

The Placer Continuum of Care is honored to host the

Twenty-Second Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable
Bridgeway Lakes Boathouse, 3650 Southport Parkway, West Sacramento, CA 95691

Thursday, November 19, 2009

8:30 am – 3:00 pm

AGENDA
Regional Coordination

- 8:30 a.m. **Gathering and Networking**
- 9:00 **Welcome and Introductions**
- 9:30 **Presentation by Placer Continuum of Care about Regional Coordination**
- Janice Critchlow, CoC Coordinator
 - Pam Herman, HomeAid Sacramento
- 10:00 **Regional Coordination and Planning**
- Speakers:
 - Gail Locke, Dos Rios Continuum of Care
 - Beetle Barbour, Central Sierra Continuum of Care
 - Group Discussion
- (Break during morning session)**
- 12:15 **Lunch**
- 1:15 **HUD Updates & Quick NOFA Review**
- Larry Wuerstle, Community Planning and Development Office, California State Office, U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development
- 1:30 **Regional Coordination: Advocacy on Homelessness Issues- Housing California**
- Zack Olmstead, Housing California
- 2:15 **Discussion about Implementation of Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing (HPRP) Program**
- 2:50 **HEARTH: McKinney-Vento Reauthorization**
- 3:00 **Adjourn**

To join the Roundtable list-serve, send a blank email to norcalcoc-subscribe@yahogroups.com
To join the Roundtable wiki (online shared workspace), send an email to
bridget@homebaseccc.org or Jason@homebaseccc.org.

The Northern/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable Roundtable Goal and History

Goal: The Northern/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable is led by delegates in homeless continuums of care in the California Northern and Central Valley communities. Its goal is to create regular opportunities for homeless continua participants to foster an exchange of information and to build community between continuum communities. April 2004

History

- **How to Develop Local Homeless Policy**, hosted by The Placer Consortium on Homelessness and Affordable Housing (PCOH), in Roseville, CA, on April 29, 2004
- **The Housing First Model**, hosted by Yolo County Homeless Coalition, in Woodland, CA, on July 29, 2004
- **Discharge Planning to Prevent Homelessness**, hosted by Sacramento County & Cities Board on Homelessness, in Sacramento, CA, on Oct. 26, 2004
- **Local Corrections Systems**, hosted by HUD Sacramento Field Office and California HCD, in Sacramento, CA, on Feb. 24, 2005
- **Housing First Model, 10 Year Plans, Prop 63**, hosted by Greater Chico Homeless Task Force/Butte Continuum of Care, in Oroville, CA, on May 5, 2005
- **Homeless Counts; Engaging Law Enforcement**, The Merced Continuum of Care Collaborative, in Merced, CA, on July 28, 2005
- **Interacting with Media, MHSA, Medical Care**, hosted by The City of Redding & Shasta County Homeless Continuum of Care, in Redding, CA, on Oct. 21, 2005
- **Advocacy Issues; Paul Boden & Megan Schatz**, hosted by The Stanislaus Housing and Supportive Services Collaborative, in Modesto, CA, on Feb. 23, 2006
- **HMIS Best Practices & Input on 10 Year Plan**, hosted by The San Joaquin Continuum of Care, in Stockton, CA, on July 27, 2006
- **Role & Enhancement of Roundtable Infrastructure**, The Planning Committee Retreat, in Sacramento, CA on August 24, 2006
- **Housing Models & Their Application in Member CoC**, hosted by The Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness, in Visalia, CA, on Oct. 19, 2006
- **10-Year Strategic Planning, Extreme Weather Preparedness**, hosted by The Yolo County Homeless Coalition, in Sacramento, CA, on Feb. 15, 2007
- **Continuum Improvement & Development**, hosted by The Chico/Paradise/Butte Continuum of Care, in Sacramento, CA, on May 17, 2007
- **Advocacy; Federal, State & Local Levels**, hosted by The Fresno-Madera Continuum of Care, in Sacramento, CA, on August 16, 2007
- **Hospital Discharge Planning**, hosted by The Redding/Shasta County Continuum of Care Council, in Redding, CA, on Nov. 15, 2007
- **SSI Advocacy**, hosted by HUD Sacramento Field Office, California HCD and HomeBase, in Sacramento, CA, on Feb. 21, 2008
- **Housing Development 101: Focus on PSH**, hosted by Central Sierra (Amador, Calaveras and Tuolumne) Continuum of Care, in Jackson, CA, on May, 22, 2008
- **Rapid Rehousing for Families, Housing Operations 101**, hosted by HUD Sacramento Field Office, via Conference Call, on August 28, 2008
- **Project Homeless Connect, Homeless Count**, hosted by The Sacramento Continuum of Care, in Sacramento, CA, on December 4, 2008
- **Homeless Programs: Surviving and Thriving**, hosted by Yolo County Housing and Poverty Action Coalition, in West Sacramento, CA, on February 26, 2009
- **How Do We Capitalize on What's Happening Now?**, hosted by The Fresno-Madera Continuum of Care, in Fresno, CA, on May 28, 2009
- **HMIS Data Standards**, hosted by the Roundtable Planning Committee, via Conference Call, on August 27, 2009.

