



California Interagency Council on Homelessness

ERF-3-R, Application

Part 1 (A): ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Application Window

- ☐ Window #1, 11/3/2023 - 1/31/2024
☒ Window #2, 2/1/2024 - 4/30/2024
☐ Window #3, 5/1/2024 - 6/30/2024

*Applications received after 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the application window will be reviewed and evaluated during the following application window. **Note, applications submitted after 5:00 p.m. on 6/30/2024 will not be reviewed.***

Eligible Applicant

Select the eligible applicant's jurisdiction type.

- ☐ CoC ☒ City ☐ County

What is the name of the city or county?

City of Redwood City

Part 1 (B) Contracting Information

Complete all elements of the below section. This information is required for contracting should this application be chosen for award.

Contractor Information

Contractor Name (the legal entity entering into contract with the State)

City of Redwood City

What is the Federal Employer Identification Number (FEIN # or tax id number) for the contractor?

94-6001116

Tax ID Form

gov_taxpayer_id_form_RWC signed.pdf

Governmental entities will need to submit a GovTIN Tax Form, and Non-governmental entities will need to submit a STD 204 Tax Form. Links to each are below:

GovTIN: [Taxpayer ID Form \(ca.gov\)](#)

STD 204: [STD 204 - Payee Data Record \(ca.gov\)](#)

Who is the best contact person for this contract?

Primary Contact

<input type="text" value="Teri"/>	<input type="text" value="Chin"/>
First	Last

This contact will receive ALL grant related correspondence (inclusive of application, award, contract, office hours, information requests, reporting, etc.)

Job title

job title

Email

Phone

This contact will receive ALL grant related correspondence (inclusive of application, award, contract, office hours, information requests, reporting, etc.)

Secondary Contact

<input type="text" value="Liz"/>	<input type="text" value="Lange"/>
First	Last

Job title

job title

Email

Phone

This contact will receive ALL grant related correspondence (inclusive of application, award, contract, office hours, information requests, reporting, etc.)

Contact Person for Reporting

<input type="text" value="Teri"/>	<input type="text" value="Chin"/>
First	Last

Job title

Homeless Services Manager

job title

Email

tchin@redwoodcity.org

Phone

(650) 780-7510

This contact will ONLY receive grant reporting correspondence (inclusive of guidance, report releases/reminders, report follow-ups).

Authorized Representative

Melissa

First

Stevenson Diaz

Last

Job title

City Manager

job title

Email

mdiaz@redwoodcity.org

Phone

(650) 780-7301

The Authorized Representative has authority to contract on behalf of the eligible applicant

If this application is funded, what address should the check be mailed to?

Address

2600 Middlefield Road

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Redwood City

City

California

State

94063

Zip Code

Attention to (if applicable):

Teri Chin



This Application uses character limits



Reaching these limits is not required, however competitive responses will address all parts of each

question asked.

Part 2: PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

Guidance:

In completing this application, applicants must identify the specific encampment that will be prioritized for resolution.

If an applicant proposes to prioritize a large, noncontiguous, or multiple site(s), the encampments may only be addressed through a single application if: (a) the justification for prioritizing the encampments is the same, **and** (b) the demographics and service needs of the residents of the encampments is sufficiently the same that, (c) the same set of services, and service providers, including outreach, interim and permanent housing programs, will be used to resolve the identified people's experience of homelessness in encampments.

Applicant must prepare a separate application for each encampment that does not meet the requirements of (a) – (c).

Proposal Summary

Summarize the proposed Encampment Resolution Fund (ERF) project, including an overview of all key components and/or phases of the project that will be funded in whole or in part with ERF-3-R resources. (1500-character limit)

During Year 1, Redwood City proposes to focus on transitioning 40 unsheltered residents to interim or permanent housing. During Years 2 and 3 we will assist those 40 residents to transition to and maintain permanent housing.

Redwood City's Coordinated, Inter-Agency Outreach Strategy Team (OS Team) has already been engaging these residents - some successfully transitioning to permanent housing and interim shelter stays while others are hesitant to engage in any services beyond basic needs; however, we still need more options for housing. ERF-3-R will build on our experience utilizing flexible housing subsidies to leverage existing housing opportunities and expand our use of interim and transitional housing options beyond our County's Continuum of Care.

While focusing on permanent housing for 40 residents (80% of the 50 residents currently residing at the targeted encampment areas), we will provide basic services and service connections for all 70 residents anticipated to reside in these targeted areas over the next 3 years.

Key components that we already implement are:

- Coordinated, Inter-Agency Team
- Utilization of By-Name list
- Utilization of On Demand Units at the Navigation Center in Redwood City
- Utilization of Hotel Respite program
- Weekly outreach and engagement
- Utilization of Housing Subsidies
- Partnership with Health and Behavioral Health to provide services in the field
- Leveraging of Coordinated Entry (CE) System to access housing options

People Served

Number of people currently residing in prioritized encampment site

50

#

Potential inflow of people into the prioritized encampment site during the grant term.

20

Of people currently residing in prioritized encampment site, how many will be served by this proposal?

50

#

Given the potential for inflow of people into the prioritized encampment site, how many people are projected to be served across the entire grant period?

70

#

Of people projected to be served across the entire grant period, number of people projected to transition into interim housing.

40

#

Of people projected to be served across the entire grant period, number of people projected to transition into permanent housing

#

*This should include both people who transition directly into permanent housing **and** people who may first transition into interim housing.*

Is the prioritized encampment site part of a larger encampment area?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Encampment Information

1. Briefly describe the characteristics of the people residing within the prioritized encampment site, including demographics, household compositions, disabilities, and projected service and housing needs. Include how this information was gathered. (1500-character limit)

All of the residents in the prioritized encampment sites have been experiencing homelessness for more than one year:

- 52% for 5 years or more
- 36% for 2-5 years
- 12% for less than 2 years

50% of the residents have a combination of physical/mental health disabilities and substance use disorder and are strong candidates for Permanent Supportive Housing,

25% of the individuals are undocumented Spanish speaking immigrants who are more reluctant to engage in services and for whom there are limited options within our Countywide CES housing matches.

80% of the residents identify as men; 17% as women; & 3% as transgender women.

The age range of these residents is 3% 18-24; 23% 25-34; 42% 35-44; 26% 45-54; & 7% 55+

We conducted feedback sessions with our homeless outreach and providers and we concluded that a Majority of the residents from the identified encampments want non-congregate, low barrier, shelter or housing in Redwood City. Access to non-congregate shelter options and the development of innovative interim and transitional housing options is key to supporting these residents.

If this proposal seeks to serve a particular target population, specify and describe.

2. Briefly describe physical characteristics of the prioritized encampment site in which the people you are proposing to serve are residing. The description must include the specific location, physical size of the area, the types of structures people are residing in at the site, whether vehicles are present, and any other relevant or notable physical characteristics of the site. (1000-character limit)

We are prioritizing 3 areas with a total of 50 residents. Encampments in these 3 areas are concealed within brush and trees, under freeway over-pass, or under freeway off-ramps. They are a combination of small and large tents and wooden structures/platforms.

The 1st area has 6 encampments along the 84 extension onto Seaport Boulevard and includes 4 along the former Cargill salt ponds that lead towards the Bay, 1 on the public shoulder of the road, and 1 adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks off Seaport Blvd.

The 2nd area has 10 encampments and is located around the Highway 101/84 Interchange including 2 encircled by the freeway on and off ramps, 1 immediately underneath the freeway at maintenance underpass, and 5 immediately adjacent to or underneath the entrances and exits along 101/ Woodside Road. 1 is parallel to the Seaport Blvd Off Ramp from 101.

The 3rd area has 2 encampments and is under the 84/Woodside Road overpass between El Camino Real and Middlefield Road.

3. Why is this encampment site being prioritized? Applicant should identify any distinguishing needs and/or vulnerabilities of the people living in this encampment and/or any health, safety, or other concerns that led the applicant to prioritize this site over other encampments. (1000-character limit)

10 of the encampments on the US101 and CA84 Encampment Circuit addressed by ERF-1 are inactive or resolved; yet, 13 additional encampments have developed along CA84 over the last two years.

We have prioritized these encampments due to the number of residents and frequency of re-encamping at these locations. In the case of the 10 encampments on CalTrans Right of Way, these locations have been subject to ongoing encampment removals. The other 8 encampments that are located on City and Union Pacific Railroad Right of Way have grown and spread with limited ability for the City to conduct clean-ups at these locations due to the Ninth Circuit Court ruling on Martin vs. Boise .

By prioritizing the residents of these locations with ERF-3-R funds, we propose to create more robust and client-focused alternatives for interim and transitional housing beyond the existing interim shelter options we have available in our countywide Continuum of Care.

ERF authorizing legislation requires funding be used for “prioritized” encampments. Applicants must, therefore, provide a justification for the prioritization of the encampment proposed to be served. Except in very small communities where it may be possible to justify prioritizing all of a small number of encampments for resolution using this fund source, ERF is not intended to be used to fund a community-wide encampment resolution program.

