications (RFA) referenced above and serve as an addendum to the information originally published on Friday, October 29, 2021.

The answers below provide general direction in direct response to questions submitted for this RFA and are given without consideration for impact to an application's score. Please reference the RFA for the potential impact on scoring of the applications.

Questions

Question 1: Do encampments, that are spread throughout the region, qualify for the encampment grant opportunity, to count as a specific encampment?

Answer: The ERF grant is not intended to address all encampments in a jurisdiction. ERF is a competitive grant, as referenced in *part 2* of the RFA scoring matrix, a specific location, physical size must be identified and the reason the location was selected must explained concisely.

Question 2: For Counties that do not currently have any encampments 50 people or larger, can we apply for the Encampment Resolution Funding Grant either by Jurisdiction to address all encampments in that jurisdiction, or as a County to address all encampments or most encampments in the County.

Answer: Per statute we will prioritize proposals to serve encampments with over 50 individuals, however the RFA does not require encampments must have 50 people or more. The council seeks proposals that are innovative and scalable, and that prioritize the wellness and safety of individuals experiencing homelessness in encampments and we encourage proposals to serve all types and sizes of encampments.

Question 3: Would a nonprofit, endorsed by the Cities, be eligible to submit one grant application on behalf of multiple cities?

Answer: Eligible Applicants as listed under section 2 of RFA are as follows: Cities, Counties and Continuum of Care. However, eligible applicants are encourage to establish partnerships, including with nonprofit entities, as part of their proposal.

Question 4: What is the definition of “cross-systems collaboration”?

Answer: HCFC encourages collaborative partnerships amongst COCs, cities, counties, state and federal government, philanthropy, systems within the same entities and non-profit organizations. Partnerships can also be systems within the same entities such as healthcare, behavioral health, workforce, education, etc.

Question 5: Are there examples for Section III. Application, C, Part 5 (Ensuring Dignity, Safety, and Wellness) particularly as related to any current or planned responses to community concerns regarding the encampment to be served and how the entity will implement the proposed project and navigate potentially conflicting intentions, to ensure that the proposed activities support the dignity, safety, and wellness of the people experiencing homelessness within the encampment site.”

Answer: Responses to this prompt will vary by community so HCFC does not have specific examples, though generally this could refer to local ordinances or action plans related to encampments. Applicants are encouraged to provide solutions addressing all things related to improving the safety, wellness and dignity of people experiencing homelessness in encampments within the context of the local political, regulatory, and community landscape.

Question 6: For Section III. Application, C, Part 6: (Personnel), can resumes and duty statements of the individuals be persons who are currently working for the city or people who are currently contracted with the city?

Answer: Yes, there must be supporting narratives to justify their involvement in the proposed project.

Question 7: Can multiple jurisdictions collaborate and submit a single application? For example, a County is interested in taking the lead to submit an application for a large encampment area that covers five different jurisdictions (County and 4 cities).

Answer: HCFC encourages collaboration, however there can only be one applicant. Each application must identify and focus on one encampment site; however, the encampment site may be broadly defined. Each application will need to describe and define the purpose(s) of their application, the site and population to be served. See page 6 (“C. Part 2: Prioritized Encampment Site”) in the RFA.

Question 8: Please define “closely linked community of encampments”.

Answer: This will vary across jurisdiction and proposals must identify how encampments in their service area are linked, such as by geographic features or specific shared challenges or barriers experienced by the individuals in the encampments.

Question 9: Please advise if there is a maximum award limit under this grant opportunity?

Answer: ERF program does not have an established award limit. Budgets submitted must be comprehensive. Applications will be scored based partly on reasonableness and cost effectiveness of proposed budget.

Question 10: Can funding be used to purchase a specific type of permanent or interim housing such as pallet shelters single/multi-family houses, pallet/tiny home shelters, hotels, indoor/outdoor emergency shelters, sites accommodating RV’s, site clean-up, waste removal, moving costs with relocation, and storing property for former residents of the camp site etc.? What about housing operational costs (e.g., utilities, insurance, maintenance) and on-site staffing that supports sustainable outcomes?

Answer: ERF Funding is highly flexible; we encourage a wide range of innovative proposals for using funds in support of encampment resolution. Applications will be scored based on effectiveness of funding allocation as it relates to all scored factors per the RFA.

Question 11: Are we able to submit two unique applications?

Answer: The intent for the program is to award grants, to the extent feasible, to a range of applicants that represent the diversity of communities across the state, including rural, urban, and suburban communities. As such, it is unlikely that more than one award will be made to the same applicant within the same jurisdiction.

Question 12: Can funding be used for staffing and any restrictions on staffing types? For instance, could it fund an analyst for data and reporting?

Answer: Yes, Part 6 of the RFA scoring matrix states: *a clear list of all relevant administrative and programmatic positions serving under this proposal, including all the following elements: their title, a brief description of their duties, and their approximate FTE for the grant project.*

Question 13: Is there a time limit to use of funds for interim or permanent housing (i.e., for a specific period of months per person)?

Answer: While there is no specific limit of how long funds may be used for specific services, recipients must expend at least 50% of their total grant funding allocation by 6/30/2023 and 100% by 6/30/2024.

Question 14: Eligible Activities. May applicants apply for funding for one or more of the four categories but not all of the categories. For example, if we leverage funding to meet our needs for capacity building, could we just apply for direct services and housing options and admin?

Answer: Yes, leveraged funding is encouraged and ERF program is flexible and can fund activities that are well supported in proposal narratives.

Question 15: The city is currently partnering with Caltrans to perform outreach on Caltrans property. Could this be considered a string of connected encampments because of the specificity of the location?

Answer: Possibly, applicants are highly encouraged to submit proposals with demonstrated partnerships and make their case for how that partnership will support a specific encampment or closely related community of encampments.