Placer County

Homeless Continuum of Care: Placer Consortium on Homelessness (PCOH)

Emergency Housing

Tahoe Women's Services Safe House: North Lake Tahoe; serves CA and Nevada

PEACE for Families: Emergency shelter, transitional housing for battered women in recovery, and HUD transitional housing for domestic violence survivors

The Gathering Inn: Nomadic shelter supported by over 60 faith congregations. Depending on facility can house 50-70 persons a night. Can increase those served or open a second facility on cold nights. Provides case management, substance abuse treatment, clothing closet, and community health clinic

Transitional Housing

Acres of Hope: Faith-based program for women with children

Adult System of Care/Advocates for Mentally Ill Housing: For clients of the Adult System of Care

Hope, Help & Healing: Sober living

New Leaf Counseling: Homeless women with substance abuse issues who have children

Re-Entry Program: Generally serves men and women coming from jail or prison; housing available for families

Roseville Home Start: Families with children

St. Vincent de Paul New Beginnings: Families with children

The Lazarus Project: Single men and single women

Transitional Housing Placement - Plus: Former foster youth

Permanent Housing

City of Roseville: Housing Choice Voucher program

County of Placer: Housing Choice Voucher program

Adult System of Care: HUD Permanent Supportive Housing, Shelter + Care

Advocates for Mentally Ill Housing: Opening Timberline House in 2010

The Lazarus Project: One house

Interim Care Project: Funded by Sutter for homeless people leaving the Sutter Auburn Faith or Sutter Roseville hospitals

Sierra Foothills AIDS Foundation: Provides comprehensive support services to people living with HIV or AIDS and their families. Serves Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, and Alpine Counties

Other

Food Closet Collaborative

The Salvation Army – Auburn and Roseville

Family Resource Centers in Lincoln, Roseville, Auburn, and North Tahoe

Placer Collaborative Network

Philosophy

To end homelessness in Placer County by bringing people together to develop, coordinate and support projects, services and resources that will enhance our community's abilities to end homelessness. Four main strategies: Prevention, Access to Services, Teamwork, and Housing.

Comparative Information on Counties

County	El Dorado	Nevada	Placer	Sacramento	Yolo
General Info					
Square miles	1,711	958	1,404	966	1,013
	S. Lake Tahoe	Truckee	North Tahoe		
2008 estimated population	176,075	97,118	341,945	1,394,154	197,658
Population per square mile	91.3	96.1	176.9	1,266.6	166.5
1/09 Homeless Count		320	616	2,800	491
Ten-Year Plan			Yes	Yes	12/09
Staff			≈ 9 hours a week	Plan staff; County staff	≈ 1/2 CoC/grantwriter
HUD SHP funding					
2009 initial pro rata need	\$176,801	\$146,878	\$267,358	≈ \$4,198,193	\$306,893
Hold harmless amount		0	\$517,825	\$9,487,934 (2008)	\$415,045
Maximum permanent housing bonus (15% of initial pro rata need)	\$26,520	\$22,032	\$40,104	≈ \$629,729	\$46,034
Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG)					
Direct allocation from HUD	0	0	0	Elk Grove: \$119,050 Sac City: \$254,622 Sac County: \$256,943	0
2009 FESG awards (competitive applications funded by HCD)	\$70,000	\$200,000	\$175,270 (1 out of 3 funded)	0	\$141,507 (1 out of 5 funded)
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Entitlement Jurisdictions	0	0	Rocklin: \$203,163 Roseville: \$513,846	Citrus Heights: \$643,667 Elk Grove: \$500,738 Rancho Cordova: \$692,016 Sac City: \$5,793,772 Sac County: \$5,833,913	Davis: \$809,087 Woodland: \$581,852
Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing (HPRP) ARRA					
Direct allocation from HUD	0	0	0	Sac City: \$2,375,126 Sac County: \$2,396,773	0
HCD competitive grants	0	\$1,600,000	\$1,243,482	0	\$1,600,000

Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

November 19, 2009

Working Across Borders: Regional Collaboration

Benefits of Regional Collaboration

A growing number of homeless people are seeking services from agencies without regard to jurisdictional boundaries. For example, a recent Sacramento Bee article indicated that at least 30 percent of people seeking services at The Gathering Inn in Roseville come from outside Placer County. The agency also stated that many of the phone calls they receive are from Sacramento County residents asking for help. Despite the flow of demand for services across political boundaries there is very little broad scale, sustained collaboration between neighboring communities.

Approximately 30% of homeless people seeking services at The Gathering Inn in Roseville come from outside Placer County

However, there is increasing recognition that many homelessness issues may be best addressed at a regional level, and in conjunction with other initiatives. In a recent speech HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan discussed the benefits of pairing housing development initiatives with other issues of public concern, such as education, energy efficiency, and reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This type of collaboration and coordination could create new opportunities for homeless and affordable housing providers. For instance, a recent Housing California bulletin indicated that adoption of greenhouse gas reduction targets could result in large scale rezoning efforts that may make it easier to build affordable housing in many communities.

Key Principles

In order to effectively address many of today's most compelling homelessness issues, providers and government agencies are increasingly finding it necessary to work collaboratively across jurisdictional lines and other boundaries. While there is no single model for regional collaboration that will work in all situations, there are several principles that can be adapted to suit the unique needs and interests various communities.

- 1. Find a common purpose or interest to use as a catalyst.** Regional collaboration becomes more compelling when people and organizations recognize that they are more likely to achieve their goals by working together than by acting independently. The objectives of regional collaboration may include one or more of the following: (1) building knowledge and understanding; (2) building community (or a sense of place and regional identity); (3) sharing resources; (4) providing input and advice; and/or (5) advocating for a particular outcome. For those interested in increasing the stock of affordable housing or serving homeless people, framing the collaboration as an effort to correct systemic and market inefficiencies, rather than creating a welfare program for the needy, may help

Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

November 19, 2009

broaden the scope of people and organizations willing to contribute time and resources.

2. **Organize around leaders with collaborative leadership styles.** Regional initiatives require leaders who are comfortable crossing jurisdictional and disciplinary lines to forge working alliances with people who have diverse goals and viewpoints. Leaders accustomed to exercising authority by taking unilateral action or using “command and control” style models of leadership may be less effective in regional collaboration settings.