Attachment: Map

ERF-3-R Encampment Map_City of Redwood City.pdf

The provided map should clearly indicate the area of the prioritized encampment. The map may also indicate the location of other key service, shelter, and housing resources described in this proposal.

4. Is the prioritized site on a state right-of-way?

☐ No ☒ Yes - partially ☐ Yes - entirely

Attachment: Caltrans Letter of Support

Projects entirely or partially on a state right-of-way must include a Letter of Support from Caltrans.

- This letter must include confirmation from Caltrans that they are aware of and in support of the ERF project, including the projected timeline, and that they will only take action on that encampment site in collaboration with and at least 2 weeks-notice to the ERF grantee, unless critical circumstances exist when an encampment poses an imminent threat to life, health, safety, or infrastructure and must be immediately addressed.
- This letter should be signed by the local Caltrans Deputy District Director of Maintenance (DDDM) or their designee.
- This letter may also include Caltrans role in the proposal and what Caltrans resources are being leveraged.

Proposal's Outcomes

5. What outcomes does this proposal seek to accomplish by 6/30/2027? Outcomes should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). (1000-character limit)

1. Provide outreach, engagement, and basic needs services to 70 individuals
2. 80% of people served will complete a CE assessment
3. Provide Encampment Waste Services for 100% of the encampments in the prioritized areas during Year 1 of the project
4. Offer field medical services to 100% of people served
5. Out of 70 people to be served, transition 40 into interim housing
6. Out of 70 people to be served, transition 40 into permanent housing
7. Out of 40 people transitioned to interim housing, 100% will receive intensive housing-focused case management to support their pathway to permanent housing
8. Out of 40 people transitioned to permanent housing, 100% will receive case management and flexible housing subsidy support to prevent returning to homelessness
9. Offer behavioral health assessments to 100% of people served
10. 80% of those diagnosed with mental illness or substance use disorder will be linked to behavioral health services
11. Resolve number of encampments by 50%

6. What are the primary activities the applicant will implement to achieve each of the proposal's outcomes? (1000-character limit)

1. Continue OS Team Activities:
 - a. Utilize By-Name list of residents to further individualized plan for engagement and transition to housing; identify and maximize all points of contact.
 - b. Utilize On Demand Units and Hotel Respite Program
 - c. Partner with Health and Behavioral Health for services in the field.
2. Extend contract with Downtown Streets Team (DST) to provide weekly encampment waste services to encampments.
3. Continue ongoing coordination with County Continuum of Care to maximize access and leveraging of county resources for shelter and housing.
4. Administer Housing Subsidies to provide additional Rapid Re-Housing Opportunities, to prevent people from losing their housing
5. Develop partnership and fund housing providers outside of the Coordinated Entry housing pool to create additional innovative interim housing options
6. Dedicate case management follow-up for each individual once they transition to interim or permanent housing

7. How will the applicant measure progress towards the proposal's outcomes? (1000-character limit)

Existing contracts with LifeMoves, the OS Team Lead Agency, and with DST already encompass the performance outcomes. Partners report monthly on performance metrics.

Additionally, the City's Human Services Manager and Homelessness Initiatives Management Analyst meet weekly with the OS Team leadership and bi-weekly with the DST leadership. City staff closely monitors the progress of our Homelessness Initiatives partners and actively participates in supporting and developing strategies. When a previously identified strategy or approach is not working as hoped, we are constantly looking at adjustments to improve outcomes and solicit feedback from City departments, homeless service providers, and community partners.

Any new contractual partnerships towards creating additional innovative interim housing options will similarly incorporate performance outcomes with regular monitoring by the City.

8. Are there any local ordinances, resources, or other factors that may hinder achieving the proposal's outcomes? If so, how will the applicant navigate these challenges? (1000- character limit)

There are no local ordinances that would hinder achieving the proposal's outcome. On the contrary, the City has a strong inter-agency team that meets monthly to coordinate on citywide homelessness efforts. This results in a unified approach to addressing homeless encampments in the City.

As noted in the description of population, many of the residents identified in the encampment sites are undocumented or monolingual Spanish speakers. While the OS Team includes staff that are culturally competent, native Spanish speakers, have lived experience of homelessness, and are from the Redwood City community, the lack of sufficient options for undocumented people is a challenge. Our exploration of innovative housing approaches is largely focused on how to best serve this particular population that has grown within the encampments in the last couple of years.

9. Does this proposal fund a standalone project, or is the proposed project one component of a larger initiative?

☐ Standalone ☒ Larger initiative

If it is part of a larger initiative, describe the role and significance of this project in achieving the objectives of the larger initiative. (1000-character limit)

The larger initiative is our coordinated, inter-agency homeless outreach pilot which has increased our effectiveness in successfully engaging unhoused residents that otherwise have not consistently engaged in services.

This project will take this pilot one step further allowing us to expand the opportunities we can offer beyond our existing CE system and pilot intensive post-housing case management. The transition from living outdoors to indoors is a major change for encampment residents and takes time for them to make the adjustment and re-learn certain life skills. This adjustment can take years and this funding will allow us to fund case managers that will provide dedicated post-housing support to residents.

The efforts of our coordinated, inter-agency approach have already had an impact on our larger countywide system as demonstrated by the approach incorporated into the County of San Mateo's successful ERF-3-R grant award.

Centering People

10. Describe how the perspectives of people with lived experience of homelessness meaningfully contributed to the content of this proposal? How will people with lived experience be part of the implementation of this ERF project? If individuals living in the encampment site were included in the development of this proposal, describe how their input was obtained and how that input shaped the proposal. (1000-character limit)

Half of the OS Team have lived experience of homelessness or recovery from substance use disorders. Additionally, our OS Team is constantly assessing and listening to the needs of our unhoused residents to ensure that they are moving in the right direction, are meeting goals, and are on a path towards sustainable, long-term housing.

Our strategy and approach to addressing the needs of encampment residents is constantly informed by the perspectives of individuals with lived experience – either directly or through our OS team and additional outreach partners whom we meet with twice a month.

It is the OS Team that has pioneered the use of housing subsidies to assist residents to pay their portion of housing even when they receive a permanent housing voucher, to pay for sober living environment move in, to start an AA program for encampment residents, and to explore possibilities for shared housing we could subsidize.

11. Briefly describe how the proposal exemplifies Housing First approaches as defined in Welfare and Institutions Code section 8255. (1000-character limit)

Our proposal is focused on offering viable housing options to all of the residents of the targeted encampment areas regardless of health or mental health disabilities, substance use disorders, lack of income, lack of legal status, or other barriers that may exist.

Through the use of our County's CE system, individuals with the highest barriers to housing are prioritized for housing matches. This benefits the high percentage of chronically homeless individuals with multiple disabilities living in the targeted encampments.

Once housed, individuals will continue to receive case management services from the OS Team geared toward providing support that will help the individual remain stably housed. The OS Team will partner with health and behavioral health colleagues to offer support in basic living skills, treatment and recovery services, and social interaction and community building to combat the sense of isolation that can come with suddenly having your own place to live.

12. Describe how each of the following service delivery practices are incorporated into the outreach, interim shelter (if applicable), and permanent housing aspects of the proposed ERF project: (a) individual participant choice and (b) trauma informed care. (1000-character limit)

(a) Encampment residents are always given options and are never forced to make a decision that they are not comfortable with. We have seen encampment residents decline housing opportunities they have been matched to and residents placed at the Navigation Center who decide not to. Outreach and case plans are designed to center the choices of clients so that they can ultimately thrive and achieve self-sufficiency.

(b) Staff receive trauma informed care training and employ a harm reduction model into all of their outreach and engagements with residents. The OS team that would be funded under this program has built strong relationships with more than 200 unduplicated unsheltered residents in Redwood City over the last 16 months and are well-equipped to continue supporting this population. Staff on the team understand the background of residents, what their needs are, how clients react in certain situations, and how to navigate mental health challenges that many of the residents face.

13. Describe how harm reduction principles will be incorporated into the outreach, interim housing (if applicable), and permanent housing aspects of this ERF project. (1000-character limit)

We recently learned that one of the local providers of sober living environment houses where we have successfully placed people also runs a "harm reduction" house in Redwood City. As a part of our exploration of innovative interim housing options, we will be exploring the possibility of master leasing spaces in this program so that this option can be available "on demand" for any encampment resident for whom this might be a good first step for moving from encampment to interim housing.

Our OS Team partners with county funded Healthcare for Homeless/ Street Medicine teams that utilize harm reduction principles in the field, including needle exchange, overdose prevention, and safe injection.

14. Describe the services that will be provided to improve people's health, dignity, and safety while they continue to reside within the prioritized encampment site. (1000-character limit)

Dignity on Wheels mobile shower and laundry service currently operates four days a week in Redwood City and will continue to be available to encampment residents during the grant period.

Street Medicine, Healthcare for the Homeless, and Behavioral Health and Recovery Services clinicians also visit encampments on a weekly basis to conduct field assessments and connect individuals to other health services.

Additionally, Downtown Streets Team (DST) will provide encampment waste services to all encampments in the identified sites to reduce the accumulation of trash, biohazard, flammable items, needles, sharp objects, and other harmful materials that can be found at encampments. DST team members include individuals that either currently or formerly resided at encampments in Redwood City. These team members serve as peers to current encampment residents and are able to effectively engage with them.