Question 16: Could a jurisdiction focus on a target population at multiple encampments (e.g. Women experiencing homelessness)? Would that impact the competitiveness of the application?

Answer: While applicants may choose to submit a proposal that focuses on services tailored to specific subpopulations experiencing

homelessness in encampments, the intent of this program is to serve a specific site rather than all sites across a jurisdiction.

Question 17: Can applicants submit more than two letters of support for a proposed project under the ERF grant?

Answer: Yes, there are no maximum limit for letters of support.

Question 18: Is it necessary to have site control (and/or intended housing built) prior to the application deadline?

Answer: No, however proposal must describe how the applicant will ensure funds will be fully spent by deadline.

Question 19: Are there other funding sources that you would recommend exploring?

Answer: It is the applicant's responsibility to develop their strategy for leveraged funding (as applicable) to support their proposal. However, HCFC's website provides resources, see link:

https://www.bcsb.ca.gov/hcfc/documents/covid19_strategic_guide_new_funds.pdf

Question 20: Given that encampments have ebb and flow to of people residing there may proposals focus on individuals moving across encampments instead of on a specific encampment location?

Answer: The purpose ERF program is to serve a specific location, applicants are encouraged to provide narratives that describe how they will address in-flow & out-flow of individuals in the area to be served to support a meaningful path towards permanent housing for the people in the service area.

Question 21: May a demonstration project that has already commenced be considered for the purpose of this grant program?

Answer: Yes, provided that it is convincingly supported by the project narrative and proposal. Existing projects that are supported by leveraged funding and partnerships are encouraged.

Question 22: Should projects be assumed to start on July 1, 2022, and end June 2024 for a 24-month performance period?

Answer: Not necessarily, grant project funding periods begin once grants are awarded and conclude by June 30, 2024, but project periods may extend beyond this period with leveraged funding.

Question 23: Must all application requirements be met regardless of activity, or if they are applicable dependent on the activity chosen?

Answer: Applicants must address all areas required in the RFA and, if they believe a requirement is not applicable to their proposal, must explain why.

Question 24: Ongoing Monitoring. How is a jurisdiction expected to monitor ongoing success at an encampment location given that the composition of an encampment likely will change from application time to award and beyond?

Answer: Applicants should describe a proposed methodology for monitoring and measuring success for your project. The purpose of this grant is to create new and innovative models for serving and measuring success of serving people experiencing homelessness in encampments.

Question 25: Because funds will likely be disbursed in spring or summer of 2022, and the application requires us to identify an active encampment, will the state reimburse or allow us to use a similar model presented to the state on a different encampment if the proposed project is addressed prior to receiving the award?

Answer: Proposals should reflect the encampments that they intend to serve at the time that funds are awarded. If there was an established model previously used effectively then you may submit a proposal that applies this model to a different encampment.

Question 26: Are proposals required to be scalable because additional funds will be available to scale these projects? If so, when?

Answer: There may be more or less funding available per grantee based on amount of proposals selected for the funding available, therefore proposals must demonstrate ability to scale down or up as needed. As for the long term future funding, the State is looking for models that can be effective anywhere within the state to consider supporting with other funds, depending on availability of dollars and feasibility of the projects selected.

Question 27: Would the development and operation for a Navigation Center be an eligible use of Encampment Resolution Funding Program funds?

Answer: The Encampment Resolution Program funds are intended to be very flexible and we encourage applicants to use them on a wide range of activities, including new or innovative service delivery models. While the activities described below may be an eligible use of these funds, this is a competitive grant and in your proposal you would make the case, per the RFA scoring requirements, for why this activity should be awarded funds.

Question 28: Does the grant require a formal council resolution authorizing the submittal of the application?

Answer: While we do not require a formal resolution from our grantee's governing bodies as part of the application process, grantees are responsible for adhering to their local governing body requirements for taking actions such as applying for new funds.

Question 29: Are COG's eligible to apply, or only Cities and CoC? Are cities allowed to apply jointly, or as a cohort of three cities?

Answer: Per California Health and Safety Code section 50250, eligible applicants for this program are CoC's, counties, and cities. While we are encouraging local entities to partner in these efforts and describe their partnerships in their proposals, for the purposes of application only an individual entity (city, county, or CoC) may apply.

Question 30: What are the documentation requirement for proving that we're serving the encampment identified in the proposal?

Answer: Awardees will be required to submit quarterly and annual reporting, HCFC will monitor project progress and may perform audits as needed.

Question 31: What happens if the selected encampment is dispersed part way through the project? The people are still experiencing homelessness but have been forced to relocate to a different part of the city or even a different city within the county or region?

Answer: HCFC recognizes that there will be movement with encampment populations, the purpose of ERF is to serve a specific location, applicants are encouraged to provide narratives to address in-flow & out-flow of encampments.

Question 32: If we started a new promising, replicable model 4 years ago (and have now implemented it many times) and want to continue to replicate it - is that eligible?

Answer: Yes, a model can be implemented from an existing encampment and details for the successful experience implementing the model should be presented with the proposal.

ERF RFA Addendum 3 - Edits

1. On page 9, struck “planning PDF” and inserted Cognito “portal”
2. On page 15, struck “5rfcd v” and materially edited the fields in #1. Now, applicants are additionally prompted about the implementing organization and specific unit or office.
3. On page 30, Question #13, edited the action and date, “. . .recipients must **expend** at least 50% of their total grant funding allocation by 6/30/**2023** . . .”
4. On pages 31-32, Question #22, inserted qualifier, “. . . grant project funding periods begin once grants are awarded and conclude **by** June 30, 2024 . . .”
5. Struck the descriptor letters of “intent” or commitment” and inserted letters of “support” – this does not affect the substance
6. Edited pagination in the Table of Contents