7 Regional Collaboration Principles

1) Find a common purpose or interest to use as a catalyst.

2) Organize around leaders with collaborative leadership styles.

3) Define the region to match the “territory of the problem”.

4) Identify and gather the proper resources.

5) Jointly determine where to go and how to get there.

6) Form a plan to move from vision to action.

7) Plan to sustain the collaborative effort until all objectives have been achieved.

3. **Define the region to match the “territory of the problem”.** Geographical boundaries can help inform the scope of regional collaboration, but precise borders may be less important to successful regional efforts than clarifying core areas of interest and the key stakeholders concerned about those topics.

4. **Identify and gather the proper resources.** Communities that are launching and/or sustaining collaborative efforts often benefit from continual reassessment of the resources they possess and those they need to acquire. Periodically asking the following questions can help a regional collaboration thrive: (1) what resources (people, skills, information, funds) are needed/available to work across boundaries? (2) Where can we find additional resources? (3) Who can help identify sources of funds and assistance? (4) How can available resources be used to stimulate more interest in the project?

5. **Jointly determine where to go and how to get there.** Investing time and energy to jointly articulate outcomes and strategies helps to create a shared vision for change. This process can involve lengthy negotiation among stakeholders concerning their preferred outcomes and action steps until common goals are identified.

6. **Form a plan to move from vision to action.** Regional efforts may benefit from careful strategizing about how to win political support by building bridges and coordinating actions, and by linking their

work to established decision-making systems. For example, an existing regional institution may, as part of its regular responsibilities, be charged with identifying and understanding the scope of housing affordability problems on a regional level and creating a forum for discussion.

7. **Plan to sustain the collaborative effort until all objectives have been achieved.** Early planning can help regional collaboratives to continue to function effectively until all goals have been reached. A region may decide to maintain a simple network to facilitate communication and exchange information. In other

Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

November 19, 2009

situations, it may make sense to create a more formal partnership by negotiating some type of compact or otherwise integrating regional efforts into existing institutions. Another option is to create a new organization - either a new regional agency with governing or regulatory power, or a non-government entity that can serve as a convener and coordinator for future regional work.

Sample Approaches to Regional Collaborations

San Joaquin Valley Housing Trust (SJV Housing Trust)

The SJV Housing Trust is a California public benefit corporation established by the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley to assist cities in the San Joaquin Valley achieve their housing goals. The SJV Housing Trust works with California Partnership to employ comprehensive and coordinated regional housing strategies focused on: (1) meeting the housing needs of farm, factory, service and office workforces; (2) creating mixed-income, high density, transit oriented developments; (3) preserving home ownership and multifamily housing opportunities; (4) encouraging regulatory reform to remove obstacles and reduce costs; (4) incentivizing housing trust funds within local jurisdictions; and (5) providing additional, flexible resources to facilitate the creation of affordable housing. The SJV Housing Trust's Board of Directors is composed primarily of representatives of the eight Valley Councils of Government, and some affordable housing developers, housing advocates, and others. The SJV Housing Trust coordinates a variety of initiatives to foster the development of affordable housing. One such effort is the Small Communities Community and Economic Development Network and Workshop Series, which stemmed from the growing awareness that small cities often face some of the largest barriers to creating sustainable, healthy communities for a variety of reasons, many of which are not shared by the larger cities, but which are shared with each other. These workshops are designed to focus on only the needs of these small communities so that they can work together in innovative ways to build their own capacity and to increase quality of living for their residents. The Trust also coordinates the San Joaquin Valley Foreclosure Task Force, designed to provide a comprehensive Valley-wide response to mitigate the negative impact of foreclosures on borrowers and communities. The Task Force is a collaborative effort between non-profit agencies, local, state and federal governments, academics, consumers, financial institutions and servicers to assist with coordinating, organizing and building off of local efforts on a regional scale. The SJV Housing Trust attributes much of the support it receives in local communities to its affiliation with the California Partnership, which is backed by the Governor and other high-profile leaders.

Together for California's Future (T4CF)

T4CF was a grassroots coalition of organizations representing the interests of teachers, firefighters, law enforcement officers, healthcare advocates, working families, and others who organized to advocate for solutions to California's recent budget crisis other than reducing or eliminating funding for education and safety net services. Members included public employee unions, the California Association of Food Banks, Center for Public Health Advocacy, California Church IMPACT, California Food Policy Advocates, California

Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

November 19, 2009

Immigrant Policy Center, League of Conservation Voters, Planned Parenthood, Health Access, Sierra Club, Western Center on Law and Poverty, and more. One of T4CF's primary strategies was educating the public about the effects of State budget cuts and the need for leadership in Sacramento to find alternatives. T4CF issued frequent updates, talking points memos in multiple languages, calls for action, and advocacy tools such as guides and sample letters to assist individuals to contact their elected officials. Regional T4CF groups organized dozens of local actions including letter writing campaigns, phone calls, and visits to legislators; statewide days of action; local events including bake sales, tabling at farmers' markets, and press conferences; among other things. T4CF disbanded following the passage of a State budget.

Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC)

The SNRPC is a collaborative effort by Clark County, multiple Southern Nevada cities, and the Clark County School District to address various challenges, including homelessness, education, health care, and transportation. SNRPC is a formal entity created by an interlocal agreement. Members of its board are elected officials appointed by the participating county, cities, and school district. SNRPC employs staff and prepares an annual budget, which apportions costs among SNRPC members. In 2004, the SNRPC established the Committee on Homelessness (CoH) to create and implement regional strategies for preventing and reducing homelessness. After a 10-month community process, SNRPC and the CoH formed a 10-point plan for the region called Help Hope Home, parts of which have been incorporated into the City of Las Vegas' 10 Year Plan. Help Hope Home coordinates the efforts of the public, non-profit and private sectors in Southern Nevada to provide outreach, housing, food, mental health services, employment training, case management and support services to enable homeless families and individuals to become self-sufficient. All Southern Nevada CoC efforts and strategic plan implementation strategies are coordinated through Help Home Home.

**Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable
Regional Coordination Discussion
November 19, 2009**

- What experience do you have within your community and your continuum with coordinating regionally?

- How might we benefit from or, what might we want to achieve by coordinating regionally, on a local regional level and a Central Valley/Northern California level?

- Where are there potential opportunities for regional approaches to address homelessness? What are obstacles?

- How is Federal stimulus money slated to be used in our counties to prevent homelessness and how might that affect or spur regional coordination? How do we make those connections?

- How might regional coordination alleviate the effects of the economic crisis on our homeless systems?

- What existing regional bodies might be a good vehicle for improving regional coordination on homelessness? Which organizations will have a common language, a common goal?

- What can the Roundtable and its members do to further contribute to regional coordination? What steps will we take next?

Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

November 19, 2009

Program Launch: Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing

Earlier this year, HUD commenced the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing Program (HPRP) as authorized by the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA). Several communities in Northern California and the Central Valley currently or will soon receive HPRP funds, either through direct allocations from HUD or via California's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). In October, some providers began opening their doors to clients.

PROGRAM PARAMETERS

HPRP provides financial assistance and services to either prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless or to help those who are experiencing homelessness to be quickly re-housed and stabilized. There are four categories of eligible activities, all of which are ultimately focused on achieving housing outcomes: financial assistance (including rental and utility assistance, moving costs, and motel vouchers); housing relocation and stabilization (including case management, outreach, legal services, and life skills instruction); data collection and evaluation (including costs associated with HMIS for HPRP); and administrative costs.

OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

Communities are using a variety of strategies to let people know about HPRP and to facilitate access to these resources. For example, some Bay Area communities are using the United Way's 211 system as a central access point to share information with the public and to refer people into HPRP. Other HPRP collaborations are de-centralized, allowing clients to access or be referred to resources through homeless and social services providers, soup kitchens, outreach teams, mainstream benefits offices, family resource centers, multi-service centers, legal services providers, and other less conventional sites. Additionally, many HPRP plans committed most or all of their rapid re-housing funds to housing households already in emergency shelter or graduating from transitional housing.

Of the providers receiving funding directly from HUD, many report overwhelming demand for HPRP resources; however, these same providers say that many people looking for help are ineligible for HPRP. They are trying to refer these ineligible households to other resources where they are available, but many agencies are becoming bogged down in the screening process. Some HPRP collaborations receiving money through HCD have reported that they started receiving calls for services long before financial resources became available. The question of appropriate marketing and referral systems looms large as providers balance staff capacity, available resources, and demand.

SCREENING & ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Many communities report that one of the most significant challenges in administering HPRP is determining who would be homeless *but for* HPRP assistance. Similarly, many providers are struggling to determine how much assistance to provide to keep a household stable while using resources as efficiently as possible. To tackle these barriers, communities are using new tools to

Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

November 19, 2009

help them screen potential participants and assess whether a household will succeed once time-limited resources are exhausted.

COORDINATING WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

HUD strongly encourages HPRP grantees and sub-grantees to coordinate with other ARRA resources. The HPRP regulations explicitly state that activities covered under a different ARRA funding stream (such as employment or mortgage assistance) cannot be billed under HPRP. Additionally, in this year's Continuum of Care application, CoCs had to explain how they were coordinating HPRP, other CoC activities, and other HUD-managed ARRA funding.

DATA COLLECTION & REPORTING

ARRA specifically requires HPRP grantees to report client-level data, such as demographic characteristics, in a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) or comparable client-level database. In July 2009, HUD published its Revised HMIS Data and Technical Standards to outline the required data elements for HPRP. In September, HUD published further guidance on HPRP definitions, general reporting requirements, and filing requirements for the Initial Performance Report (IPR) and Quarterly Performance Reports (QPR). Additional requirements continue to be published.

HCD RECIPIENTS

For communities receiving funds through HCD, the application process, data collections, administrative funds available, and draw down process add an additional layer of complications.

Discussion Questions:

What engagement strategies are you preparing to use? How will you be doing assessment and screening?

How do you engage with existing systems of care? ARRA programs?

What challenges do you foresee in collecting and reporting data?

What challenges or benefits are you facing/expecting in regard to working with HCD?

Do you anticipate any spend-down problems (either too quickly or not quickly enough)?

How can we support each other in implementing strong programs?

MEMORANDUM

TO: Northern California/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable

FROM: HomeBase

RE: Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (“HEARTH”): Reauthorizing and Modifying the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987

DATE: November 19, 2009

Background:

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 (“McKinney-Vento”) has provided the backbone and funding of the Homeless Assistance grants, including Emergency Shelter Grants (“FESG”), Supportive Housing Program, and Shelter Plus Care. On May 20, 2009, President Obama signed the HEARTH Act into law, reauthorizing the McKinney-Vento Act and making the following key changes to McKinney-Vento:

- **Appropriations:** Authorizes \$2.203 billion in funding for fiscal year 2010, an increase of nearly \$600 million compared to current funding levels.
- **Possibly Expanded Funding Streams:** Renewal of expiring contracts for leasing, rental assistance, or operating costs associated with permanent housing can be funded either through McKinney appropriations or through Section 8 Project-based Rental Assistance. Some new permanent housing contracts may be partially funded through Section 8 Project-based Rental Assistance as well.
- **Continuum of Care Programs:** Collapses the Supportive Housing Program, Shelter Plus Care Program, Safe Havens for Homeless Individuals Demonstration Program, and Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Assistance for Single-Room Occupancy Dwellings into one Continuum of Care (“CoC”) Program with one set of requirements.
 - CoC project sponsors can use up to 10% (up from 5%) of their grant amount to cover administrative costs.
 - Match will be simplified to 25% cash or in-kind match for all activities (except leasing and admin which will continue to have no match).
 - Operating costs include coordination of services to ensure long-term housing stability.
 - Capital costs are no longer capped and the use requirement has changed from 20 years to 15 years.
- **Emergency Shelter Grants:** Changes the Emergency Shelter Grant Program to the Emergency Solutions Grant (“ESG”) and now emphasizes prevention and re-housing. ESG recipients will need to coordinate with their local CoC process and participate in

the Homeless Management Information System (“HMIS”). Up to 40% of ESG funds can be used for prevention and re-housing, although funding for existing shelter operations will be held harmless.

- **CoC Process:** A CoC – now called the “Collaborative Applicant” – can receive up to 3% of the total grant to cover the costs of overseeing the community planning and funding application process and participating in the local Consolidated Plan. An additional 3% is available to meet specific duties if the CoC agrees or is designated to become a Unified Funding Agency and takes on certain fiscal responsibilities.
- **Definition of Chronically Homeless:** Families are included under the definition of chronic homelessness.
- **Definition of Homeless Individual:** The legislation expands the definition of homelessness to include those who are at imminent risk of homelessness (within 14 days) and, for a limited portion of Continuum of Care funds, those who are living unstably, including those who meet other federal statutory definitions of homelessness.
- **Set Asides:** Except under certain circumstances, at least 30% of the funding must be used for permanent housing for homeless disabled individuals or families. At least 10% of the funding must be used for permanent housing for homeless families.

Timeline according to HEARTH

May 20, 2009 – President Obama signs HEARTH into law.

12 months later – HUD shall promulgate regulations governing these programs

18 months later – *HEARTH Effective Date:* Last day HEARTH could take effect.

Other deadlines to look forward to:

Notice of Funding Availability (“NOFA”): HUD must release a NOFA not later than 3 months after the date of HUD appropriations for the year.

CoC Program Award Announcement: After the effective date, HUD must announce conditionally awarded grants within 5-6 months after the application deadline each fiscal year.

*For more information, please contact Bridget Kurtt DeJong:
(415) 788-7961 x314 or bridget@homebaseccc.org*

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Continuum of Care Program

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
<p>Structure and Basic Provisions</p>	<p>Under the legislation, SHP, S+C, and Section 8 SRO Mod Rehab are combined into one Continuum of Care program, with one set of eligible activities, a single match requirement, and a unified set of operating rules.</p>	<p>Funds can be consolidated into one single program for clarity and consistency.</p>
<p>Eligible Activities and Applicable Limitations</p>	<p>Eligible program activities under HEARTH include acquisition, rehabilitation, construction, rental assistance, operating costs, supportive services, re-housing services, and HMIS. Key differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No cap on Acquisition/Rehabilitation/Construction Awards:</i> Currently, they have a cap of \$400,000. • <i>Rental Assistance Administration:</i> PH Rental Assistance must be administered by a State, unit of general local government or public housing agency. • <i>Addition of Re-housing services:</i> Re-housing services include any of the following: Housing search, Mediation or outreach to property owners, Credit repair, Providing security or utility deposits, Rental assistance for a final month at a location, Assistance with moving costs, and other such activities. • <i>Staff training:</i> HUD may allow reasonable costs associated with staff training <p>For Collaborative Applicants (formerly the Continuum of Care) eligible activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If it is a Legal Entity:</i> HMIS operation and support and Administrative Costs related to the CoC application, program evaluation and Con Plan participation • <i>If it is a Unified Funding Agency</i> (a Collaborative Applicant that has taken on additional responsibilities): Additional Administrative Costs related to fiscal and fund accounting, audits, monitoring, etc. 	<p>This allows maximum flexibility with respect to eligible activities to allow communities to respond to their specific needs.</p>

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Administrative Costs	<p>HEARTH makes the following administrative funds available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project sponsors</i>: Can now receive 10% of the total funds made available to that project sponsor (up from 5%) • <i>Collaborative Applicants (that are legal entities)</i>: Can now receive 3% of total funds for geographic area (none provided before) • <i>Collaborative Applicants that are Unified Funding Agencies</i>: Can receive an additional 3% of total funds for geographic area. 	<p>More administrative funds are useful, some are concerned that administrative funds will come out of current project funds.</p>
Match Requirements	<p>Under current legislation and practice for Continuum of Care programs, there are different match requirements for each eligible activity, including a range of 0-25% cash match, or 100% in-kind match.</p> <p>Under HEARTH, Continuums must demonstrate a match of 25% for all activities except leasing which has no match requirement. This match will be calculated on a Continuum-wide, not project-by-project, basis. The match requirement can be satisfied by in-kind contributions as long as a Memorandum of Agreement indicating that the services will be provided supports those contributions.</p>	<p>One consistent match requirement will hopefully make it easier to apply for and administer grants.</p>
Eligible Participants	<p>HEARTH modified/expanded the definition of homeless and who can be served by programs. (See "Definitions" chart.)</p> <p>In addition, a Collaborative Applicant may use up to 10% of its CoC's total funds to serve unaccompanied youth, families, and children defined as homeless in other Federal statutes if it demonstrates that using the funds in this way is of: (1) Equal or greater priority AND (2) Equally or more cost-effective in meeting the overall plan goals and objectives. This limitation does not apply to Collaborative Applicants that have a homelessness rate of less than 0.10% of their total population.</p> <p>Recipients receiving project-based or sponsor-based PH may also serve individuals who had previously met the requirements for such project prior to moving into a different permanent housing project.</p>	<p>This allows more flexibility in who can be served within narrow parameters.</p>

