

Encampment Resolution Funding Program, Round 5

Frequently Asked Questions

June 4, 2026



The purpose of this Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document is to support applicants in navigating the Encampment Resolution Fund Round 5 (ERF Round 5) [Notice of Funding Availability \(NOFA\)](#) and [application](#). All supporting documents for the ERF ROUND 5 application are posted on the [ERF website](#).

How to navigate this FAQ: The sections of this document align with the correlating section of the NOFA.

Table of Contents

Section I: Overview	2
Section II.A: Eligible Applicants.....	2
Section II.B: Eligible Population to Serve.....	3
Section II.C: Prioritizing Encampment Sites to Address.....	3
Section II.D: Compliance with State Encampment Guidance.....	7
Section III: Eligible Uses	7
Section IV.A: Application Required Components.....	13
Section IV.B: Submitting a Complete ERF Round 5 Application	16
Section IV.C: HCD Review, Scoring, and Award	18
Section V: Award and Funds Disbursement.....	19
Section VI. Monitoring, Documentation, and Reporting	19

Section I: Overview

1. What does “rolling” mean for ERF Round 5 applications?

A: “Rolling” means that program applications are accepted continuously until funds are exhausted through awards. For ERF Round 5, this means that an initial application window will open from March 27 through June 30, 2026, and all applications submitted during this window will be reviewed concurrently during July and August with awards anticipated to be made in September 2026. If funds remain after awards are made in September, a second application window will open from September 1 to October 31, 2026, at which time HCD will accept additional applications, with those awards anticipated in January 2027.

Section II.A: Eligible Applicants

2. Are applicants required to have received funding through prior ERF rounds in order to be eligible for funding under ERF Round 5?

A: No, there is no requirement or prerequisite to have a previous ERF award in order to apply for ERF Round 5, and HCD encourages applications from non-grantee jurisdictions. Eligible Applicants for ERF Round 5 program funds are the same as in previous Rounds of ERF, which include:

- Local Jurisdiction – as defined in Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 50250(j), means a city, including a charter city, a county, including a charter county, or a city and county.
- Continuum of Care (CoC) – as defined in HSC section 50250(d), “continuum of care” has the same meaning as in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Per authorizing statute (see Appendix B of the ERF Round 5 NOFA), local jurisdictions have priority to apply for ERF Round 5 to address encampments on the State right of way (SROW) over CoC applicants.

3. Are jurisdictions that have received an award, or awards, through a prior ERF round eligible to apply for ERF Round 5?

A: Yes, jurisdictions that have received a prior round award are eligible to apply in this round. Please note that ERF Round 5 may not supplement a prior ERF award to accomplish the same activities and outcomes committed to in the awarded proposal. Applications must propose to serve a new unsheltered population, even if the new unsheltered population is living at a previously addressed encampment.

4. Can a community based nonprofit organization apply for this grant?

A: Only Local Jurisdictions and nonprofits or non-governmental organizations that are the lead entity of a CoC are eligible to apply for ERF Round 5. These eligible applicants are defined in statute:

- Local Jurisdiction – as defined in HSC section 50250(j), means a city, including a charter city, a county, including a charter county, or a city and county.
- Continuum of Care (CoC) – as defined in HSC section 50250(d), “continuum of care” has the same meaning as in Section 578.3 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Section II.B: Eligible Population to Serve

5. If an individual who was previously served under a prior round of ERF is encountered in an encampment targeted by ERF Round 5, are they eligible to receive services under the new grant?

A: Yes, as they are living unsheltered in the prioritized encampment site.

6. Are applicants required to list the names of the individuals they plan on serving in the application?

A: No, HCD does not collect any personally identifiable information (PII) regarding individuals proposed to be served in the application, nor in program reporting. Do not include PII in any part of the application. However, ERF Round 5 grantees and their subcontractors must report client data into their local Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS), and that data must be shared quarterly with the statewide Homeless Data Integration System (HDIS). Applicants can find more information on reporting requirements in NOFA Section VI.D.1., Reporting into HMIS.

Section II.C: Prioritizing Encampment Sites to Address

7. Will HCD verify whether a prioritized encampment is located on a state right-of-way during its application review?

A: HCD will partner with Caltrans in the application review to confirm sites identified are in fact on the state right of way. Applicants are encouraged to verify whether a site is on the state right of way by contacting their local Caltrans District Office before submitting an ERF application using the [Caltrans Encampment Coordinators contact sheet](#) available on HCD’s ERF website.