15. Identify what controls are or will be in place to ensure that all ERF-3-R funded parties will not penalize homelessness. The term “penalize homelessness” means to impose, by a governmental unit, criminal or civil penalties on persons who are homeless in a manner that is related to those persons’ engagement in necessary human activities, including sleeping, resting, and eating. (1000-character limit)

As stated previously, the City has an inter-departmental team that meets monthly to coordinate on the City’s homelessness initiatives. Participants include representatives from the police department, the fire department, public works services, library, parks, housing office, city manager’s office, and city attorney’s office.

Additionally, the Homeless Services Manager and Homelessness Initiatives Management Analyst meet weekly with the police department’s homelessness liaison and consult regularly with the patrol captain to be aware of any potential enforcement action being considered.

The City is also keenly aware of limitations deriving from the Ninth Circuit Court ruling on *Martin vs Boise* which prohibits the City from enforcing any law related to sleeping or occupying public property unless the City can first demonstrate there is shelter available for all homeless individuals within the City.

16. Describe how this proposal considers sanitation services for people residing in the prioritized encampment. This may include but is not limited to non-intrusive, curb-side waste removal and access to clean and available bathrooms. (1000-character limit)

Downtown Streets Team (DST) will provide encampment waste services (EWS) on a weekly basis to all of the prioritized sites. DST has operated in Redwood City since 2015 and launched the EWS program in 2021 to address the health and safety impacts from the encampments.

While not funded through this program, the City also funds WeHOPE’s Dignity on Wheels (DOW) mobile shower and laundry program which currently operates in Redwood City 4 days a week and each session lasts 4 hours. DOW offers free laundry and shower services, provides case management to clients, and connects clients to other community resources.

Part 3: IMPLEMENTATION

Core Service Delivery and Housing Strategies

17. Describe the proposed outreach and engagement strategy, case management, and / or service coordination for people while they are continuing to reside within the encampment site. Quantify units of service to be delivered including the ratio of staff to people served, frequency of engagement, and length of service periods. (2000-character limit)

Given the existing knowledge and relationships of the OS Team and the partners from our Redwood City Homeless Outreach and Service Providers group, we propose to develop strategies to maximize our outreach and engagement efforts with each resident within the priority encampment areas:

- Coordination of multi-disciplinary weekly encampment visits
- Development of outreach campaigns for each of the encampment areas focused on listening to the residents' needs and interests with regards to interim and permanent housing options as well as other needs.
- Creation of a by name list of residents for each of the encampment areas; identify case manager lead and team for each resident (depending on individual's needs, existing relationships, and expertise within the team)
- Utilization of multi-disciplinary team case conference model to support each individual with the goal of encouraging residents to consider interim housing via shelter or some other type of transitional housing

Coordinate field outreach with CE to encourage residents to do CE assessment. During Year 1 of the project, we will have the equivalent of 4.7 FTE outreach staff (3 case managers; 2 of which are bilingual Spanish speakers) and 4 outreach workers (3 of which have lived experience of homelessness) - all spending approximately half of their time supporting the targeted encampments. Additionally, we will leverage the support of LifeMoves, WeHOPE, Catholic Worker House, Healthcare for the Homeless/Street Medicine, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS) Clinician and Outreach Worker for the outreach to the 50 residents of the encampments.

Units of services provided to the 50 residents include: food, toiletries, health services, mental health services, transport to appointments, obtaining driver's licenses and IDs, employment services, CES assessments, gift card incentives, etc.

18. Describe the role of Coordinated Entry in the context of this proposal and how Coordinated Entry policies or processes will support and / or hinder the implementation of this proposal. (1000-character limit)

San Mateo County's Continuum of Care utilizes CE for access to shelter and to housing options for homeless individuals and families. The OS Team currently offers CE to each individual they engage. Ultimately, it is up to the individual whether or not they want to provide the information for the CES assessment. It is two step process with the OS Team member providing the initial referral to the CES assessor.

The OS Team is able to access CE Assessors from the field for phone assessments. Due to the current high demand for CE assessments for shelter, there are times when there are delays and the individual decides not to wait or the OS Team member is unable to stay to help the client complete the assessment. For this project, we will work with the County Center on Homeless and CE provider to schedule dedicated days/times for CES assessments to facilitate the process and avoid these potential delays.

19. Describe each of the specific (a) interim housing and (b) permanent housing opportunities that will be used to achieve the proposed outcomes of this ERF project. Demonstrate that any ERF-3-R funded interim housing capacity is either non-congregate or clinically enhanced congregate shelter. (2000-character limit)

I. Interim Housing

A. Shelter via CES – County Funded Adult Shelters

- Navigation Center, Redwood City
- Pacific Emergency Shelter (non-congregate shelter), Redwood City /re-opening for single adults in the summer of 2024
- WeHOPE Shelter (congregate shelter), East Palo Alto
- Safe Harbor Shelter (congregate shelter), South San Francisco

B. Spring Shelter, Redwood City – not part of CES; referrals made directly to shelter for individuals with a mental health diagnosis

C. Sober Living Environment – independently operated; potential for utilizing housing funding from ERF-3-R

D. Harm Reduction House – independently operated; potential for utilizing housing subsidy funding from ERF-3-R

E. HIP Housing Self-Sufficiency Program Home – part of innovative solutions for transitional housing up to 2 years. Home where people would share on an interim basis; would explore use of housing funding from ERF-3-R to supplement individual's portion of rent for initial period of time.

F. Master Leased Units – part of innovative solutions to explore with housing funding from ERF-3-R; especially for undocumented residents.

G. Existing Rapid Rehousing via CES – utilize as pathway to permanent housing.

H. Rapid Re-Housing – funded from ERF-3-R

I. Skilled Nursing – for individuals needing skilled nursing accessed via Healthcare for the Homeless

II. Permanent Housing

A. Housing via CES

- Permanent Supportive Housing Vouchers
- Rapid Re-Housing (for this population, this is an Interim Housing Option)
- Casa Esperanza
- Shores Landing for adults 62+
- New PSH Project Based sites projected to come online during grant period

B. Board and Care – independently operated; potential for utilizing housing funding from ERF-3-R

C. Moving to Work Waitlist - Section 8 voucher waitlist for San Mateo County

D. Housing Waitlists– for Extremely Low Affordable Housing Units

E. Potential Set-Aside Units in Redwood City Housing Developments – part of exploring additional housing via set-aside units

20. Demonstrate the applicant's commitment and ability to deliver permanent housing solutions to the people residing in the prioritized encampment, including by providing examples of prior successful efforts to permanently house similarly situated individuals. (2000-character limit)

Given that over 50% of the people residing in the prioritize encampment areas have been chronically homeless for more than 5 years and 50% have physical or mental health disabilities, the likelihood that individuals who are CE assessed will get matched to housing options is high. This has been our experience with former encampment residents that we have been able to house – including from these same encampment areas.

Currently, only about 50% of the people the OS Team has engaged over the last year and half have agreed to do CE assessments. With this project, we will further strategize and focus on getting folks in these encampments CE assessed.

Unfortunately, the City does not have control over what is available in terms of housing. The OS Team has had individuals who have matched to RRH voucher but decline due to worry about paying their rent once the RRH voucher expires. For this reason, we propose to use housing funding from ERF-3-R to help extend these opportunities through the entire grant period while assisting the individuals with moving towards self-sufficiency or with accessing a permanent affordable housing opportunity.

Since 25% of the people in prioritized areas are undocumented, their options for subsidized housing within the current system are much more limited. This project would allow us to explore Master leasing a block of units and/or shared housing options as interim housing which could allow these individuals to stabilize and return to being housed on their own. We have seen firsthand the community and pseudo-family dynamics that are present at the larger encampments and would invite clients to self-identify who they would want to live in shared housing with in order to ensure a safe and enjoyable environment for all of the individuals.

21. Describe how this proposal is tailored to meet the needs and preferences of people residing within the prioritized encampment. (1500-character limit)

As indicated previously, the OS Team is very familiar with the prioritized encampment areas. Over the last 6+ months, the OS team has conducted “outreach campaigns” to better understand the dynamics of the residents that live together at encampments and their needs. In particular, the innovative options for interim housing that we have identified for this project come directly out of that experience and our experience of utilizing our current housing subsidy funds to support individuals transitioning into permanent housing as well as sober living environments (SLEs).

Prior to the opening of the County’s Navigation Center in Redwood City, a 240 unit non-congregate shelter, over 30 encampment residents who had previously been reluctant to go to shelter told OS Team members that they would be willing to go to the Navigation Center. Once the Navigation Center filled up, access to these non-congregate units became more limited. Many of the encampment residents who have agreed to go to one of the OS Team On Demand units at the Navigation Center eventually returned to the streets when they couldn’t be placed at the Navigation Center and were alternately placed at one of the congregate shelter sites in our county. Clearly the option for non-congregate shelter is preferred; and many residents chose to remain or return to their encampments when only congregate shelter was available.

Where applicable, identify the people, data, evidence, and / or other sources of information that was relied upon for this proposal.

