

Tehama County Continuum of Care Executive Council Meeting



February 22, 2023

Agenda

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Adoption of Minutes from January 25, 2023**
3. **Additions to the Agenda**
4. **Project Updates:**
 - a. **PATH Plaza** - E.C. Ross
 - b. **Permanent Housing** – Travis Lyons
 - c. **Stakeholders' Collaborative** – Andrea Curry
5. **Capacity Building**
Andrea Curry
 - a. **Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP)**
 - i. HHAP-4 Allocations Published in January
 - ii. HHAP-4 Amendments Requested and Submitted
 - b. **HUD CoC Program**
 - i. Registration due March 2, 2023
6. **HMIS/CES**
Andrea Curry
 - a. **2023 Point in Time Count Recap**
 - b. **2021-22 System Performance Measures Report**

Tehama County Continuum of Care Executive Council Meeting



Meeting Minutes

January 25, 2023

Meeting held via Zoom

| COUNCIL ATTENDANCE: | PRESENT | EXCUSED |
|---|---------|---------|
| Gail Locke , Chairperson | X | |
| Tara Loucks-Shepherd , Vice-Chair; Tehama County Department of Social Services | | X |
| Jayne Boffke , Tehama County Health Services Agency | | X |
| Candy Carlson , Tehama County Board of Supervisors | X | |
| Johnna Jones , Community Member | X | |
| Jeremiah Fears , Corning Police Department | | X |
| Kris Deiters , Red Bluff City Council | X | |
| Travis Lyon , Tehama County Health Services | X | |
| David Madrigal , Tehama County Community Action Agency | X | |
| Kimberlee Monroe , Empower Tehama | X | |
| E.C. Ross , Poor and the Homeless Tehama County Coalition (PATH) | | X |
| Jim Southwick , Tehama County Department of Education | X | |

Guest: **Tom Westbrook**, City of Red Bluff

Continuum of Care Coordinator: **Andrea C. Curry**

Notes by: **Heather Henderson**

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
2. **Adoption of Minutes from November 23, 2022**

The minutes and agenda from the Executive Council meeting held on November 23, 2022 were made available prior to this meeting for review. The minutes were approved as emailed.

3. **Additions to the Agenda**

None.

4. **Executive Council**

- a. **Executive Council Membership Application Consideration**

An application to be considered for Executive Council membership was submitted in November 2022 by Johnna Jones, a community member. Johnna previously served on the Executive Council in her capacity as a City Councilmember for the City of Red Bluff and is willing and available to continue serving on the CoC Executive Council in her capacity as a community member.

Kris motioned that the council approve appointment of Johnna Jones, Community Member, to the Executive Council. Jim seconded. Motion carried.

- b. **Executive Council Officers**

Jim and Johnna both reported being willing to serve in either the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson positions. Jim advised that he occasionally has a scheduling conflict that prevents him from attending the Executive Council meeting and suggested that it would be more appropriate for him to serve as Vice-Chairperson.

Kris motioned that the council appoint Johnna as Chairperson and Jim as Vice Chairperson of the CoC Executive Council. Kimberlee seconded. Motion carried.

5. Project Updates:

a. PATH Plaza Update

Andrea reported that ground has been broken at the PATH Plaza site but that progress has been slow due to recent rainy weather. Johnna reported that she noticed that the contractor has moved an office on-site.

b. Permanent Housing Update

Travis reported that approval letters have been sent to seven prospective tenants for the No Place Like Home units at Olive Grove and that applications for the remaining tenants continue to be processed. The project is closer to receiving its occupancy permit, but there are still some inspections that need to be completed. Travis reported that the address for the project will be 2171 Fig Lane, Corning, CA 96021.

Work continues on No Place Like Home Round 4 funding for the Red Bluff projects; supportive services plan has been approved by HCD, developer(s) working on other parts of the plan.

c. Stakeholders' Collaborative Update

Heather reported that the last Stakeholders' Meeting was held on January 4, with an informational presentation was provided by Tribal TANF and Andrea led a review of the Point in Time Count survey and solicited input from the Stakeholders' Group on improvements for this year's survey and invited volunteer survey teams to register. Stakeholders' Collaborative will be held quarterly moving forward, per vote by the group.