8. Can an applicant propose to serve an encampment or scattered sites which individually may not be continuously inhabited, but people move between?

A: Yes, an applicant may propose to serve a cluster of sites that is frequently repopulated and/or sees patterns of people moving between sites. In this case, the applicant must:

- Describe how the site meets the program's defining criteria of an encampment reflecting ongoing habitation and causes sustained impacts on the individuals living there, the surrounding community, or nearby infrastructure.
- Describe how the multiple encampments or zone in the proposal share one unified justification for being prioritized, the populations and needs across sites are sufficiently similar, and the same set of services and providers will be used throughout.

The applicant can also address any expected inflow of additional people to the encampment through Section 2, Proposal Overview of the application. This can include serving people who live at the encampment site after the application is submitted.

9. If an applicant is currently an ERF recipient from a prior round, do they need to propose new encampment sites to prioritize under ERF Round 5 or can they propose to serve the same encampment site that has experienced inflow of new individuals camping there?

A: Applicants may not apply for ERF Round 5 funds to supplement a prior ERF award to accomplish the activities and outcomes committed to in the awarded proposal, including serving and housing the same individuals in the same encampment. Applications must propose to serve and house new individuals, even if the new unsheltered population is living at a previously addressed encampment.

10. Are encampments in remote or less visible rural areas (e.g., canyons not visible from public rights-of-way) eligible to be targeted with ERF funding?

A: Yes. Whether an encampment is remote or less visible has no bearing on the score of the application. Applicants should be sure the application addresses all criteria in NOFA Section IV.C., Application Review, Scoring, and Award.

11. For jurisdictions with dispersed, lived-in vehicles rather than large encampments, can a defined corridor (e.g., a multi-mile stretch of right-of-way and surrounding radius) qualify as an eligible ERF project area?

A: Yes, a corridor or similar geography with dispersed vehicle habitation may qualify as an ERF project area if it meets the program's defining criteria of an encampment

reflecting ongoing habitation and sustained impacts on the individuals living there, the surrounding community, and/or nearby infrastructure.

As a reminder, ERF is not designed to support broad, jurisdiction-wide initiatives. An applicant may include multiple encampments or a zone in a single proposal only when there is one unified justification, the populations and needs across sites are sufficiently similar, and the same set of services and providers will be used throughout.

12. Is a jurisdiction eligible to apply for ERF if it is not proposing to target a specific encampment?

A: ERF Round 5 is not intended to fund a community-wide encampment resolution program; rather, the program is intended to address specific encampments. Applications may propose to serve a single individual encampment, or an encampment zone of multiple encampments that meets all three conditions listed below. Applicants must provide justification for the prioritization of the specific encampment, encampment zone(s), or scattered sites proposed to be served. If an applicant proposes to prioritize multiple encampments (encampment zone), the encampments may only be addressed through a single application if all of the following conditions listed on p. 6-7 of the NOFA apply:

- 1) There is a single justification for prioritizing the encampments;
- 2) The demographics and service needs of the residents of the encampments are sufficiently similar; and
- 3) The same set of services, and service providers, including outreach, interim and permanent housing programs, will be used to serve and house the individuals in the encampments.

13. Is there a minimum number of people that must be living unsheltered at a location in order for that location to be considered an “encampment”?

A: No. ERF does not provide a specific definition of “encampment,” but encourages applicants to identify encampments using the following guidance from p. 6 of the NOFA, in Section II.C:

“Encampment” generally refers to any location where multiple individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness have established a place of residence, and where the ongoing presence and conditions of the site result in sustained or significant impacts to health, safety, public access, or infrastructure. Encampments may exist on public or private land and are typically characterized by the presence of personal belongings, makeshift or semi-permanent structures, and repeated or prolonged habitation.

The defining criteria of an encampment are not based on the number of occupants, but on the degree of impact on:

- The individuals living in the encampment, including exposure to environmental hazards, violence, or lack of access to services and housing;
- The surrounding community, including limitations to public access, increased health and safety risks, or strain on public systems; and
- Critical infrastructure and natural resources, including blocked rights of way, degraded environmental conditions, or damage to public property.

14. Can a city or county apply to address an encampment located adjacent to another city or county’s border?

A: Yes, only with the adjacent jurisdiction’s knowledge and coordination. While ERF Round 5 does not allow for joint applications between eligible applicants, ERF requires applicants to communicate and collaborate with adjacent jurisdictions when an encampment is near shared borders. This coordination should be demonstrated throughout the application, including Sections 2D, 2F, and Section 3, where applicants describe their engagement, partnerships, and implementation approach.