Table 1: Projected Living Situations Immediately Following the Encampment

For people served who exit the encampment, what are the projected Living Situations Immediately Following the Encampment, including but not limited to, permanent housing, interim sheltering, and unsheltered?

Please provide responses in the table below. Add a row for each projected living situation. (250-character limit for each cell)

Briefly Describe Each Projected Living Situation Immediately Following the Encampment	Is This Permanent Housing?	Quantify the Capacity (e.g., number of beds/units, frequency of bed/unit availability)	Prioritized or Set-Aside for ERF-3-R?	Is this living situation funded by ERF-3-R and / or Leveraged Funds?	% of Served Persons Projected to Fall Within This Living Situation
Shelter via CES	No Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	20 %
Spring Street Shelter	No Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	4 %
Harm Reduction Environment	No Yes/No	2	Set-Aside Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	4 %
Sober Living Environment	No Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	8 %
HIP Housing Self Sufficiency	No Yes/No	2	Set-Aside Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	4 %
Master Leased Units	No Yes/No	2	Set-Aside Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	4 %
Rapid Re-Housing (CES)	No Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	16 %
Rapid Re-Housing (non-CES)	No Yes/No	10	Set-Aside Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	18 %

Permanent Housing Voucher	Yes Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	16 %
Shores Landing Permanent Supportive Housing	Yes Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	2 %
Casa Esperanza	Yes Yes/No	As Available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	2 %
Skilled Nursing Facility	No Yes/No	As available	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	Both ERF/Lev/Both	2 %

Table 2: Permanent Housing Opportunities

A permanent housing opportunity is a combination of project and/or service provided to an individual with the goal of helping the individual obtain permanent housing. Of course, applicants cannot and do not need to provide every possible scenario; Cal ICH is looking to understand the primary, expected permanent housing opportunities for people projected to be served by this proposal.

Please provide responses in the table below. Add a row for each projected opportunity. (250-character limit for each cell)

Describe the Permanent Housing Opportunity	Prioritized or Set-Aside for ERF-3-R?	Quantify the Capacity of the Housing and Service Opportunity	Is this Housing Opportunity Funded by ERF-3-R and / or Leveraged Funds?
CES Permanent Housing Voucher/ Tenant Based or Project Based	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	As Available	Lev ERF/Lev/Both
NEW CES Project Based Permanent Housing Projects Projected During Grant Period	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	As Available	Lev ERF/Lev/Both
Rapid Re-Housing where individual increases income to be able to afford housing or transitions to Permanent Housing Voucher	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	2 case managers available to work with individuals	ERF ERF/Lev/Both

Board and Care where financial support accessed to be able to afford care	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	2 case managers available to work with individuals	Both ERF/Lev/Both
Section 8 Wait Lists/Tenant Based and Project Based	Neither Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	As Available	Lev ERF/Lev/Both
Potential Set-Aside Units in Housing Developments	Set-Aside Pri/Set-Aside/Neither	4	Both ERF/Lev/Both

22. Describe strategies the applicant will use to ensure that people are not displaced from the prioritized encampment into another unsheltered location. Include strategies that are in addition to/complement the interim shelter and permanent housing opportunities that are part of this proposal. (1000-character limit)

We will coordinate closely with CalTrans, Union Pacific Railroad, and within our City's Inter-Departmental Team to prevent the priority encampment areas from being subject to encampment removals and clean-ups prior to fully implementing our plan to offer enhanced interim housing options for the residents. In order to decrease the need for frequent clean-ups, we will utilize Downtown Street Team's encampment waste services to help mitigate excess garbage and waste at the encampment

IF there are any encampment removals at these locations, we will continue to utilize up to 5 On Demand Units at the Navigation Center, and we will utilize our hotel respite program as an immediate, emergency, temporary housing option for clients that are at risk of being displaced so that they can stabilize. We currently operate the hotel respite program and have successfully used this program to support residents that are affected by encampment clear-outs when there were no On Demand Units available.

23. Describe specific strategies and/or services the applicant will use to prevent returns to unsheltered homelessness among people from the prioritized encampment who are sheltered and housed through this ERF project. Include whether these strategies will be funded with ERF-3-R funds and, if not, what other resources will be leveraged. (1000-character limit)

Strategies will include offering “flex” funds for emergency support to ensure clients can remain housed. Uses of funds may include but are not limited to utility payments, phone bill, legal fees, car payment, property damage, pet fee, child support, etc.

We have included “Housing Subsidy flex funds” in our non-personnel costs of our budget proposal in the amount of \$10,000 from ERF-3-R funds. This amount was based on supporting 50 residents with a \$200 housing subsidy flex fund.

Our other strategy is to assign 2 FTE case manager to provide post-housing case management with a focus on keeping clients stably housed for the last 21 months of the project. Many of the residents from the identified encampments have not lived indoors for a long time, and we understand that they will need help transitioning from outdoors to indoors. We have budgeted this under the Prevention and Diversion eligible use category in the amount of \$366k. We have requested to use ERF-3-R funds for this position.

24. Describe how this proposal considers and plans for the dynamic nature of encampments including potential inflow of people into the geographically served areas. (1000-character limit)

The OS Team assigns two Outreach Workers or Case Managers to each encampment. As such, the Workers have become familiar over time with the residents of each of the priority area encampments. They know who the regular encampment residents are and when a new resident joins the encampment. By utilizing the By Name list for the prioritized encampments along with the HMIS Outreach Module, we are able to track when individuals move to a different encampment. With this proposal we will focus on increasing the continuity of relationships with the encampment residents even as they move to different locations or to shelter, for example. It's important to be able to continue with consistent follow-up and engagement wherever an individual may have moved.

As new people move to the targeted encampments, we will provide outreach and engagement and connect those individuals to existing services, shelter, and housing.

25. Describe how participants in this ERF project will be supported with continued access to, and storage of, their personal property while in the encampment, in interim housing (if applicable), and in permanent housing. (1000-character limit)

Currently, we provide storage to residents that are affected by encampment clear-outs, residents that transition to shelter or hotel and need space to temporarily store their belongings, or to residents that enter treatment/detox and need a safe space for their items. We also recognize that this is not a solution for all residents; therefore, outreach workers and the encampment waste services team will continue to assist residents with “paring” down or selling items they no longer need. Items will never be removed without the resident’s consent and outreach workers will utilize motivational interviewing to build trust and confidence in the support they are offering.

26. Describe how participants in this ERF project who have service animals and/or pets will be supported while in the encampment, in interim shelter (if applicable), and in permanent housing. (1000-character limit)

Based on our current assessment of the identified sites for this project, there are very few pets that reside in the encampments. For the clients that currently have pets, we estimate that there are at most five pets (dogs) and we will identify housing options that will allow pets to reside in units.

Through our current hotel respite program, the hotel that we partner with does accept pets, and we will continue to partner with the hotel and utilize this resource for individuals at the encampments that have pets as an interim sheltering opportunity during their housing search process.

Additionally, the Navigation Center in Redwood City does allow pets, and WeHOPE Shelter (a congregate shelter in East Palo Alto that a few encampment residents have moved to) has a kennel for pets.

Budget and Resource Plan

27. State the total amount of ERF-3-R funds requested.

\$2,850,628.24

\$

28. State the estimated dollar value of secured, non-ERF-3-R resources that will help meet this proposal's outcomes.

\$13,611,536.30

\$

29. Identify and describe each leveraged non-ERF-3-R resource and how that specific resource will be used to help meet the proposal's outcomes, including the permanent housing outcomes. (1000-character limit)

\$500,000 in Redwood City Funding to support the OS Team staff costs.

\$750,000 in Redevelopment Agency Funds to support the Housing Specialists and Post Housing Case Management

\$12.4 million in Shelter and CE Costs provided by the County of San Mateo through federal, state, and local funding sources cover the cost of these services

The City will additionally leverage existing Rapid-ReHousing, Permanent Supportive Housing and HUD Unsheltered NOFO funding through the County

The City will seek an additional \$1,000,000 in funding and resources through the following:

- Deeper Integration of county funded homeless outreach workers into the OS Team model
- Work with the County of San Mateo on utilizing County Homeless Outreach funding to support the OS Team Coordination. Integration of the model and lessons from the OS Team has been the vision since the County provided funding for the OS Team in February 2022.
- Seeking grants from through alternative local funding sources

*Applicants are directed to provide a detailed description of other fund sources, and system capacity, that will be leveraged to achieve the outcomes proposed for the ERF-3-R funded project (**especially as it relates to meeting this proposal's permanent housing outcomes**) and, if applicable, to sustain the new programming beyond the end of the grant term.*

This includes prior ERF awards, HUD unsheltered NOFO, and other federal, state, and local funding sources.

Applications will be evaluated with the understanding that communities vary significantly with respect to the current availability of other fund sources that can be used as leverage for their proposed projects and to sustain the projects beyond the grant term.

In the absence of currently available resources, Applicants are encouraged to provide a specific plan for obtaining the funding necessary to sustain their project beyond the grant term if the project is intended to continue.