6. Capacity Building

a. FY2022-23 Mid-Year Budget Overview

An updated 5-Year Budget was provided to the council prior to this meeting and included in the posted Agenda Packet for this meeting. Andrea reviewed the updated budget with the council and pointed out that some funds had been shifted to accommodate the local project funding requests to be considered in item 6.b, resulting in a reduction of the total funds currently budgeted to the 2025-26 year.

b. Local Project Funding

A chart of the renewal and City of Red Bluff funding requests was provided to the council prior to this meeting and included in the posted Agenda Packet for this meeting.

- i. **Renewal Requests:** Andrea provided a review of the timeline that led up to this list of renewal funding being brought before the council. The most recent round of revisions to current subgrants made under the CoC's ESG-CV RFA took place in September 2022, where some funds were re-allocated to ensure that all currently funded projects could continue operating through November 2022. The council had then asked that these projects be asked to submit projected budgets for operations through June 30, 2023. Heather sent requests to each project and provided technical assistance with developing as needed. Andrea advised that all of the renewal requests on the list were consistent with the corresponding project's historical spending, with the exceptions of PATH Street Outreach and Sale Property. The PATH Street Outreach monthly expenditure estimate used was based on just the last three months rather than over 12

months, because their costs had increased due to providing meals at Samuel Ayer park. The Sale Property contract had so far only been used by PATH to pay for some one-time expenses (bathroom remodel, emergency roof repair, etc.) but that since the Homekey grant used to purchase the property had only come with 1 year of operating costs, they were hoping to use their renewal funds for operating through June. Gail asked if this was sustainable. Andrea shared that the state was aware that operations for Homekey projects was a challenge and that she hopes that advocacy led by the larger communities with Homekey 1.0 grants would result in the state providing either dedicated funding for ongoing operations or building it in as a priority in an existing funding program. She went on to say that with the addition of Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA) funds to navigation center/emergency shelter operations in future years and the state's continued commitment to funding homelessness services, we can reasonably expect that funds should be available to continue supporting the Sale Property transitional houses, particularly due to the relatively low annual operating costs not covered by program fees collected by the project. Andrea also advised the council that due to some reorganization and shifting of roles at Faith Works, they will be partnering with PATH to continue their motel shelter project. Pastor Scott and Robin from Faith Works will still be conducting the direct services activities associated with the project, but PATH will be handling the fiscal end of the project. For this reason, the \$51,000 amount in the line item on the row of the renewal budget that reads "Faith Works Emergency Assistance", award, if approved by the council, along with the approximately \$8,000 that was unspent from Faith Works existing, will be added to the PATH Sale Property and Shelter contract to accommodate this new arrangement.

- ii. **City of Red Bluff request:** Tom reported that the city removed the electric wiring from the restrooms at Samuel Ayer park years ago due to flooding concerns, so there are currently no lights there. The city would like to install a solar power setup at those restrooms that would be self-contained and would not require any wiring to be low enough to the ground to short out if the area were to flood. Adding the solar unit would increase safety for unsheltered individuals currently camping at SA Park and would increase safety for anyone using the park in the future after dark, as well.

Johnna asked if the city foresaw any issues with needing to get federal approval for the installation as an "improvement" since the park is a collaboration between the city and the federal government (who owns the land). Tom said that they didn't foresee any issues with that but that they would look into it prior to installing the setup to confirm.

Andrea reported that the estimate that Clay Parker provided to her was for \$6,752.18 but advised the council that the amount they would see on the funding list was \$8,000 because at the time the list was developed, she wasn't sure if there would be other costs involved. Tom let her know early this morning that there would not be additional costs, as city staff would install and maintain the unit. Andrea also stated that the estimate she was given was dated 11/1/22 and said it was good for 60 days, so it's possible the cost has gone up and advised that the contract with the city, if approved, could be written as a "not to exceed \$8,000" and that the actual amount disbursed to the city would be based on reimbursement of actual costs.