NOTE: This response does not apply to applicants that are CoCs, which are required to submit a letter, or letters, of support from overlapping cities or counties in which the specific encampment, encampment zone(s), or scattered sites are located. The letter(s) of support must include the elements detailed on p. 12 of the NOFA.

15. Is there a cap on the number of encampments in an “encampment zone”?

A: There is no cap, or maximum number of encampments that can be addressed under a single application. The applicant must demonstrate that the encampments meet the justifications to be served under a single application detailed on p. 6-7 of the NOFA:

- 1) There is a single justification for prioritizing the encampments;
- 2) The demographics and service needs of the residents of the encampments are sufficiently similar; and
- 3) The same set of services, and service providers, including outreach, interim, and permanent housing programs, will be used to serve and house the individuals in the encampments.

16. For encampment zones made up of multiple scattered sites, can an applicant submit a single application if the same service providers will conduct the encampment resolution work, but different interim housing providers will be used at each site?

A: Yes; however, the application must include a clear, thorough response for how the proposal will utilize “the same set of services, and service providers, including outreach, interim and permanent housing programs...to serve and house the individuals in the

encampments.” In other words, the application must include a cohesive approach that meets all requirements of the NOFA, particularly NOFA Sections II.C Prioritizing Encampment Sites to Address and IV.C.2., Core Service Delivery and Housing Strategy.

Section II.D: Compliance with State Encampment Guidance

17. Does Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention (HHAP) Round 6 compliance satisfy demonstration of compliance for an ERF Round 5 application?

A: No, documentation provided in the HHAP Round 6 application does not automatically satisfy ERF Round 5 requirements.

However, jurisdictions that already met the HHAP Round 6 encampment policy threshold may submit the same documentation for ERF Round 5. (NOTE: This guidance only applies to jurisdictions that receive a direct allocation of HHAP.)

If your HHAP 6 application included an approved timeline to adopt a compliant policy, you may either: submit the completed policy or provide the approved HHAP 6 timeline showing when the policy will be adopted.

18. Will HCD review my encampment policy before an applicant submits their application?

A: No, HCD will not review policies before an application is submitted. ERF is a competitive funding opportunity, and applicants are expected submit complete and competitive applications that demonstrate compliance with all eligibility requirements at the time of the application.

Applicants should review the seven components of Cal ICH’s Encampment Guidance in Appendix D of the ERF 5 NOFA and clearly explain how their documentation demonstrates compliance with each component.

19. Can jurisdictions with “no camping” ordinances or no formal encampment policy apply for ERF Round 5?

A: The existence of a local ordinance, by itself, does not determine eligibility for ERF Round 5. Eligibility is based on an applicant’s ability to demonstrate compliance with all seven components of Cal ICH’s Guidance on Addressing Encampments. Please refer to Section II D (beginning on page 7 of the NOFA), as it provides sufficient information regarding the documentation and pathways available to demonstrate compliance, including for jurisdictions that do not currently have a formal encampment policy.

Section III: Eligible Uses

20. Does HCD have a comprehensive list of allowable expenses for each eligible use category?

A: No, HCD does not have a comprehensive list of allowable expenses under each eligible use category. Eligible applicants must refer to Section III of the ERF Round 5 NOFA for the list of eligible use categories and eligible use examples of ERF Round 5 funding; however, eligible uses of ERF are broad and not limited to the examples. Beyond the NOFA, when considering whether a use may be allowable, HCD encourages applicants to assess the use for compliance with all five of the following conditions:

- It intends to address and/or prevent homelessness,
- It will be used to serve the eligible population (people experiencing unsheltered homelessness in encampments) as outlined in the application,
- It will be incurred within the eligible expenditure timeframe,
- It complies with Housing First, and
- It is necessary for the implementation of the proposal.

ERF is a flexible source of funding that can support a variety of activities outlined in an application tailored to the needs of the community and individuals living in the targeted encampment(s). When proposing activities, outcomes, and uses of ERF funds, it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate a compelling model and make the case for how each use or proposal component is necessary and will contribute to the proposal's success.

21. Can ERF Round 5 proposals build on existing program infrastructure or a successful model created under another ERF round, even if addressing a different encampment?

A: Yes, HCD encourages proposals that build on existing program infrastructure or a successful model created under a previous ERF round, whether the encampment is in the same location or a different one.