30. Describe how the proposal is a prudent and effective use of requested funding relative to the number of people it seeks to serve, the types of services and housing to be provided, and any

benefits to the community's efforts to address homelessness that will extend beyond the grant term, including ongoing expansion of interim and permanent housing capacity. Include an explanation of how the requested ERF-3-R amount was determined. (1000- character limit)

Our proposal of \$2.85 million to serve 70 individuals is an effective use of requested funding with over 60% budgeted for housing and direct client assistance. The outreach and engagement portion of this proposal is expected to conclude in year one with year two and three focused on supporting the 40 individuals successful housing outcomes. With over 50% of the individuals having been homeless for more than 5 years and 50% having dual diagnoses of disabilities and substance use, the investment in case management support for the full term of the grant is critical. Unfortunately, we have seen too many cases of formerly homeless individuals losing their housing and returning to homelessness without ongoing longer term case management support. And this translates into further costs in 911 medical emergencies, emergency room visits and hospital stays, and ongoing costs to police, fire, public works services, CalTrans, and CHP in responding to impacts of encampments.

Attachment: Standardized Budget

ERF Standardized Budget_City of Redwood City_04.24 (1).xlsx

Applicants must use the [ERF-3-R Budget Template](#) available on box.com

Key Entities and Staff

31. First, describe the implementing organization and specific unit or office within the implementing organization that would administer ERF-3-R. Then, describe their role and primary responsibilities for this proposal. Finally, if these entities have managed a complex homelessness project or grant, describe how those experiences informed this proposal. (1500-character limit)

Redwood City's Homelessness Initiatives (HI) Unit will oversee ERF-3-R implementation. As an inaugural ERF-1 recipient, the City is capable of managing another ERF project. Additionally, the City is also a recipient of ARPA pass-through funds that were awarded by the County of San Mateo in late 2022.

Redwood City is historically the jurisdiction with the highest unsheltered homeless population in San Mateo County. Although Redwood City has historically relied on the County's Continuum of Care System (CoC) to address homelessness, in 2020, the City decided to launch its own Homelessness Initiative to leverage and complement the existing CoC system. The City established a two year Temporary RV Safe Parking program successfully reducing RVs on the street from a high of 140/ night to an average of 5/night; assisting over 60% of the participants to transition to permanent housing. Redwood City was the only jurisdiction in San Mateo County to decrease the number of unsheltered homeless comparing the Homeless One Day Count for 2022 to 2019. The OS Team with the Coordinated, Inter-Agency Strategy focus was subsequently launched as a pilot to address unsheltered homelessness in Redwood City. Initially funded with one time City funds, the goal is functional zero homelessness, eventually allowing the City to again step back and continue primarily utilizing the CoC system to address homelessness going forward.

Table 3: Key Staff

Identify all staff positions (e.g. administrative, programmatic, development etc.) which are integral to this ERF project and to achieving the proposal's outcomes. For each position include the title, whether the position is filled or vacant, the approximate fulltime equivalent (FTE) of the position dedicated to the ERF project, whether the position is funded through ERF-3-R and/or Leveraged (i.e.non-ER-3-R) funds, and a brief description of the duties. Please provide responses in Table 3 below.

Title	Currently Filled Position?	FTE of Staffing for This Proposal	Funded by ERF-3-R and / or Leveraged Funds?	Brief Description of Duties
Homeless Services Manager	Yes Yes/No	0.2 # FTE	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	To provide overall direction and project management for ERF-3-R project
Grants and Finance Management Analyst	Yes Yes/No	0.3 # FTE	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	To oversee ERF-3-R Contracts, Grants, and Finances
Program Director	Yes Yes/No	0.5 # FTE	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	To Coordinate ERF-3-R Coordinated Homeless Outreach Strategy and lead the OS Team
Associate Program Director	Yes Yes/No	0.5 # FTE	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	To oversee case managers, outreach workers, and housing specialists

Case Manager	Yes Yes/No	2 # FTE	ERF ERF/Lev/Both	To provide personalized case plans, assist clients with housing readiness, and provide long-term housing case management once clients are housed
Outreach Worker	Yes Yes/No	1.7 # FTE	ERF ERF/Lev/Both	Provide outreach and engagement services to encampment residents, serve as initial point of contact, connect clients to services, and refer clients to case managers
Housing Specialist	No Yes/No	1 # FTE	ERF ERF/Lev/Both	To conduct housing searches, engage with landlords, and assist individuals in applying for housing
Data Analyst/Intern	Yes Yes/No	0.5 # FTE	Lev ERF/Lev/Both	To track data, outcomes, and performance measures, prepare reports, and perform data quality assurance in HMIS Clarity system
Housing Property Manager	No Yes/No	1 # FTE	Both ERF/Lev/Both	To provide property management services, oversee leases, and manage units that will be "master leased"

32. First, describe key partners that will be responsible for implementing this ERF project and achieving the proposal's outcomes (e.g. service providers, public agencies, development entities etc.). Then, describe their role and primary responsibilities for this proposal. Finally, if these entities have managed a complex homelessness project or grant, describe how those experiences informed this proposal. (1500-character limit)

LifeMoves is the lead agency for the OS Team and has been providing homeless outreach services for over 14 years, operates the Navigation Center in Redwood City and operated the Redwood City Temporary RV Safe Parking Program.

The OS Team Partner Agencies are:

- WeHOPE brings 8 years of homeless outreach services and Dignity on Wheels
- Nations Finest brings over 50 years of serving Veterans who are homeless and at risk of homelessness
- Downtown Streets Team brings 5 years of employment services for unhoused residents in Redwood City with a focus on building peer to peer support amongst homeless community members and providing Encampment Waste Services
- Street Life Ministries has been providing basic services for unhoused residents for the last 20 years

All members of the current OS Team that has been providing outreach, engagement, and case management to encampment residents and former encampment residents for the last year and a half.

Members of the OS Team along with our RWC Homeless Outreach and Service Providers Group provided feedback regarding the proposed target areas and the types of housing and services the residents of this set of encampments might be most responsive to.

We will be selecting a contractor to provide property management services and manage units that will be “master leased”. Possible contractors we have had preliminary conversations with include HIP Housing and Abode Services with whom we also discussed innovative housing solutions.

33. Describe specific examples of how Local Jurisdiction(s) and the CoC have collaborated on the design and implementation of this proposal. (1000-character limit)

The implementing organization for this proposal is the City of Redwood City and the lead staff who will direct the project is the Homeless Services Manager who also serves on the CoC Steering Committee and is the Human Services Manager for the Fair Oaks Community Center (FOCC). FOCC is one of the Core Services Agencies that is funded through the San Mateo County and serves as the entry point to CE for unhoused Redwood City residents. We collaborate closely with staff from the San Mateo County Human Services Agency (HSA), which is the lead agency for the County’s CoC, and rely on the County’s current Homelessness Strategic Plan for the successful implementation of our proposal. Staff from HSA also participate in our bi-weekly outreach and providers meetings, and we have weekly meetings with the Center on Homelessness Manager to discuss strategies around encampment clear outs, priority shelter placement, and use of on-demand shelter beds.

Applicants may upload evidence of cross-jurisdictional collaboration such as MOUs, letters of support, or interagency agreements etc. in the field immediately below.

Optional Upload: Evidence of Cross-Jurisdictional Collaboration

34. Identify any entities that have a right to and/or control of the property upon which the encampment site resides. Describe how applicant has engaged with these entities and confirm that each of these entities has committed to allowing the implementation of this proposal. (1000-character limit)

The prioritized encampment areas include:

- 10 sites that are on CalTrans Right of Way
- 7 sites that are on City of Redwood City Right of Way
- 1 site that is on Union Pacific Railroad Right of Way
-

We have been working in close coordination with CalTrans District 4 external affairs and maintenance division since March 2022. We continue to meet bi-monthly, regularly share information, and strategize solutions. CalTrans regularly notifies us at least two weeks in advance when they have identified a location in Redwood City for encampment removal. As expressed in their letter of support, we will continue to work together to support the implementation of this proposal.

Our contact with Union Pacific Railroad is on a case by case basis, but also allows for coordination when necessary to support implementation of this proposal. If we are awarded the grant, we will share the information and strategy with our Union Pacific Railroad contact.

Accelerated Timeline

35. How is your community currently supporting and / or engaging with people residing within the prioritized encampment? (1000-character limit)

The RWC OS team, and other homeless services providers from LifeMoves, WeHOPE, Healthcare for the Homeless, Street Medicine, Downtown Streets Team, Catholic Worker House, & Behavioral Health and Recovery Services currently visit the identified encampments multiple times a week, including “after-hours” to optimize the number of engagements with residents. These providers have been working in Redwood City for several years and understand the dynamics of the encampments, unique challenges each resident faces, and have strong community connections that they rely upon to support residents.

Encampment Waste Services, care kits, hot meals, and other supplies are provided to these sites on a weekly basis. Through our coordinated inter-agency collaborative of providers from varying fields, in addition to monthly case conferencing, we are always able to support one another in working with each resident so that contact, rapport, and momentum is not lost.