Kris motioned that the requests be approved as presented. Candy seconded. Motion passed.

c. PATH Plaza Navigation Center

- i. Update on funding sources for development contract

A chart reflecting a shift in the make-up of the PATH Navigation Center Development contract approved by this council in November was provided to the council prior to this meeting and included in the posted Agenda Packet for this meeting. At that time, Andrea had mentioned that she was waiting on clarification from HCD on potential

limitations on allowable expenses under the CESH program that might necessitate a shift in the funds that be most appropriate to use for this contract. The Council approved shifting funding sources as needed to accommodate this but requested that any changes be reported back at the next Executive Council meeting. Andrea reported that she had received the information back from HCD that CESH funds could be used for capital expenditures but only for remodel of existing shelter facilities, which would have made allocating PATH Plaza development expenditures complicated. For this reason, funding for this contract were shifted to utilizing HHAP-1, HHAP-2 and HHAP-3 funds. Andrea reported that the CESH 2018 and CESH 2019 funds that would be recouped by this move were integrated into the allocation configuration of the renewal requests in item 6.c.

d. Point in Time Count Expenditure Update

Andrea reported that after purchase of the Thank You gifts for both the LIFT Event surveys and Point in Time Count surveys, there was approximately \$2,000 left in the original \$8,000 approved for this purchase. After taking inventory of the household items purchased for the Olive Grove NPLH units, it was discovered that some additional items would need to be purchased to ensure that all units could be supplied equitably. Andrea and Heather inquired with the HHIP funder, Anthem Blue Cross, to see whether the funds remaining in the Thank You Gift budget could be used to cover this expense. The funder enthusiastically approved this use, as assisting in the transition from homelessness to housing for participants connected to Permanent Supportive Housing through the Coordinated Entry System would meet additional HHIP metrics.

7. Written Standards

a. Plan and timeline for review and potential updates to:

- i. *Governance Charter*
- ii. *Standards for Provision of Assistance*
- iii. *Standards for Monitoring Program Outcomes*

Andrea Reported that the CoC's Written Standards were due for review. The original documents were developed in 2016 when the CoC was just getting off the ground, and while they have been amended occasionally to meet changing HUD requirements, there are several places where the CoC has latitude to customize its written standards to fit local needs. She suggested that a subcommittee be formed to review the written standards and suggest amendments to be approved by the council. Johnna and Gail said that they would be willing to serve on this subcommittee. Andrea will work with them to coordinate meeting to review.

8. HMIS/CES

a. 2023 Point in Time Count Update

Andrea reported that the 2023 Point in Time Count will be conducted on January 31, 2023. Heather reported that we currently have approximately 30 volunteer surveyors signed up to conduct surveys. Gail encouraged council members to sign up to help if they were available.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 22, 2023, at 9:30 AM and will be held via Zoom.



**HOMELESS HOUSING, ASSISTANCE, AND PREVENTION (HHAP)
ROUND 4 BASE ALLOCATIONS**

| CONTINUUM OF CARE | ALLOCATION |
|---|------------------|
| Alpine, Inyo, Mono Counties CoC | \$ 186,099.67 |
| Amador, Calaveras, Mariposa, Tuolumne Counties CoC | \$ 830,802.06 |
| Bakersfield/Kern County CoC | \$ 2,130,841.12 |
| Chico, Paradise/Butte County CoC | \$ 1,337,258.99 |
| Colusa, Glenn, Trinity Counties CoC | \$ 451,956.32 |
| Daly/San Mateo County CoC | \$ 2,403,344.20 |
| Davis, Woodland/Yolo County CoC | \$ 991,645.34 |
| El Dorado County CoC | \$ 679,263.76 |
| Fresno City & County/Madera County CoC | \$ 5,604,258.37 |
| Glendale CoC | \$ 299,088.75 |
| Humboldt County CoC | \$ 2,190,658.87 |
| Imperial County CoC | \$ 1,405,052.44 |
| Lake County CoC | \$ 450,627.04 |
| Long Beach CoC | \$ 4,381,317.74 |
| Los Angeles City & County CoC | \$ 86,550,964.60 |
| Marin County CoC | \$ 1,490,126.57 |
| Mendocino County CoC | \$ 1,103,305.13 |
| Merced County CoC | \$ 1,136,537.22 |
| Napa City & County CoC | \$ 657,995.23 |
| Nevada County CoC | \$ 700,532.30 |
| Oakland, Berkeley/Alameda County CoC | \$ 12,956,524.27 |
| Oxnard, San Buenaventura/Ventura County CoC | \$ 2,988,228.85 |
| Pasadena CoC | \$ 680,593.05 |
| Redding/Shasta, Siskiyou, Lassen, Plumas, Del Norte, Modoc, Sierra Counties CoC | \$ 2,441,893.41 |
| Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC | \$ 4,111,473.23 |
| Riverside City & County CoC | \$ 4,407,903.41 |
| Roseville, Rocklin/Placer County CoC | \$ 996,962.47 |
| Sacramento City & County CoC | \$ 12,333,090.41 |
| Salinas/Monterey, San Benito Counties CoC | \$ 3,195,597.04 |
| San Bernardino City & County CoC | \$ 4,430,501.22 |
| San Diego City and County CoC | \$ 11,201,870.32 |
| San Francisco CoC | \$ 10,307,262.67 |
| San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC | \$ 13,330,052.88 |
| San Luis Obispo County CoC | \$ 1,924,802.21 |
| Santa Ana, Anaheim/Orange County CoC | \$ 7,600,841.88 |
| Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County CoC | \$ 2,608,053.82 |
| Santa Rosa, Petaluma/Sonoma County CoC | \$ 3,845,616.57 |
| Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC | \$ 3,082,607.96 |
| Tehama County CoC | \$ 386,821.45 |
| Turlock, Modesto/Stanslaus County CoC | \$ 2,468,479.08 |
| Vallejo/Solano County CoC | \$ 1,567,225.00 |
| Visalia/Kings, Tulare Counties CoC | \$ 1,641,664.87 |
| Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC | \$ 3,056,022.29 |
| Yuba City & County/Sutter County CoC | \$ 1,454,235.92 |

| CITY | ALLOCATION |
|---------------|-------------------|
| Anaheim* | \$ 5,092,955.47 |
| Bakersfield | \$ 4,283,319.84 |
| Fresno | \$ 11,265,425.10 |
| Irvine* | \$ 5,092,955.47 |
| Long Beach | \$ 8,807,125.51 |
| Los Angeles** | \$ 143,640,000.00 |
| Oakland | \$ 26,044,615.38 |
| Riverside | \$ 8,860,566.80 |
| Sacramento | \$ 24,791,417.00 |
| San Diego | \$ 22,517,489.88 |
| San Francisco | \$ 20,719,190.28 |
| San Jose | \$ 26,795,465.58 |
| Santa Ana* | \$ 5,092,955.47 |
| Stockton | \$ 6,196,518.22 |

| COUNTY | ALLOCATION |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Alameda | \$ 12,156,020.98 |
| Alpine | \$ 3,741.48 |
| Amador | \$ 231,970.85 |
| Butte | \$ 1,254,638.05 |
| Calaveras | \$ 153,400.08 |
| Colusa | \$ 42,403.27 |
| Contra Costa | \$ 3,857,450.79 |
| Del Norte | \$ 576,185.67 |
| El Dorado | \$ 637,296.27 |
| Fresno | \$ 4,911,296.87 |
| Glenn | \$ 140,928.53 |
| Humboldt | \$ 2,055,311.64 |
| Imperial | \$ 1,318,242.96 |
| Inyo | \$ 119,726.89 |
| Kern | \$ 1,999,189.66 |
| Kings | \$ 390,359.55 |
| Lake | \$ 422,785.59 |
| Lassen | \$ 127,209.82 |
| Los Angeles*** | \$ 85,120,000.00 |
| Madera | \$ 346,709.12 |
| Marin | \$ 1,398,060.89 |
| Mariposa | \$ 59,863.45 |
| Mendocino | \$ 1,035,138.75 |
| Merced | \$ 1,066,317.63 |
| Modoc | \$ 14,965.87 |
| Mono | \$ 51,133.36 |
| Monterey | \$ 2,552,926.54 |
| Napa | \$ 617,341.79 |
| Nevada | \$ 657,250.75 |
| Orange | \$ 7,131,232.99 |
| Placer | \$ 935,366.34 |
| Plumas | \$ 163,377.32 |
| Riverside | \$ 4,135,566.39 |
| Sacramento | \$ 11,571,105.23 |
| San Benito | \$ 445,234.38 |
| San Bernardino | \$ 4,156,768.02 |
| San Diego | \$ 10,509,776.22 |
| San Francisco | \$ 9,670,440.82 |
| San Joaquin | \$ 2,892,152.73 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$ 1,805,880.62 |
| San Mateo | \$ 2,254,856.46 |
| Santa Barbara | \$ 2,446,918.35 |
| Santa Clara | \$ 12,506,471.57 |
| Santa Cruz | \$ 2,867,209.63 |
| Shasta | \$ 995,229.79 |
| Sierra | \$ 13,718.72 |
| Siskiyou | \$ 400,336.79 |
| Solano | \$ 1,470,395.89 |
| Sonoma | \$ 3,608,019.77 |
| Stanislaus | \$ 2,315,967.06 |
| Sutter | \$ 487,637.65 |
| Tehama | \$ 362,922.14 |
| Trinity | \$ 240,700.94 |
| Tulare | \$ 1,149,877.02 |
| Tuolumne | \$ 334,237.57 |
| Ventura | \$ 2,803,604.72 |
| Yolo | \$ 930,377.72 |
| Yuba | \$ 876,750.05 |