22. Is site restoration an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funds? Can funds be used to harden infrastructure (place fencing and/or block walls) where an encampment is located to prevent future camping?

A: No. Site restoration, or returning the encampment site to its original intended use, was an eligible use category used only in ERF Round 1 and is not an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funds.

ERF Round 5 funds may only be used for activities that seek to resolve targeted experiences of unsheltered homelessness by addressing the safety and wellness of people within encampments, resolve critical encampment concerns, and transition individuals into interim shelter with clear pathways to permanent housing or directly into permanent housing. Because site restoration and infrastructure hardening for the

purpose of preventing people from being able to live at the site again are not eligible uses of ERF Round 5 funds, these activities cannot be funded through this program.

23. What non-ERF funding sources are available for debris removal?

A: Costs associated with site restoration after people living in the prioritized encampment have been served and housed are not allowable uses of ERF Round 5 funds. ERF Round 5 does allow costs associated with sanitation services for people living in the prioritized encampment (e.g., access to restrooms/showers, regular garbage removal, etc.). Typically, local jurisdictions are responsible for site restoration costs; however, there may be funds available through Caltrans if the site is located on a state right-of-way. Applicants should coordinate with Caltrans to determine the availability of funds for this effort.

24. Can ERF Round 5 funds be used to acquire or rehabilitate properties for permanent housing for individuals currently living in prioritized encampments?

A: Yes, this is categorized under the Permanent Housing Eligible Use Category on p. 9 of the NOFA.

25. Can ERF Round 5 be used to fund activities such as gap funding for development of permanent housing?

A: Yes, if it creates permanent housing opportunities prioritized for individuals from the encampment the application proposes to address. This would also be categorized under the Permanent Housing Eligible Use Category on p. 9 of the NOFA.

26. Are recreational vehicles (RVs) or RV parks considered permanent housing?

A: Under the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) definitions, a recreational vehicle (RV) is generally designed for human habitation for recreational or emergency purposes. RV Park Trailers (PTs) are a type of RV intended for human habitation for recreational or seasonal use. For the purposes of the Encampment Resolution Funding (ERF) Program, Round 5, RVs and PTs are not considered permanent housing. However, applicants may propose the use of RVs or PTs as interim housing, provided that appropriate wraparound services are offered in alignment with Housing First requirements. Applicants should also ensure that any proposed use of RVs or PTs complies with local ordinances related to RVs and PTs. Although RVs and PTs are not eligible under the permanent housing category, mobilehomes and manufactured homes are considered permanent housing and are allowable uses under ERF, Round 5.

27. Is it possible to use ERF Round 5 funds to extend housing subsidies for individuals who were housed under Homekey or prior ERF awards who have lost or are losing their Homekey or ERF housing subsidy?

A: No, ERF Round 5 is not intended to augment prior ERF awards, nor is it intended to fund subsidies for individuals other than the individuals from the targeted encampment(s) the proposal will address.

28. Can a single budget propose to use ERF Round 5 funds to both build a new non-congregate shelter and renovate an existing one?

A: Yes, both activities are eligible uses of ERF Round 5 funds and may be part of a single proposal's implementation strategy. ERF can support a variety of activities across engagement, services, and housing. When proposing activities, outcomes, and uses of ERF funds, it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate a compelling model and make the case for how each use or proposal component is necessary and will contribute to the proposal's success.

29. Can a jurisdiction fund existing Interim Housing sites to serve clients living in the prioritized encampment sites/zones?

A: Yes, proposals may fund existing interim housing sites if they support the ERF Round 5 proposal and outcomes and serve/house the people living in the prioritized encampment.

30. Can Interim Housing include a sober living environment model?

A: Recovery housing, including sober living models, can be funded as interim or permanent housing, so long as the model aligns with Cal ICH's guidance, [Implementing Recovery Housing in Alignment with California Housing First Requirements](#).

31. Are storage costs (to help clients maintain access to their belongings while in the process of being connected to housing) an eligible use of ERF funds?

A: Yes. Additionally, the Application Submission, Review, and Award section of the NOFA (Section IV.A.3.a.), under Core Service Delivery and Housing Strategies, requires proposals to detail how they will provide support for storage and access to personal belongings across housing stages. This is an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funding.