36. If this proposal is selected, in advance of receiving funding, what steps will your community take to support the people living in the encampment and swift implementation of this proposal? (1000-character limit)

All key staff to be funded through this project (except the housing specialists) are already hired and onboarded and have been engaging with the individuals living at these encampments. Because the OS Team is already established in Redwood City, and other County-funded homeless outreach service providers also work intensely with these clients at the identified sites, there is no need for a ramp-up plan. Steps to assist clients with our current funding for housing subsidies are already underway, but the funds set aside for the current allocation of housing subsidies need to be spent by June 2024. If awarded, a portion of the housing subsidy funds requested through our budget proposal will be immediately used to support residents living in the ERF-3-R prioritized sites that get housed before June 2024 to continue to stay housed, and funds would be utilized to assist clients that are currently enrolled in our transitional hotel respite program to move into housing.

Table 4: Project Timeline

Cal ICH should be able to use the project timeline to understand the general parameters of the project and how it will be implemented.

This Standardized Project Timeline Template will not perfectly capture every nuance - that's Ok. However, applicants are strongly encouraged to provide incremental milestones for achieving the interim shelter and permanent housing goals set out in the proposal. For projects that include interim shelter and/or permanent housing development, the timeline should include major development milestones.

Where there is ambiguity, conflict, or silence, use your judgment.

Date	Milestone	Category	Additional Detail for Milestone
6/30/2024	ERF-3-R Award Announcement	Project Management	
6/30/2024	Contracts finalized with Downtown Streets Team and LifeMoves	Project Management	
7/1/2024	Encampment Waste Services	People	Weekly encampment waste services begins at prioritized encampments
7/1/2024	Dignity on Wheels mobile shower and laundry services	People	First session of FY24-25 starts
7/1/2024	Begin targeted outreach at prioritized encampments	People	
7/5/2024	LifeMoves coordination initial meeting	Project Management	
7/17/2024	Redwood City Outreach and Providers Initial meeting	Project Management	

8/31/2024	ERF-3-R Encampment By-name list finalized	People	Creation of ERF-3-R encampment by-name list will be finalized and include HMIS ID number, current living situation, household size, and anticipated initial housing placement
8/31/2024	Hire and onboard Housing Specialists	Project Management	
8/31/2024	CES assessments	People	25% of residents CES assessed
9/30/2024	Secure MOUs and agreements	Project Management	MOUs and/or Agreement with contractor to provide Property Management and Master Leasing Services
10/31/2024	CES assessments	People	50% of residents CES assessed
10/31/2024	Shelter Placement	People	10 people (10 total) move into non- congregate shelter
10/31/2024	RRH placement	People	10 people (10total) move into housing through RRH program. Includes hotel respite, sober living environment, detox, rehab, skilled nursing facility

12/31/2024	Permanent Housing Placement	People	First 5 clients move into permanent housing (includes clients that directly transition from encampment to housing and clients that first entered interim housing)
1/31/2025	San Mateo County bi-annual Point-In-Time Count	Project Management	
2/28/2025	CES assessments	People	75% of residents CES assessed
2/28/2025	RRH placement	People	10 more people (20total) move into housing through RRH program. Includes hotel respite, sober living environment, detox, rehab, skilled nursing facility
3/31/2025	Permanent Housing Placement	People	5 more clients (10 total) move into permanent housing (includes clients that directly transition from encampment to housing and clients that first entered interim housing)
4/30/2025	CES assessments	People	100% of residents CES assessed

6/30/2025	RRH placement	People	10 more people (30 total) move into housing through RRH program. Includes hotel respite, sober living environment, detox, rehab, skilled nursing facility
6/30/2025	Permanent Housing Placement	People	10 more clients (20 total) move into permanent housing (includes clients that directly transition from encampment to housing and clients that first entered interim housing)
6/30/2025	50% of ERF-3-R funds expended and 100% of funds obligated	Project Management	Statutory Deadline for 50% of ERF funds to be spent and 100% Obligated
6/30/2026	Permanent Housing Placement	People	10 more clients (30 total) move into permanent housing (includes clients that directly transition from encampment to housing and clients that first entered interim housing)
6/30/2027	Permanent Housing Placement	People	10 more clients (40 total) move into permanent housing (includes clients that directly transition from encampment to housing and clients that first entered interim housing)

6/30/2027	100% of ERF-3-R funds Expended	Project Management	Statutory Deadline for 100% of ERF funds to be spent
-----------	--------------------------------	--------------------	--

Table 5: Projected Milestones

Answer the following questions in relationship to April 30, 2024. Cal ICH assumes disbursement will occur approximately 3-6 months after April 30, 2024.

Please provide responses in the table below including the month and year. (15-character limit for each cell)

Outreach to the people residing in the prioritized encampment site began / will begin in mm/yyyy.	This proposal will reach full operating capacity in mm/yyyy.	The first planned exit of a person or household from the prioritized encampment will occur in mm/yyyy.	The last planned exit of a person or household from the prioritized encampment will occur in mm/yyyy.
07/2024	09/2024	10/2024	05/2027

CERTIFICATION

Before certifying, applicants are strongly encouraged to review the NOFA.

I certify that all information included in this Application is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Name

Teri

Chin

First

Last

This does not have to be an authorized representative or signatory.

Title

Homeless Services Manager

Email

tchin@redwoodcity.org

Section: Core Service Delivery and Housing Strategies

1. **Permanent Housing Supply:** Given that the permanent housing solutions are neither set aside nor prioritized for ERF 3-R clients, how will the applicant ensure sufficient permanent housing availability for all program participants?

We will ensure sufficient permanent housing options for all program participants by pursuing a multi-pronged strategy:

- I. **Maximizing Access to System Resources for PSH:** Between April 2023 and April 2024, Redwood City's Outreach Strategy Team helped 92 unhoused Redwood City residents receive coordinated entry system (CES) assessments, and of those, 33 (36%) were matched to PSH. Many of these clients were long-term, chronically homeless adults that had been living in an encampment prior to being housed. Because of this experience we are confident that our focus on strategies to encourage encampment residents to get CES assessed will lead to more PSH matches and placements. We have partnered with the following properties and will continue working with these properties to place clients while also continuing to identify additional partners:

Non-profit housing developments:

- **Mosaic Gardens Apartments in Redwood City (MidPen Housing):** 55 project based affordable housing units (21 units for individuals making 30% of AMI; 32 units for individuals making 50% of AMI; & 1 unit for individuals making 80% of AMI); also accepts voucher recipients
- **Miramonte Apartments in Redwood City (HIP Housing):** 38 project based affordable housing units (30 for individuals making 30% of AMI; 8 for individuals making 60% of AMI; also accept voucher recipients; accessed through CES.
- **Casa Esperanza in Redwood City (Alta Housing/Mental Health Association):** 51 project based PSH units accessed through CES.
- **Kiku Crossing in San Mateo (MidPen Housing):** 225 units of affordable housing
- **Light Tree Apartments in East Palo Alto (Eden Housing):** 185 units; project based affordable housing; 9 units accessed through CES; remaining units accept clients with vouchers.
- **240 Linden Apartments in Redwood City (Caminar):** 32 units; accepts clients with vouchers.
- **Shores Landing in Redwood City (MidPen):** 95 project based PSH units for seniors who are homeless or at risk of homelessness; units are accessed through CES.

Private developments:

- **Avenue Two Apartments in Redwood City:** 125 below market rate units; constantly have open units; accepts clients with vouchers.
- **Woodland Park Apartments in East Palo Alto:** approximately 300 below market rate units; constantly have open units; accept clients with vouchers.

- **Grand and Linden Family Apartments in South San Francisco:** 42 units; project based affordable units.
- **Private landlords:** we have worked with landlords in the past to house formerly homeless clients. We are currently partnering with a landlord who owns a home in Menlo Park and has 5 beds. This landlord has connected us to 3 additional landlords and we are exploring housing additional clients through this option. We also included landlord incentives in our ERF-3-R budget to assist us with encouraging more landlords to partner with us.

Among these non-profit housing developments, there are 681 total units. Based on our estimated annual turnover, we expect an average of 10 vacant units available per year with these units totaling 30 units over 3 year period. We expect to be able to place any clients we are unable to place with our non-profit housing developments with our private development/property management partners given their typical turnover and availability.

Our Housing Specialist has been instrumental in securing housing for our most vulnerable clients by proactively searching for available units, calling existing housing partners and other prospective housing partners to find out if units will be available soon, touring properties and conducting a screening and “pre-interview” with the landlord/property manager, and accompanying clients to appointments. Our Housing Specialist has crafted a housing sales pitch that has successfully encouraged landlords who have not worked with unhoused clients and has built trust with properties, ensuring them that these clients will follow the terms of the lease and subsidized payments will always be submitted on time. The Housing Specialist is also available to the property managers to address any issues that may occur with the clients that have been placed in housing.