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act): Big Changes on the Forefront

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Grant Terms and Contract Renewal	<p><u>Permanent housing for leasing/ rental assistance/operations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>New project-based rental assistance, sponsor-based rental assistance, and operating cost assistance contracts</i> may have a 15-year initial term at recipient discretion with the first 5 years funded through CoC appropriations, next 10 years can be funded either through CoC appropriations or through Section 8 Project-based Rental Assistance • <i>Renewals</i> of expiring contracts for PH leasing, rental assistance, or operating costs can be funded either through McKinney-Vento Housing Assistance appropriations or through Section 8 Project-based Rental Assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Tenant-based assistance</i>: successive 1-year terms ○ <i>Project-based assistance</i>: successive terms up to 15 years subject to the applicant's discretion and annual appropriations. ○ HUD will approve renewals based on need and program/housing quality compliance. <p><u>Grant renewal amounts (PH Leasing, operations, or rental assistance):</u> HUD will make adjustments proportional to increases in the fair market rents in the geographic area, expanding the S+C FMR increases to all PH activities.</p> <p><u>Grant term (New PH):</u> HUD may impose minimum grant terms of up to 5 years for new projects providing permanent housing.</p>	<p>Using other funding, such as Section 8, in order to allow for additional new projects to be funded with McKinney funds. However, such a mechanism must be supported by additional funds; this funding mechanism should not take away from existing Section 8 programs.</p>
Obligation/ Receipt of funding/ Timing	<p>Under HEARTH,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Within 9 months of award announcement (generally)</i>: Recipient must meet all requirements for the obligation of funds, including site control, matching funds, and environmental review requirements • <i>Acquisition/rehabilitation/construction projects</i>: Must meet the requirements stated above within 24 months • HUD can grant extension if delay was beyond the reasonable control of the recipient. (HUD must obligate funds within 45 days of the date the recipient meets its requirements. Grantees are required to distribute funds within 45 days after the sponsor's request.) 	

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Funding recapture	<p>An Acquisition, Rehabilitation, or Construction project that ceases to operate within 15 years of award, must repay according to a new schedule (was a 20 year schedule before), except under certain circumstances.</p>	
Set-Asides/ Formula	<p><i>Set-asides:</i> HEARTH sets aside funds as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Except under certain circumstances, at least 30% of CoC and ESG funds (but not counting Permanent Housing renewals) must be used for permanent housing for homeless disabled individuals or families. This does not apply if there aren't enough funds to cover renewals for one year, or if the HUD goal of 150,000 new units has been reached. • At least 10% of the CoC and ESG funds must be used for permanent housing for homeless families. <p><i>Formula:</i> HEARTH states that HUD shall develop a formula within the next two years to allocate funds, as opposed to using the CDBG formula.</p>	
Incentives	<p>HEARTH creates several types of incentives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentives for High-Performing Communities (discussed in Admin/Coordination) • Incentives for Proven Strategies: HUD can provide bonuses or other incentives for use of activities that have been proven to be effective at reducing homelessness generally or for a specific subpopulation (e.g. PSH for CH, flexible subsidies for families, etc.) 	
Research	<p>\$8,000,000 authorized for each of fiscal years 2010 and 2011, for research into the efficacy of interventions for homeless families.</p>	
Rural Homeless Assistance/ Housing Stability Assistance	<p>HEARTH includes a Rural Homeless Assistance program, pursuant to which grants can be made in lieu of Continuum of Care grants. Rural areas have more flexibility to serve people at risk of homelessness or in sub-standard housing. Rural areas are defined in a very limited way to be: (a) an area that is not part of a standard metropolitan statistical area, (b) an area that is part of a metropolitan statistical area and is in a county where at least 75% of the population is rural or (c) an areas in a states with low population density and large areas under federal jurisdiction (not California).</p>	

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) (formerly Emergency Shelter Grant)

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Appropriations	Funding was increased from 15% of McKinney-Vento appropriations to 20% (so long as there is no effect on existing grant renewals).	
Allocation	In areas that served by Collaborative Applicant(s) (Continuum of Care), allocation of the ESG funds should be done in consultation with the Collaborative Applicant(s).	
Eligible Uses	<p>The eligible uses for ESG funding were expanded to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional services that can be provided in shelter or part of street outreach. ▪ Expanded homelessness prevention activities to include short- and medium-term rental assistance, housing relocation/stabilization, housing search, legal services, and other forms of prevention assistance. 	Generally, ESG is more focused on prevention activities.
Funding Caps	The 30% cap on prevention activities and 10% cap on staff were both eliminated. Instead, there was a cap placed on shelter/street outreach activities equal to the greater of 60% of the grant total or the amount previously utilized for shelter/street outreach.	
HMIS	ESG Program recipients will ensure the consistent HMIS participation by emergency shelters, and homeless prevention and rehousing programs.	
Administrative Costs	The amount of the ESG funding that can be used for administrative costs has been increased from 5% to 7.5% of the grant amount.	