32. Are portable restrooms an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funds?

A: Yes. In fact, the Application Submission, Review, and Award section of the NOFA (Section IV.A.2.f.), under Centering People, requires proposals to describe how sanitation services will be provided to those living in the prioritized encampment, either with ERF Round 5 funds or by a jurisdiction or nonprofit entity.

33. Can ERF Round 5 funds be used to purchase a vehicle for staff implementing the program to transport clients, move belongings as needed, and conduct street outreach?

A: Yes. ERF is a relatively flexible source of funding that can support a variety of activities across engagement, services, and housing. When proposing activities,

outcomes, and uses of ERF funds, it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate a compelling model and make the case for how each use or proposal component is necessary and will contribute to the proposal's success.

34. Are RV buyback incentive programs, relinquishments, and dismantling eligible uses of ERF Round 5 funds?

A: Yes, these types of programs are allowable provided that they are designed to provide a direct connection to interim and/or permanent housing. The connection to interim and/or permanent housing must be clearly and specifically described in the proposal.

35. Are law enforcement staffing costs an eligible use of funds if law enforcement is part of the homeless outreach team and is providing service and/or housing information to people living in encampments (e.g., information on coordinated entry, emergency shelter, and storage of personal items)?

A: Yes. The proposal must detail the roles and responsibilities law enforcement will be performing under the proposed staff costs, including how law enforcement will connect individuals in the targeted encampment to services and/or housing. Activities performed using law enforcement staff costs must be in alignment with the [Cal ICH Guidance on Addressing Encampments](#).

36. Is funding to cover in-house staff salaries an allowable use of ERF Round 5 funds?

A: Yes, staff salaries to administer the grant are an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funds. Please note that administrative costs are capped at 5% of awarded funds, as detailed on p.10 of the NOFA, in the Eligible Uses table.

37. Is field medicine for individuals living in the prioritized encampment(s) an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funding, and if so, do related services have to be administered in the prioritized encampment?

A: Yes, street medicine is an eligible use of ERF funds. Street medicine should be one proposal component that supports a central housing strategy to connect individuals in the prioritized encampment(s) directly into permanent housing or into interim housing with a direct connection to permanent housing. Applications that only propose street medicine as their model to address homelessness for people experiencing unsheltered homelessness will not be funded, as the purpose of ERF is to provide housing solutions for people experiencing homelessness in a targeted encampment. To pass the funding threshold for the application, applications must meet the minimum threshold for all application sections listed in the NOFA, p. 16-20.

Regarding where services may be provided: there is no restriction on providing services only at the encampment site. The applicant should present a competitive model and

program components that are well aligned with the program objectives, the proposal's outcomes, and the people the proposal seeks to serve.

38. Is there a cap on the number of providers an eligible applicant can propose to use/fund using ERF Round 5?

A: No, there is no specific minimum or maximum number of providers allowable under ERF Round 5.

39. Is the provision of support to families of those experiencing homelessness in encampments an eligible use of ERF Round 5 funds, for example, as part of a reunification support model?

A: Yes, this could potentially be an eligible use of ERF funds provided that the applicant explains the reasoning for its inclusion in their proposal. For example, the applicant could demonstrate how this is part of a housing retention strategy that meets the needs of the people residing in the encampment. Support could include move-in costs, rent, flexible problem-solving funds, case management, etc., to help ensure the reunification is effective and stable.

40. Does ERF Round 5 fund pilot models tied to workforce engagement or employment stabilization?

A: HCD recognizes that workforce engagement and employment stabilization can play an important role in promoting long-term housing stability. ERF proposals should resolve the experience of unsheltered homelessness for people living in the prioritized encampment or encampment zone and must remain low barrier and fully aligned with Housing First principles. This means applicants may include supportive workforce or employment components that are person-centered and voluntary (i.e., participation in workforce services cannot be required as a condition for receiving services, accessing shelter, or transitioning into housing).

41. Are improvements to shelter kennels, kennels where pets accompanying individuals at a shelter may stay, an allowable use of funds?

A: Yes. When proposing activities, outcomes, and uses of ERF funds, it is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate a compelling model and make the case for how each use or proposal component is necessary and will contribute to the proposal's success.

Section IV.A: Application Required Components

42. What forms are required for contracting under ERF Round 5?

A: Applicants must submit:

- A Taxpayer ID form:
 - For cities and counties, or a city and county: [Government Agency Taxpayer ID Form \(GovTIN\)](#).
 - For nonprofits and non-governmental organizations (NOTE: Only nonprofits or non-governmental organizations that are the lead entity of a CoC are eligible to apply for ERF Round 5): [Payee Data Record \(STD 204\)](#).
- An [Authorized Signatory form](#), with names authorized to sign the Standard Agreement.
- Contracting information, including primary contact details consistent with the application's administrative section.