- II. **Optimizing RRH Options within the CES System and Support Transition to Permanent Housing** for unhoused residents that otherwise are reluctant to accept matches to RRH by extending subsidy to at least two years. According to San Mateo County evaluation of RRH¹, 61% of those receiving RRH referrals decline the match due to a variety of concerns including maintaining rental payments and short timelines for the subsidy. Yet for those who do enroll and find housing with RRH, 82% of RRH clients transitioned to permanent housing.
- III. **Targeted Housing Solutions:** For other participants who are not matched to PSH, or RRH programs through the CES System, we are facilitating connections to alternative **interim housing** programs through use of housing subsidies, and shared housing opportunities. Our shared housing strategy is targeted at individuals who already have connections or currently live in an encampment together and have formed a “pseudo-family” and to place them in a shared housing with the goal that they can combine their income towards the shared housing costs (i.e. utilities, water, cleaning, etc.), clients will

¹ Data is from San Mateo County Human Services Agency Rapid Rehousing Evaluation (July 2024)

not live in isolation, clients' individual rent will likely be lower in shared housing, clients will have a network of support. Many immigrant clients living in encampments, previously lived in a shared housing situations prior to their current episode of homelessness. By transitioning them back to a shared housing situation, this will restore a sense of familiarity and ensure community for these clients. We have had success placing clients at the following interim housing programs:

- **Sober living environments (SLE):** this option serves as a transitional/interim housing opportunity for clients that need to stabilize more on their recovery journey before living on their own
 - **Our Brother's Home in Santa Clara County:** have placed 3 clients at this site; house has 4 bedrooms and can accommodate 6 residents at a time; program length varies
 - **Action Housing, LLC:** operate 5 SLEs (4 in San Mateo County) and one harm reduction house in Redwood City; 53 total beds across 6 sites
- **Grace's Place in Redwood City:** interim housing for women and children that are victims of domestic violence; house can accommodate 3 families
- **Extended Stay Hotel:** we have partnered with Extended Stay hotel in San Carlos as an alternative interim housing option for clients that need more than 28 nights. We primarily use this hotel for clients when they are waiting to be approved for a housing opportunity and are in the application process. Total capacity is 150 units.

2. **RRH Voucher Utilization:** The proposal suggests using ERF 3-R funds to extend the timeframe for RRH voucher utilization. Given the limited duration of the grant, please explain how this strategy will lead to sustained permanent housing outcomes for participants beyond the grant period.

We have seen that clients are hesitant to accept RRH referrals, but by using ERF-3 funds to extend the length of the subsidy to two years, we will be able to encourage and incentivize more clients to accept this referral and increase the percentage of clients that transition from RRH to PSH. Our strategy includes:

- I. **Funding for Housing Specialists:** With the ERF-3-R funding, we will fund multiple housing specialists who will serve as a key resource for helping clients from ERF-3 targeted encampments identify the housing opportunity that will best suit their needs, preparing a subsidy plan for the client, and serving as the point of contact with landlords and property managers. Additionally, housing specialists will be instrumental in assisting clients that are initially placed into interim/transitional/RRH to transition into permanent housing.
- II. **Increased Stability and Savings:** By providing extended support for at least 2 years instead of the standard 1 year RRH Voucher, participants will have more time to stabilize their financial situations, address barriers to housing, and increase income, reducing the risk of returning to homelessness. The County of San Mateo recently did a case

study² of 9 RRH recipients and a consulting firm evaluated these households. From the study and evaluation, it was recommended that RRH program lengths and subsidy timelines should be flexible and the County should have the ability to extend RRH programs beyond the 1 year. With all clients we have supported with housing subsidies in Redwood City, we always design the subsidy plan to be flexible and tailored to the clients' needs because we recognize that a one size fits all approach does not work.

- III. **Improved Housing Transitions:** The additional timeframe also allows for longer term case management and housing navigation, increasing participants' chances of securing long-term housing solutions such as PSH or affordable housing units. With ERF-3-R funding, case managers will be able to provide this post-housing support as needed for the duration of the grant period. Additionally, San Mateo County is in the process of developing a RRH to Voucher Transfer Process for RRH clients who need more assistance providing a stable pathway to permanent housing. We anticipate that the vast majority of unhoused encampments who accept RRH will be eligible to benefit from this new process expected to roll out in 2025.

- 3. **Undocumented Individuals Strategy:** Please provide a more detailed explanation of the specific strategies and resources that will be provided to undocumented individuals to help them overcome barriers to accessing housing and support services.

To support undocumented individuals in overcoming barriers to housing and support services, we are implementing comprehensive strategies that address their unique challenges while leveraging tailored resources:

- I. **Culturally and Linguistically Competent Support:**

- a. **Hiring Spanish-Speaking Case Workers:** To ensure effective communication and culturally relevant services, we are prioritizing the recruitment of case workers fluent in Spanish and are familiar with Redwood City. We have seen the importance of hiring case workers that speak the native language of our clients and how they can build trust faster.
- b. **Collaboration with Consulates:** Partnering with the consulates of Mexico, Guatemala, and El Salvador enables us to assist clients in obtaining necessary documentation, such as birth certificates and consular IDs, which are often critical for accessing housing and services.

- II. **Documentation Assistance:**

- a. We actively assist clients in securing essential documentation, such as individual taxpayer identification numbers or IDs, which can help them navigate local systems and establish eligibility for certain programs.

² San Mateo County Human Services Agency Rapid Rehousing Evaluation (July 2024)

III. **Overcoming Federal Program Barriers:**

- a. Recognizing that undocumented individuals are often ineligible for federally funded programs like Section 8 housing vouchers, TANF, SNAP, & ERF-3-R funding will allow us to prioritize use of housing subsidies for this population.

IV. **Leveraging High Workforce Participation:**

- a. With a higher percentage of undocumented individuals actively working, we support shared housing arrangements where groups can combine their incomes to achieve affordability.

- V. **Community Connections and Resources:** Partnering with organizations such as the **Immigration Institute of the Bay Area, Community Legal Services of East Palo Alto, and Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County** enables us to assist undocumented individuals with identifying pathways to adjusting their legal status while also educating individuals on public benefits that they may be eligible for. Additionally, through partnerships within the faith community such as Catholic Worker House, St. Anthony's Dining Room, St. Vincent de Paul Society, and Street Life Ministries, we are able to offer services and supports at locations where undocumented individuals have already built a sense of trust.

Section: Timeline

4. The statement in the timeline indicates that "10 people move into housing through the RRH program," but it includes references to hotel respite, sober living environments, detox, rehab, and skilled nursing facilities. Could you clarify whether you are referring to RRH in the context of interim housing (IH) or permanent housing (PH)? This distinction is important for accurately interpreting the budget.

While the timeline includes references to interim housing options such as hotel respite, sober living environments, detox, rehab, and skilled nursing facilities, these placements serve as transitional steps within the larger housing stabilization process. These interim options are utilized to address immediate needs, such as medical recovery or stabilization, ensuring participants are better prepared to transition successfully into permanent housing.

Participants in interim housing are actively supported by case managers and provided resources to transition into long-term, sustainable housing as quickly as possible. This distinction between IH and PH ensures that budget allocations are aligned with the program's ultimate objective of permanent housing stability.