All jurisdiction allocations are based on the 2022 PIT counts.

*When more than one eligible city is within the same PIT count area, the proportionate share of funds shall be equally allocated to those cities.

**No more than 45 percent of the total allocation for cities will be awarded to an individual city.

***No more than 40 percent of the total allocation for counties will be awarded to an individual county.

The base allocation is the total share of funds that jurisdictions are eligible to receive, not including the additional bonus funds that will be allocated on a competitive basis. The base allocation will be disbursed in two rounds.

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Summary Report for CA-527 - Tehama County CoC

Measure 1: Length of Time Persons Remain Homeless

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

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

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

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

| | Universe (Persons) | | Average LOT Homeless (bed nights) | | | | Median LOT Homeless (bed nights) | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
| 1.1 Persons in ES and SH | 39 | 59 | 15 | 12 | 56 | 44 | 9 | 7 | 47 | 40 |
| 1.2 Persons in ES, SH, and TH | 106 | 143 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 1 | 28 | 40 | 52 | 12 |

b. This measure is based on data element 3.17.

This measure includes data from each client's Living Situation (Data Standards element 3.917) response as well as time spent in permanent housing projects between Project Start and Housing Move-In. This information is added to the client's entry date, effectively extending the client's entry date backward in time. This "adjusted entry date" is then used in the calculations just as if it were the client's actual entry date.

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

| | Universe (Persons) | | Average LOT Homeless (bed nights) | | | | Median LOT Homeless (bed nights) | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
| 1.1 Persons in ES, SH, and PH (prior to "housing move in") | 79 | 161 | 303 | 268 | 352 | 84 | 101 | 114 | 205 | 91 |
| 1.2 Persons in ES, SH, TH, and PH (prior to "housing move in") | 146 | 244 | 392 | 414 | 390 | -24 | 199 | 162 | 206 | 44 |

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

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

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

| | Total # of Persons who Exited to a Permanent Housing Destination (2 Years Prior) | | Returns to Homelessness in Less than 6 Months | | | Returns to Homelessness from 6 to 12 Months | | | Returns to Homelessness from 13 to 24 Months | | | Number of Returns in 2 Years | |
|-------------------------------|--|---------|---|---------|--------------|---|---------|--------------|--|---------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | % of Returns | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | % of Returns | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | % of Returns | FY 2022 | % of Returns |
| Exit was from SO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| Exit was from ES | 27 | 52 | 1 | 5 | 10% | 7 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 4 | 8% | 9 | 17% |
| Exit was from TH | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 1 | 6% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 6% |
| Exit was from SH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| Exit was from PH | 71 | 54 | 1 | 1 | 2% | 1 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| TOTAL Returns to Homelessness | 113 | 123 | 2 | 6 | 5% | 9 | 1 | 1% | 4 | 4 | 3% | 11 | 9% |