Applicants can refer to Contract and Disbursement Documentation Guidance published on the ERF website for more detailed instruction on how to complete these forms.

43. Are there special requirements for cities when completing the Authorized Signatories Form?

A: Yes, under [Government Code section 40602](#), cities (including charter cities) must ensure:

- The Authorized Representative is the mayor, OR
- A city ordinance delegating signing authority is cited in the form.

44. May city and county applicants (applicants that are not CoCs) submit letters of support from neighboring jurisdictions to demonstrate cross-jurisdiction collaboration?

A: Yes; however, support letters are not required and are not a replacement for the description of how the applicant intends to collaborate with state and local partners to mitigate risk and address safety concerns while ensuring a pathway for individuals living in encampments to move into safe and stable housing. This requirement is detailed in NOFA Section IV.A.2.d., State and Local Collaboration (p. 12).

45. The ERF Round 5 NOFA states that the CoC's Local Jurisdiction Letter of Support should come from the city or county where the prioritized encampment is located. Is there a specific organization or department this letter should come from?

A: No. Responsibilities for addressing encampments and providing services and housing vary among local government agencies across the state, depending on the jurisdiction. The letter should come from the entity, or entities, responsible for addressing encampments locally. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure coordination is occurring locally, that a proposal will be implementable, and that the prioritized encampment will not be prematurely abated without connecting individuals to services and interim and/or permanent housing.

46. What is considered a homeless shelter that requires reporting to HCD? Should reports include inspections of interim housing, safe parking, etc.?

A: HCD encourages local jurisdictions to review HSC section 17974(b) for the definitions of homeless shelter and determine if the respective program falls under any of those definitions.

HSC section 17974(b) defines a “homeless shelter” as the following:

- An emergency shelter, as defined in Section 576.2 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
- An emergency shelter, as defined in HSC section 50801.
- A navigation center, as defined in HSC section 50216.
- “Homeless shelter” does not include emergency shelters that are funded by the program commonly referred to as Project Roomkey administered by the State Department of Social Services.

47. If a city or county in which the prioritized encampment is located has not submitted an AB 130 report, what would be the impact on a CoC’s ERF Round 5 application?

A: In their application, a CoC must confirm that the jurisdictions (city or cities and/or county) responsible for all applicable shelters proposed to be funded by the CoC’s ERF Round 5 proposal performed an annual inspection and submitted an annual report to HCD as required by HSC section 17974.5. HCD will verify submission of the report, and applicants can verify all submitted reports using the dashboard on the [HCD Homeless Shelter Inspection Reporting Requirements website](#).

If the appropriate jurisdiction(s) have not submitted a report, the application will be disqualified.

48. If a jurisdiction is not listed on the Annual Homeless Shelter Inspection Reports Dashboard, does this indicate that no report has been submitted or are there pending or recently submitted reports still under review by HCD not currently listed on the dashboard?

A: The Annual Homeless Shelter Inspection Reports Dashboard refreshes daily to reflect all submitted reports. Although these reports were due April 1, 2026, HCD is continuing to accept late reports. For ERF Round 5 application purposes, HCD will be looking to verify that an applicant's jurisdiction has submitted a report by June 30, 2026.

HCD encourages jurisdictions to refer to the [Homeless Shelter Inspection Reporting Requirements website](#), which includes a dashboard of all submitted reports, and the [Annual Homeless Shelter Inspection FAQ](#).

49. Is submitting an AB 130 report required only for applicants proposing to use ERF funds for emergency shelter or interim housing activities, or for all applicants?

A: Submitting the report to HCD is a baseline requirement for all city and county applicants regardless of whether they intend to use ERF funds for emergency shelter or Interim Housing activities, and any application submitted by a city or county that has not submitted the report will be disqualified. Additionally, CoC applicants proposing to fund a shelter using ERF Round 5 funds are required to ensure that the jurisdiction in which the shelter proposed to be funded is located has submitted a report.

50. Does HCD maintain a list of homeless shelters that require inspection and reporting?

A: No. Consistent with the [Annual Homeless Shelter Inspection FAQ](#), it is up to each jurisdiction to inspect and report homeless shelters within their jurisdiction and maintain a list of homeless shelters for annual reporting to HCD.