		ELIGIBLE USE CATEGORY	~5 WORD DESCRIPTION	NAME OF ENTITY OR PART OF PROPOSAL				ERF-3-R PROPOSED BUDGET	LEVERAGED FISCAL SUPPORT	~2 SENTENCE DESCRIPTION			
Guidance and Intended Use	This budget template may be slightly modified to meet local needs. If awarded funding, this budget, once approved, will serve as your community's official project budget. Any future changes to this budget must be authorized through the change request process.	Use dropdowns. See NOFA, III. A.	Enables Cal ICH to immediately understand the line item.	Enables Cal ICH to associate the line item with specific entities or parts of a proposal.				Only ERF-3-R Funds	Non-ERF-3-R Funds That WILL be Used to Support this Proposal	Enables Cal ICH to better understand the line item, context, and / or other pertinent information related to the proposed line item.			
		PERSONNEL COSTS					MONTHLY SALARY AND BENEFITS	FTE	MONTHS				
		Services Coordination	Homeless Outreach Team Program Director	LifeMoves	\$	12,955.35	0.50	36	\$	-	\$	233,196.31	To Coordinate ERF-3-R Coordinated Homeless Outreach Strategy and lead the OS Team for years 1-3
		Services Coordination	Homeless Outreach Team Assistant Program Director	LifeMoves	\$	10,420.87	0.50	18	\$	-	\$	93,787.83	To oversee case managers, outreach workers, and housing specialists during years 1 and 2
		Services Coordination	Homeless Outreach Team Case Managers	LifeMoves	\$	8,709.62	2.00	21	\$	365,803.96	\$	-	To provide post-housing services coordination with a focus on problem-solving assistance, increasing income, job searches, and assisting clients with any services and supports need to
		Street Outreach	Homeless Outreach Team Case Managers	LifeMoves	\$	8,709.62	0.50	15	\$	65,322.14	\$	-	To provide outreach and engagement services to encampment residents, connect clients to services, and work with residents to develop personalized case plans
		Street Outreach	Homeless Outreach Team Case Managers	WeHOPE	\$	7,860.97	0.25	15	\$	29,478.64	\$	-	To provide outreach and engagement services to encampment residents, connect clients to services, and work with residents to develop personalized case plans
		Services Coordination	Homeless Outreach Team Case Managers	LifeMoves	\$	8,709.62	0.50	15	\$	65,322.14	\$	-	To work with residents to develop personalized case plans and assist clients with housing readiness
		Services Coordination	Homeless Outreach Team Case Managers	WeHOPE	\$	7,860.97	0.25	15	\$	29,478.64	\$	-	To work with residents to develop personalized case plans and assist clients with housing readiness
		Street Outreach	Homeless Outreach Team Outreach Worker	Nation's Finest	\$	10,147.06	0.50	12	\$	60,882.33	\$	-	To provide outreach and engagement services to encampment residents, serve as initial point of contact, connect residents to services and case managers, and continue to support residents on
		Street Outreach	Homeless Outreach Team Outreach Worker	Street Life Ministries	\$	7,760.84	0.50	12	\$	46,565.06	\$	-	To provide outreach and engagement services to encampment residents, serve as initial point of contact, connect residents to services and case managers, and continue to support residents on
		Street Outreach	Homeless Outreach Team Outreach Worker	Downtown Streets Team	\$	3,901.80	0.70	12	\$	32,775.12	\$	-	To provide outreach and engagement services to encampment residents, serve as initial point of contact, connect residents to services and case managers, and continue to support residents on
		Rapid Rehousing	Housing Specialist	LifeMoves	\$	8,681.06	0.50	4	\$	17,362.11	\$	-	To provide follow up support to residents in partnership with Case Managers and help maintain housing stability during portion of year 2
		Rapid Rehousing	Housing Specialist	LifeMoves	\$	8,681.06	1.00	12	\$	104,172.68	\$	-	To conduct housing searches, engage with landlords, and assist residents with applying for housing during year 1
		Systems Support	Homeless Services Manager	City of Redwood City	\$	21,627.34	0.20	36	\$	-	\$	155,716.85	To provide overall direction and project management for ERF-3-R project
		Systems Support	Grants and Finance Management Analyst	City of Redwood City	\$	15,719.86	0.30	36	\$	-	\$	164,829.60	To oversee ERF-3-R Contracts, Grants, and Finances
		Systems Support	Data Intern/Analyst	LifeMoves or City of Redwood City	\$	8,709.62	0.50	36	\$	-	\$	152,206.92	To track data, outcomes, and performance measures, prepare reports, and perform data quality assurance in HMIS Clarity system
		Rapid Rehousing	Housing Property Management	Property Management Contractor	\$	6,437.50	1.00	32	\$	156,000.00	\$	50,000.00	To provide property management services, oversee leases, and manage units that will be "master leased"
Subtotal - Personnel Costs					\$	156,893.15	9.70		\$	973,162.82	\$	849,737.51	

NON-PERSONNEL COSTS			UNIT	RATE	TIME					
Interim Sheltering	Hotel Respite Program					\$	200,000.00	\$	-	To help transition clients from encampments to shelter or housing while they are on shelter or housing waitlists
Prevention and Diversion	CES/Prevention & Diversion Contracts					\$	-	\$	369,139.20	County funded CES. Amount reflects costs of current CES contracts which include start time and all items non-direct labor items. Contract includes work doing CES assessments, prevention and diversion work. CES budgeted at \$400,000.00 for FY 24-25 to FY 26-27. County Shelter Contracts calculated as 40% of County's total cost since shelters also serve non-encampment residents.
Interim Sheltering	Countywide Shelter System (Accessed through CES)					\$	-	\$	12,027,843.60	
Systems Support	Encampment Waste Services	Downtown Streets Team				\$	75,000.00	\$	75,000.00	To Support Health and Safety in Encampments during year 1 of the project
Rapid Rehousing	Housing Subsidies- Rapid re-housing					\$	784,750.00	\$	100,000.00	To be used for time-limited subsidies for up to 3 years
Rapid Rehousing	Housing Subsidies- Transitional Housing					\$	248,934.01	\$	34,815.99	To be used as time limited stays while residents continue to work on housing-readiness and seek out permanent housing opportunities
Rapid Rehousing	Housing Subsidy- Sober living environment (SLE)/Harm-reduction House					\$	256,250.00	\$	25,000.00	SLE will be for clients living with substance use disorder that need a sober living environment before living on their own. Harm-reduction house will provide programmatic support to individuals with the following risk factors: (1) client must have a history of substance use disorder
Interim Sheltering	Housing subsidy- Skilled Nursing Facility					\$	65,000.00	\$	10,000.00	For senior clients or clients with disabilities that need a higher level of care before entering housing
Prevention and Diversion	Housing Subsidy flex funds					\$	10,000.00	\$	-	For housing stability client assistance including but not limited to utility payment, delinquent fee, phone bill, legal fee, car payment, property damage, pet fee, child support incentives to landlords to increase housing options, especially for unaccompanied residents. Holding fees will be used to secure competitive units and ensure units are available to residents
Rapid Rehousing	Landlord incentives and unit holding fees					\$	50,000.00			To be provided by Bay Area's furniture bank or another agency. Items can include but are not limited to furniture, security deposit, renters insurance, kitchen/bathroom/laundry supplies, toiletries, linens, internet/mobile hook up
Delivery of Permanent Housing	Move in assistance costs					\$	45,000.00	\$	5,000.00	
Services Coordination	Dignity on Wheels	WeHOPE	2 sessions per week for 1 year	\$1,085 per session	4 hours/session	\$	-	\$	115,000.00	Mobile laundry and shower services for unhoused clients in Redwood City. Case management, referrals to other services, and hygiene kits are also provided to clients
Subtotal - Non-Personnel Costs			-	-	-	\$	1,734,934.01	\$	12,761,798.79	
ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS										
Administrative Costs	Finance/ Grants Administrator	City of Redwood City		5%		\$	142,531.41			
Subtotal - Administrative Costs							\$	142,531.41	\$	-
TOTAL BUDGET							\$	2,850,628.24	\$	13,611,536.30

California Department of Transportation

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
P.O. BOX 942873, MS-49 | SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001
(916) 654-6130 | FAX (916) 653-5776 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



April 29, 2024

Jeannie McKendry
Grants Development Section Chief
California Interagency Council on Homelessness
801 Capitol Mall, Suite 601
Sacramento, CA 95814
calich@bcsh.ca.gov

RE: Letter of Commitment for the City of Redwood City's application for funding through the Encampment Resolution Funding Program (ERF-3)

Dear Chief Jeannie McKendry:

I am writing in support of the City of Redwood City's application for Encampment Resolution Funding Program Round 3 Funding.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has been working with staff from the City of Redwood City ("the City") since March 2022 to address the impacts of homeless encampments located on Caltrans Right of Way. During the last two years, we have successfully partnered with the City to assist encampment residents in accessing shelter, services, and housing. We have also worked closely, including coordinating with the California Highway Patrol and the Redwood City Police Department, to resolve multiple encampments on Caltrans Right of Way, particularly in the immediate vicinity of a residential neighborhood that had been experiencing ongoing impacts from the homeless encampments for several years.

More than half of the encampments that the City proposes to address with their ERF-3-R application are locations that Caltrans has conducted ongoing encampment removals. This includes the following locations on Caltrans Right of Way:

Hwy 101/84 Interchange Area:

- HWY 101 @ Seaport Blvd dead end P.M 5.5, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- SBNB 101 Under Bridge @ Veterans, PM 5.45, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- SB 101 Seaport Circle Off P.M. 5.35, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- N/B Hwy 101 from E/B Woodside Rd, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- N/B 101 Seaport Blvd on Ramp RHS before 101, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- WB 84 Veterans Blvd, LHS PM 25.66 Redwood City, San Mateo County
- WB 84 @ Veterans Blvd RHS P.M. 25.66, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- NB Veterans Blvd under 101 Offramp to WB 84, Redwood City, San Mateo County

Ms. Jeanie McKendry
Grants Development Section Chief
March 7, 2024
Page 2

84/Middlefield/Shasta Area:

- EB 84 Woodside Rd. @ Middlefield right side down hillside & under 84 PM 24.84, Redwood City, San Mateo County
- WB 84 Woodside Rd @Shasta Right Side Down Hillside, Redwood City, San Mateo County

Caltrans will take action on these targeted encampment sites in collaboration with the City and with at least two weeks-notice prior to encampment removal unless critical circumstances exist such as where an encampment poses an imminent threat to life, health, safety, or infrastructure and must be immediately addressed. This is consistent with our practice with the City since we began our strategic partnership in March 2022. The City's non-profit outreach partners provide ongoing outreach and engagement, including offering services and housing options for unsheltered individuals living in encampments on Caltrans property. The City also coordinates closely with the San Mateo County Continuum of Care/ Center on Homelessness to prioritize access to shelter services for encampment residents to ensure same-day placements to shelter.

Additional funding from ERF-3-R will make it possible for the City to increase the transitional and permanent housing opportunities available for the residents of these encampments, reduce the number of clean-ups that take place at these encampments, improve the health and safety of the encampment area, and assist encampment residents towards recovery and self-sufficiency.

Thank you,

Leah Budu

Leah Budu
Deputy District Director, Maintenance

**City of Redwood City
ERF-3-R Application
Prioritized Encampment Sites**

**Site 1: Seaport Blvd
20 individuals
6 encampments**