Measure 3: Number of Homeless Persons

Metric 3.1 – Change in PIT Counts

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

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

| | January 2021 PIT Count | January 2022 PIT Count | Difference |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Universe: Total PIT Count of sheltered and unsheltered persons | 267 | 291 | 24 |
| Emergency Shelter Total | 16 | 34 | 18 |
| Safe Haven Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transitional Housing Total | 33 | 39 | 6 |
| Total Sheltered Count | 49 | 73 | 24 |
| Unsheltered Count | 218 | 218 | 0 |

Metric 3.2 – Change in Annual Counts

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Unduplicated Total sheltered homeless persons | 104 | 106 | 153 | 47 |
| Emergency Shelter Total | 35 | 39 | 69 | 30 |
| Safe Haven Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transitional Housing Total | 69 | 67 | 89 | 22 |

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

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

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Number of adults (system stayers) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of adults with increased earned income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of adults who increased earned income | | | | |

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Number of adults (system stayers) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of adults with increased non-employment cash income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income | | | | |

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Number of adults (system stayers) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of adults with increased total income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of adults who increased total income | | | | |

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

Metric 4.4 – Change in earned income for adult system leavers

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of adults who exited with increased earned income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of adults who increased earned income | | | | |

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of adults who exited with increased non-employment cash income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of adults who increased non-employment cash income | | | | |

Metric 4.6 – Change in total income for adult system leavers

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Number of adults who exited (system leavers) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of adults who exited with increased total income | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percentage of adults who increased total income | | | | |

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

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

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period. | 88 | 93 | 136 | 43 |
| Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year. | 10 | 17 | 20 | 3 |
| Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time) | 78 | 76 | 116 | 40 |

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH, TH or PH during the reporting period. | 163 | 169 | 380 | 211 |
| Of persons above, count those who were in ES, SH, TH or any PH within 24 months prior to their entry during the reporting year. | 5 | 21 | 23 | 2 |
| Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time.) | 158 | 148 | 357 | 209 |

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

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

This Measure is not applicable to CoCs in FY2022 (Oct 1, 2021 - Sept 30, 2022) reporting period.

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

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Persons who exit Street Outreach | 0 | 0 | 47 | 47 |
| Of persons above, those who exited to temporary & some institutional destinations | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| % Successful exits | | | 17% | |

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

FY2022 - Performance Measurement Module (Sys PM)

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Persons in ES, SH, TH and PH-RRH who exited, plus persons in other PH projects who exited without moving into housing | 100 | 116 | 250 | 134 |
| Of the persons above, those who exited to permanent housing destinations | 47 | 54 | 168 | 114 |
| % Successful exits | 47% | 47% | 67% | 20% |

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

| | Submitted FY 2021 | Revised FY 2021 | FY 2022 | Difference |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Universe: Persons in all PH projects except PH-RRH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Of persons above, those who remained in applicable PH projects and those who exited to permanent housing destinations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Successful exits/retention | | | | |

FY2022 - SysPM Data Quality

CA-527 - Tehama County CoC

| | All ES, SH | | | All TH | | | All PSH, OPH | | | All RRH | | | All Street Outreach | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|--------|------------------|------------------|--------|------------------|------------------|--------|------------------|------------------|--------|---------------------|------------------|--------|
| | Submitted FY2020 | Submitted FY2021 | FY2022 | Submitted FY2020 | Submitted FY2021 | FY2022 | Submitted FY2020 | Submitted FY2021 | FY2022 | Submitted FY2020 | Submitted FY2021 | FY2022 | Submitted FY2020 | Submitted FY2021 | FY2022 |
| 1. Number of non-DV Beds on HIC | 0 | 0 | | 18 | 22 | 27 | | | | 61 | 72 | 31 | | | |
| 2. Number of HMIS Beds | 0 | 0 | | 18 | 22 | 27 | | | | 61 | 72 | 31 | | | |
| 3. HMIS Participation Rate from HIC (%) | | | | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | | | | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | | | |
| 4. Unduplicated Persons Served (HMIS) | 258 | 359 | 34 | 43 | 63 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 113 | 133 | 399 | 582 | 56 |
| 5. Total Leavers (HMIS) | 258 | 359 | 26 | 26 | 49 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 60 | 47 | 4 | 9 | 0 |
| 6. Destination of Don't Know, Refused, or Missing (HMIS) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Destination Error Rate (%) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.85 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |

FY2022 - SysPM Data Quality

DRAFT