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Administration and Coordination: CoC Process

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Funding Competition	<p>The form and procedure of the funding competition have been codified in the legislation.</p> <p>The legislation includes the following timeline requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The NOFA must be released within 3 months of when Congress passes an appropriations bill including HUD's fiscal year appropriations. ▪ The award announcements must be made within 6 months of the submission deadline for the first two years after HEARTH is implemented, and within 5 months after that. ▪ The HUD Secretary is required to establish a timely grant award appeals process. 	<p>Some providers has expressed reservations about including this level of information in the legislation when it might be more appropriate as program regulations.</p>
Selection Criteria	<p>The selection criteria are now codified in the legislation whereas, previously, most criteria appeared in the NOFA on an annual basis. Selection criteria include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previous performance with respect to project outcomes, including length of homelessness, job and income growth, and other goals. ▪ The quality of the community's plan, including all strategies to address homelessness, serving subpopulations, securing funding for planned activities, and other related activities. ▪ The methodology of the Review and Rank process and priority setting process. ▪ Leverage of additional resources ▪ Coordination with other Federal, State, local, private, and other entities. ▪ Other factors deemed appropriate by HUD. 	<p>See above: these components of the legislation might be more appropriate as program regulations.</p>

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act): Big Changes on the Forefront

<p>Continuum of Care Structure – Collaborative Applicant</p>	<p>The “Collaborative Applicant” is the entity within a community that submits a joint application on behalf of all of the applicants for funding in the community. A Collaborative Applicant is not required to be a legal entity.</p> <p>The duties of a Collaborative Applicant include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designing a collaborative process to apply for funding, evaluate outcomes, determine compliance and establish funding priorities. ▪ Participating in the Consolidated Plan. ▪ Ensuring participation in HMIS. <p>A Collaborative Applicant can receive up to 3% of a community’s Continuum of Care grant to cover the administrative costs of performing these duties.</p>	<p>Receiving funding for CoC activities is welcome, however, CoCs should not have to choose between funding direct services and supporting their CoC. Additional funding must be made available if a CoC is to be paid for administrative costs.</p>
<p>Unified Funding Agencies</p>	<p>A Collaborative Applicant can serve as a Unified Funding Agency that, in addition to performing the duties of the Collaborative Applicant, also receives and distributes funds to project sponsors.</p> <p>A Collaborative Applicant can choose to serve as a Unified Funding Agency and the HUD Secretary reserves the right to designate Unified Funding Agencies.</p> <p>In addition to the standard Collaborative Applicant duties, a Collaborative Applicant that is either selected or designated as a Unified Funding Agency must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require each project sponsor to establish proper fiscal control and fund accounting procedures. ▪ Arrange for an annual survey, audit, or evaluation of the financial records of each project. <p>A Unified Funding Agency can receive up to 6% of a community’s Continuum of Care grant to cover the administrative costs of performing these duties.</p>	<p>See above: if a Unified Funding Agency is eligible to receive CoC funding, additional resources should be made available. Funds should not be diverted from direct services.</p>

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

<p>High-Performing Communities</p>	<p>A Collaborative Applicant can apply to HUD to be considered a “High-Performing Community.” Up to 10 communities can be designated per year. A designation lasts only one year but can be renewed.</p> <p>Some of the criteria required for this designation include successful implementation of “proven strategies” that result in reductions in the length of homelessness, low recidivism rates, effectiveness at serving households that meet other Federal definitions of homelessness, etc.</p> <p>Communities designated as “High-Performing” can use as much of their funding as they would like for homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing services to households at risk of, or currently experiencing, homelessness.</p>
---	--

Data, Reporting & Outcomes

<p>Issue</p>	<p>What’s Changed?</p>	<p>HomeBase Notes/Thoughts</p>
<p>HMIS Participation</p>	<p>As before, all ESG and Continuum of Care funded agencies must participate in HMIS. The HMIS system must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collect unduplicated counts; • analyze patterns of use; • provide information for needs analyses and funding priorities; and • be developed in accordance with standards established by the Secretary <p>The new HMIS data elements were published on June 17, 2009. HUD is expected to release revisions to HMIS privacy standards soon.</p>	

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Information Protection for Victim Service Providers	<p>As before, project sponsors must certify that it will maintain the same client record confidentiality and non-disclosure requirements.</p> <p>Proposed legislation requires HUD to instruct any victim service provider not to disclose personally identifying information about any client for the purposes of HMIS. Providers may be asked to disclose non-personally identifying information as long as that information has been de-identified, encrypted, or otherwise encoded.</p> <p>Nothing in the legislation may supersede any prior law granting greater protection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.</p>	
Reporting and Outcomes	<p>As before, project sponsors must monitor and report data to HUD.</p> <p><u>High-performing communities:</u> must demonstrate through reliable data that meets 5 required criteria to be selected (see CoC Program chart, Incentives). [§424(d)] Selected communities' collaborative applicants must cooperate with the HUD Secretary to distribute information about their successful efforts to reduce homelessness [§424(e)]</p>	
Homeless Counts	<p>Despite the expanded homeless definition the homeless count remain limited to people are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence • Residing at night primarily in a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as human beings' regular sleeping accommodations • Living in a shelter designed to provide temporary living arrangements • Who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation and is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided 	

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act): Big Changes on the Forefront

Definitions

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
<p>Definition of who is homeless</p>	<p>Anyone who met the previous definition of homeless is still considered homeless under HEARTH; however, HEARTH expands the statutory definition of homelessness to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An individual or family living in a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living arrangements, including hotels or motels paid for by Federal, State, or local government programs for long-income individuals or by charitable organizations, congregate shelters, and transitional housing. (This section, more than expanding the definition merely modifies language about hotels.) • An individual who resided in a shelter or place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided. • An individual or family who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Will imminently lose their housing, including housing they own, rent, or live in without paying rent, are sharing with others, and rooms in hotels or motels not paid for by Federal, State, or local government programs for low-income individuals or by charitable organizations, as evidenced by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A court order resulting from an eviction action that notifies that individual or family that they must leave within 14 days ii. The individual or family having a primary nighttime residence that is a room in a hotel or motel and where they lack the resources necessary to reside there for more than 14 days. iii. Credible evidence indicating that the owner or renter of the housing will not allow the individual or family to stay for more than 14 days, and any oral statement from an individual or family seeking homeless assistance that is found to be credible 	<p>This was a heavily debated section of the bill. Some providers support this definition while others have pushed for a broader definition that includes households that are doubled-up or living in overcrowded conditions and people living in hotels or motels.</p>