51. Is a jurisdiction required to submit the annual report even if the jurisdiction does not directly operate a homeless shelter, but instead provides funding to a third party, or subcontractor, that operates a shelter?

A: Yes. Consistent with the [Homeless Shelter Inspection/Reporting Requirements for Local Jurisdictions Frequently Asked Questions](#), pursuant to HSC section 17974.5, each city and each county must submit a report annually.

52. Does AB 130 require physical inspections by state or federal government agencies at the homeless shelters and at the offices of the grantees?

A: No. HCD will verify that eligible applicants meet the AB 130 inspection requirements by cross-referencing information provided in an ERF application with submitted AB 130 reports. This includes:

In application Section 2.D. State and Local Collaboration:

- All city and county eligible applicants have submitted an annual report to HCD, as required by HSC section 17974.5.

- CoC applicants have verified that the jurisdiction(s) (cities and/or county) responsible for all applicable interim housing proposed to be funded by their ERF Round 5 proposal performed an annual inspection and submitted an annual report to HCD as required by HSC section 17974.5.

In application Section 3.A. Core Service Delivery and Housing Strategies:

- All shelters that meet the AB 130 definition of “homeless shelter” have been identified as either:
 - Not having any uncorrected violations pursuant to the AB 130 Shelter Reporting and Inspection requirements, **or**
 - Having any uncorrected violations pursuant to AB 130 Shelter Reporting and Inspection requirements, **and** that the eligible applicant provided a list of outstanding violations, corrective actions required (as outlined in the violation(s) notice(s)), and a list of the current statuses of corrective actions required.

Section IV.B: Submitting a Complete ERF Round 5 Application

53. If the same jurisdiction submits multiple ERF Round 5 applications, how should they differentiate the names of attached files?

A: If an applicant is submitting multiple applications, the applicant should include the proposal identifier in the file names (E.g., “ERF Round 5 Budget Template_Jurisdiction Name_Proposal Identifier_mm.yy”).

54. What documentation is required to demonstrate site control and project feasibility for applications proposing development of permanent supportive housing and/or acquisition and rehabilitation of an existing structure?

A: There is no specific document requirement. Applicants must comprehensively identify the resources they have secured, the due diligence performed, and the steps taken to demonstrate viability and competitive qualities of the proposal against the program priorities and ERF Round 5 Scoring Matrix in Section IV.C. of the NOFA (p. 16-20).

55. Does HCD expect applicants to use a specific model or methodology for monitoring encampment population changes and inflow, or are applicants expected to propose their own approach?

A: Page 14 of the NOFA requires applicants to demonstrate “consideration for the dynamic nature of encampments, including potential inflow,” but does not require a specific methodology to demonstrate this consideration. Rather, HCD’s evaluation focuses on the comprehensiveness of the strategy described, which should ensure that the approach considers and accounts for potential population inflow, addresses the

specific needs of the people living in prioritized encampments, and outlines a service delivery model that transitions individuals into permanent housing or a pathway toward it.

56. Where should subcontractor costs be included within the ERF Round 5 budget template?

A: Subcontractor costs should be included in the Non-Personnel Costs section of the [budget template](#).

57. Are there set regional allocations or a recommended range from HCD for how much ERF Round 5 funding applicants should request in an application?

A: No. Awards amounts are informed by the amount requested in the proposal and the amount of funds available for award at the time of the application's approval. When applying for ERF Round 5 funding, it is up to the eligible applicant to determine the amount of ERF Round 5 funds requested and to provide a justification as to how the proposal is a responsible and effective use of the requested funds based on the proposal's objectives, including how many people it will serve during and after the grant term, other sources of funding it will leverage, etc. HCD encourages eligible applicants to review [previously approved applications](#) on the ERF website for an idea of how proposal objectives, available resources, leveraged funding, etc., may inform the amount of ERF funds requested.

58. Do applications proposing to address larger encampments receive priority consideration over those focused on smaller encampments? Similarly, are rural areas given equal consideration as urban areas in funding?

A: The number of individuals living in an encampment is not a prioritized factor in application evaluation and scoring; rather, proposals that score highest against the threshold criteria outlined in the NOFA are prioritized for award. Furthermore, in accordance with HSC section 50252.1(c)(5), HCD shall prioritize both of the following:

- Applications that demonstrate cross-systems collaboration, including collaborations with state and federal entities, and innovative efforts to resolve encampment issues, while focusing on protecting the health and well-being of the individuals living in those encampments.
- Applications that represent the diversity of communities across the state, including, but not limited to, rural, urban, and suburban communities.

59. Can an eligible applicant request HCD review and provide feedback on their ERF Round 5 application prior to official submission?

A: ERF is a competitive grant program; therefore, HCD will not review nor provide feedback on applications prior to submission.

60. Would an application be strengthened by demonstrating alignment with a coordinated subregional strategy involving multiple jurisdictions? If so, should jurisdictions apply jointly or submit separate applications that reference one another?

A: In accordance with HSC section 50252.1(c)(5), funding shall be prioritized for both of the following:

- Applications that demonstrate cross-systems collaboration, including collaborations with state and federal entities, and innovative efforts to resolve encampment issues, while focusing on protecting the health and well-being of the individuals living in those encampments.
- Applications that represent the diversity of communities across the state, including, but not limited to, rural, urban, and suburban communities.

While ERF Round 5 does not allow for joint applications among multiple applicants, there are multiple opportunities to highlight joint efforts and collaboration throughout the application. Some examples are outlined below:

- Section 2.D: State and Local Collaboration
- Section 3A: Core Service Delivery and Housing Strategies
- Section 3.C: Key Entities and Staff

Section IV.C: HCD Review, Scoring, and Award

61. Will applications submitted by or before the June 30, 2026 deadline (Window #1) be reviewed as they are received, or all together at the close of the application window?

A: All applications received during Window #1 (March 27-June 30, 2026) will be reviewed at the same time, beginning July 1, 2026.

62. Will ERF Round 5 proposals either be denied or awarded the full requested amount?

A: Historically, proposals have been awarded for their full requested amount unless program funds are exhausted. Pursuant to HSC section 50251(c)(1), HCD has the authority to award less than the full requested amount, including removal of specific line items if necessary.

63. Can an eligible applicant subcontract the services related to implementing their ERF Round 5 proposal up to and including the full scope of ERF-funded activities?

A: Yes. There is no prohibition on subcontracting any or all aspects of the proposal. As a reminder, the eligible applicant jurisdiction, if awarded, would still be responsible for reporting on related activities and outcomes to HCD.

Section V: Award and Funds Disbursement

64. Can an eligible applicant begin carrying out proposed eligible activities prior to award?

A: Yes, applicants may begin carrying out activities funded through other sources prior to award but may not begin spending ERF Round 5 funds until they receive an official award from HCD. Once awarded, grantees may begin incurring expenses in alignment with their approved budget and may use ERF Round 5 funds to reimburse themselves for those expenses as far back as the date listed on the award letter issued by HCD.

Section VI. Monitoring, Documentation, and Reporting

65. How long must an encampment site remain clear to be considered resolved?

A: There is no specific timeframe specified by statute or the NOFA. In reporting encampment status, the definition of Resolved is, “people no longer live at the site (fully moved into shelter/interim/perm OR connected to housing solution and no longer live there) and it’s been fully restored to its intended public use.”

66. How should grantees notify HCD if an encampment is abated or disbursed?

A: Generally, you can notify HCD via email at HPDHomelessnessGrants@hcd.ca.gov. HCD partners with Caltrans to ensure that if the action is being carried out on the state right-of-way by Caltrans, grantees receive two weeks’ advance notice from Caltrans provided there are no immediate health and safety threats to the people living in the encampment.

67. What reports will ERF Round 5 grantees be required to submit?

A: All reporting requirements are detailed in NOFA Section VI.A. Reporting, beginning on p. 21 of the NOFA, and in NOFA Section VI.D. Other Requirements, beginning on p. 23. Grantees are required to submit:

- Quarterly Reports with fiscal and programmatic data reflecting the progress of the ERF Round 5 award.
- Annual Reports due each year on April 1, with a Final Report submitted in lieu of the final Annual Report.
- Reporting into the Homeless Management Information System, and that data must be shared quarterly with the statewide Homeless Data Integration System.

Additionally, ERF Round 5 grantees and their subcontractors that operate or fund homeless shelters must comply with all inspection, reporting, and corrective action requirements as detailed in [HCD's Information Bulletin 2025-02](#).

68. What is the duration of the ERF Round 5 grant award, once awarded?

A: The 50% expenditure deadline is 2 years from the date of award, and the 100% expenditure deadline is 4 years from the date of award.

69. Where can successful ERF Round 5 grantees find the date of award?

A: The date of award is the date on the award letter from HCD.