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act): *Big Changes on the Forefront*

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
<p>Definition of who is homeless</p>	<p>B. Has no subsequent residence identified C. Lacks the resources or support networks needed to obtain other permanent housing The major change here is from 7 to 14 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additionally, any individual or family who is fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions in the individual's or family's current housing situation, including where the health and safety of children are jeopardized, and who have no other residence and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing. <p>The definition of homelessness also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes and who meet all of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Have experienced a long-term period without living independently in permanent housing B. Have experienced persistent instability as measured by frequent moves over such period C. Can be expected to continue in such status for an extended period of time because of chronic disabilities, chronic physical health or mental health conditions, substance addiction, histories of domestic violence or childhood abuse, the presence of a child or a youth with a disability, or multiple barriers to employment. 	
<p>Definition of Who is Chronically Homeless</p>	<p>HEARTH expands the term "chronically homeless" means to include families with children. It also adds post-traumatic stress disorder and brain injury to the qualifying disabling conditions. Also, people who are chronically homeless prior to entering an institution for up to 90 days continue to be chronically homeless upon their exit.</p> <p>A person or family is now considered "chronically homeless" if that individual or family:</p>	

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act): Big Changes on the Forefront

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Definition of Who is Chronically Homeless	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is homeless or lives or resides in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter, • Has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least 1 year or on at least 4 separate occasions in the last 3 years, and • Has an adult head of household (or a minor head of household if no adult is present in the household) with a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, post-traumatic stress disorder, cognitive impairments resulting from a brain injury, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of 2 or more of these conditions. <p>In addition, a person who currently lives or resides in an institutional care facility, including a jail, substance abuse or mental health treatment facility, hospital or other similar facility, and has resided there for fewer than 90 days shall be considered chronically homeless if such person met all of the requirements described above.</p>	
Definition of who is At-Risk	<p>Previous legislation did not define "at risk of homelessness." HEARTH defines it as an individual or family who meets all 3 criteria below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income is below 30% of AMI; • Insufficient resources immediately available to attain housing stability, and • Meets at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has moved frequently because of economic reasons ○ Is living in the home of another because of economic hardship ○ Has been notified that their right to occupy their current housing or living situation will be terminated ○ Lives in a hotel or motel ○ Lives in severely overcrowded housing ○ Is exiting an institution ○ Otherwise lives in housing that has characteristics associated with instability and an increased risk of homeless 	

Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act): Big Changes on the Forefront

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
<p>Other Federal Definitions for Homelessness</p>	<p>While HEARTH does not change other Federal definitions, the Act gives Collaborative Applicants flexibility to use 10% of continuum of care funding for eligible activities to serve families and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes.</p> <p>The Collaborative Applicant must demonstrate that the use of funds is an equal or greater priority or is equally or more cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives of the plan.</p> <p>The limitation does not apply if the Applicant's rate of homelessness (calculated based on the most recent count) is less than 1/10 of 1% of the total population.</p>	
<p>Future Changes</p>	<p>The HEARTH Act directs the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness to have an extensive meeting to discuss whether to change the definition of homelessness, and whether there is a "compelling need for a uniform definition of homelessness under Federal law."</p>	
<p>Other Definitions (apply only to ESG, CoC, and Rural Housing Stability Assistance Program)</p>	<p>HEARTH expands "operating costs" to include coordination of services as needed to ensure long-term housing stability.</p> <p>Shelter Plus Care will now use the same definition of "Private nonprofit organizations" as all other Continuum of Care programs.</p> <p>"Supportive services" has been changed to make the definition consistent between programs. New services added to the definition include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach services, advocacy, life skills training, and housing search and counseling services • Legal services for purposes including requesting reconsiderations and appeals of veterans and public benefit claim denials and resolving outstanding warrants that interfere with an individual's ability to obtain and retain housing • Transportation services that facilitate an individual's ability to obtain and maintain employment 	

**Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (The HEARTH Act):
Big Changes on the Forefront**

Issue	What's Changed?	HomeBase Notes/Thoughts
Protections for Homeless Children and Families	<p>HEARTH adds a completely new requirement that will go into effect in 2 years. The law prohibits Continuum of Care programs from denying admission to families with children under the age 18 based on the age of any child in the family.</p> <p>There is an exception for transitional housing programs that target resources for families with children of a certain age if the program has a primary purpose of implementing an evidence-based practice that requires that housing units be targeted to families with children in a specific age group. HUD will not fund such a project unless specific certifications are made in relation to educational needs of the children.</p>	

For more information, please contact Bridget Kurti DeJong, Staff Lawyer at Bridget@homebaseccc.org or (415) 788-7961 x. 314

Feedback Please!
Twenty-Second Northern/Central Valley Homeless Roundtable
November 19, 2009

	Not Helpful At All	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	N/A
Gathering & Networking				
Welcome & Introductions				
Presentation by Placer County Continuum of Care				
Regional Coordination and Planning				
HUD Updates & Quick NOFA Review				
Regional Coordination: Advocacy on Homelessness Issues- Housing California				
Discussion about Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program				
HEARTH: McKinney-Vento Reauthorization				

What can we improve for next time?

Topics you'd like on the agenda for upcoming Roundtables:

Other comments/suggestions about this meeting:

