

NOFA Comments Summary

Comment	Response	Edits made (indicate page numbers)
General Comments		
<p>Per the ESG Balance of State NOFA, page 10, the Butte CoC can recommend/submit up to 2 competitive applications for an amount between \$75-\$200,000 each to the Northern Region’s competitive pool. Based on the decision by the CoC to retain 40% of the \$303,313 allocation for non-competitive RRH, the remaining \$181,988 would get thrown into the regional competition where the CoC could be awarded 2 contracts for up to \$400,000 (if both recommended providers were awarded the maximum award). Recommend that the Super NOFA be revised to indicate the potential for two recommended contracts at an amount between \$75,000-\$200,000. The amount of \$181,988 (60% of the allocation) is only what the CoC is placing in the regional competition.</p>	<p>Recommend that this change be incorporated into the SuperNOFA.</p>	<p>Page 4 & page 5</p>
<p>Reinforce that emergency shelters need to be low barrier and what “low barrier” means.</p>	<p>See attachment A</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>I like the planning grant possibility, but looks like this activity needs to be accounted for within the NOFA, scoring, etc.</p>	<p>Additional clarification will be added to the NOFA. Applications will not be accepted for Planning Grants only. Planning Grants will be awarded in combination conditional shelter awards in order to bring an applicant into compliance with state requirements.</p>	<p>Page 4</p>
<p>Suggest that a more explicit statement be made regarding the intent of the use of the remaining funds that are not part of the Super NOFA. There is a good general statement that is</p>	<p>This will be addressed at the June 17, 2019 Council meeting.</p>	

<p>included and perhaps that is all that is needed since so much had to be completed since the Resource Mapping and Concept Presentation steps.</p> <p>But it could be helpful to include a statement to reinforce the idea that our intentions are to continue to move us in a more strategic direction.</p> <p>“The CoC will use remaining funds to accomplish system improvements that support CoC purposes. These include HMIS and Coordinated Entry System support in accordance with federal standards and state requirements. In addition, the CoC’s data usage needs will be addressed to enable the area to be positioned for further funding opportunities that address local priorities” or something to that effect.</p>		
<p>Unless we missed it there is no reference to the need for a Resolution from a Governing Body. The first HEAP NOFA also did not include such a reference but the post-award procedures did include the expressed requirement for one. The purpose of a Resolution is generally to demonstrate that the applicant is authorized to commit themselves legally to a contractual relationship. Resolutions are generally required by funders at either time of application to demonstrate capability or at time of contract to ensure legal liability. When considering action timelines then knowing sooner rather than later about such requirements is helpful.</p>	<p>ESG requires a board resolution to any applicant awarded funding.</p>	<p>NA</p>

Specific Comments	Response	Edits made (indicate page numbers)
Page 1 – Tab F is listed twice, once as References and once as Financial Statements.	This will be corrected.	Page 1
Page 1 – Clarify terms bidder, organization, applicant. Are they interchangeable?	These terms are interchangeable.	NA
Page 1 – Tab H labeled Cost Proposal – consistent word choice throughout document		Tab H is labeled Cost Proposal
Page 1 – Add language in the instruction paragraph that non-responsive bidders that are deemed non-responsive but the information is not materially relevant be given five business days to provide the missing information.	This language exists on page 5 - Applications that meet the requirements set forth in this Super NOFA will be evaluated according to the criteria within this Super NOFA. Notwithstanding the above, in the event that information that is not materially relevant to the project is missing or deficient, the application may be scored as submitted and the applicant will have 5 business days to provide the missing or deficient information.	NA
Page 1 – What if an organization wants to apply for multiple projects? Do you want them to include more than one proposal checklist along with Tab E and H?	Organizations must submit one application per project. The organizational information can be copied and pasted in each application.	NA
Page 2 – under “Cost and Financials” the term “Original Proposal” is used twice. To what does this refer as it is not used elsewhere.	Language was added to clarify that the original proposal is a hard copy with a wet signature and the same documents provided on a flash drive excluding Tab I.	Page 2
Page 2 – under “Cost and Financials” a bullet point refers to an “End of Last Fiscal Year Balance Sheet”. Since an audit or even a financial review is not required of applicants then we suggest that the identity of the preparer of this end-of-last-fiscal-year balance sheet document be requested. It will give reviewers the opportunity to know whether the financial information of the	Language was added to include the name of the preparer	Page 2

applicant is attended to by a professional or not. This identity will play a part in risk assessment as considerations are made as to the capacity to not only perform but to exercise accountability.		
Page 3 – Concerned that all mention of emergency shelter is too general. Add “low barrier” in these groupings.	The shelter requirements including low barrier and Housing First are described elsewhere in the RFP.	NA
Page 3 – Request that that paragraph " the CoC reserves the right to withhold funds for ES located in Chico until there is a proposal..... etc." be stricken.	This reflects the need/priorities of the CoC to create a shelter in Oroville, is not hard and fast so recommend keeping this language in. See for example RFP Attachment C page 29.	NA
Page 3 – the term “implementation funds” is used without a definition or clarification of whether this is referring to a separate project, contract or something else.	Changed implementation to project.	Page 3
Page 4 – (top paragraph) the last sentence includes a term, “separate application” when on page 3 in the fourth paragraph the term “...CoC has streamlined this application...” is used. Could use of these two terms be reconciled?	This Super NOFA streamlined 5 application processes into one. If an applicant decides to apply for both rapid rehousing and emergency shelter then two separate applications must be submitted under this Super NOFA.	NA
Page 5 – Change “Criteria listed below” – “criteria within this RFP”	This change will be made.	Page 5
Page 5 – (top paragraph) uses the term, “...in Hard Copy...”. Is this connected to the “Original” reference cited earlier in these comments and in the document?	Clarifying language added	Page 5
Page 5 – Under funding source change CA to Federal for ESG RHH and ESG Competitive.	These are federal ESG funds.	Page 4
Page 5 – Under eligible uses under the Super NOFA – Add the following, up to two applicants will be recommended by the CoC for ESG non-competitive funding. Up to 10% of the request	Language added	Page 4 & 5

<p>can be used in each category for Street Outreach, Homelessness Prevention, and HMIS.</p>		
<p>Page 5 – Under the estimated maximum available for ESG Competitive add \$75,000-\$200,000 each; there will be two recommendations to the state to award funding. Under eligible uses for the ESG Competitive add, the CoC will take 60% of our ESG allocation (\$181,988) and out it in the Balance of State Northern competitive region to compete for up to two awards in an amount between \$75,000-\$200,000 each. Eligible activities include; emergency shelter, rapid rehousing, street outreach, HMIS (10%) and homelessness prevention (10%). ESG has a 100% match requirement; applicants must use HMIS and follow the CoC’s written standards and participate in coordinated entry. Funding is for a term of approximately 21 months.</p>	<p>Additional language added.</p>	<p>Page 5</p>
<p>Page 6 – add the following language, a small portion of these funds can be used for homelessness prevention, HMIS, and street outreach.</p>	<p>language added to page 5</p>	<p>Page 5</p>
<p>Page 6 – in both identification boxes of the Primary Applicant and the Co-Applicant the following explanation in quotes is given: “Execution hereof is certification that the undersigned has read and understands the terms and conditions hereof, and that the undersigned’s principal is fully bound and committed.”. Prior to that in the top paragraph of the same page the statement “Signature by an authorized representative of the Organization on the proposal cover page shall constitute a</p>	<p>Proposal and application are used interchangeably throughout the Super NOFA. Language under the Primary Applicant and Co-Applicant deleted.</p>	<p>Page 6</p>

warranty...". This language seems to suggest personal liability when we think that personal knowledge is the goal. Could this be clarified since personal liability is not an option for most representatives whether on a governing body or as staff in an applicant. In addition, this is an example where other terms, (e.g. "proposal") is used rather than "application".		
Page 6 – Is this a public bid opening?	Yes	NA
Page 6 – change \$1.26M to \$1.47M	Change made to page 5	Added change to page 5 and added up to because the full amount of competitive ESG may not get awarded to Butte County.
Page 6 – strike stream and insert sources, change CA to Federal, change \$181,988 to \$150,000-\$400,000, add two applications , strike operations only and capital or operations after each funding source	Added clarifying language	Page 5
Page 7 – under #5 the request is that the Applicant provide names of "persons" with whom the bidder has been "associated" in business as partners or business associates in the last five years. This is an open-ended request that could use further definition and clarification as to intent. What is meant by a "business associate"? Is this a character reference? Is it a capacity-assessment? And is it to be all persons or only/primarily persons related to the application concept?	This refers to someone that has had some contractual relationship or an active MOU during the last five years.	NA
page 8 – "Qualifications/service delivery conditions.....project must implement Housing First/Low Barrier policy".....	Unclear what change requested. Low barrier language already included.	
Page 8 – DOJ criminal back ground check. Is this necessary?	Because all grantees will be required to use HMIS, those applicants who received awards	Page 8, deleted Department of Justice

	will be required to conduct criminal background checks for those employees with access to HMIS. This does not have to occur until the award is made. SuperNOFA will ask applicants to describe how it will be done in the future if it is not already done.	
Page 8 – strike bidder’s proof and insert an IRS Letter of Determination	Change made	Page 7
Page 9 – There is no request for documentation of OMB Single Audit compliance/finding for non-profit entities which would demonstrate 24 months experience as a non-profit	Not all non-profits are required to have a single audit. If a non-profit does have a single audit it may be submitted to demonstrate 24 months experience.	NA
Page 9 – By when do applicants that do not meet threshold have to submit additional information in order to meet the threshold requirements.	5 business days	Page 8
Page 10 – Define “regularly”	“Regularly” is defined in the CoCs written standards.	Page 10
Page 10 – in the top and middle paragraphs the phrase, “...or comparable database as allowable by HUD” is used. If this is intended to confirm that the Applicant has conducted the necessary research, then that is fine. But to our knowledge there is only one instance when a comparable database to the HMIS in place is allowable. That would be for a Domestic Violence program. So if the goal is for clarity then it is suggested that the words, “...for DV Programs” be added under both instances when the phrase is used on the page.	This is for DV program only as allowable by HUD. This is the only exception HUD makes. Clarifying language added.	Page 10
Page 10 – in the last bullet point of the top paragraph the phrase, “Adhere to all contract requirements and state regulations” is used. As regulations are legally different from laws it is suggested that the word, “laws and” be inserted between “state” and “regulations”.	Clarifying language added.	Page 10

Page 11 under “Federal Education Requirements” the following statement is included, “Required for homeless individuals and families per (42 USC 11431 et seq)”. The requirement actually pertains to children and youth and the requirement to ensure that these are afforded access to education services as with other non-homeless families. We suggest a revision to the language from “individuals and families” to “children and youth”.	Change made	Page 11
Page 11 – “B” – does this apply only to ESG?	“B” will be removed.	Page 11
Page 11 – Add N.A. to “E”	“N.A.” will be added for capital only; state and federal requirement for others. Will remove the word “designated”.	Page 11
Page 11 – What if an entity does not want to apply for ESG?	Added language clarifying that it only applies to applicants requesting ESG funds.	Page 10
Page 11 – How is an entity to demonstrate site control if the site will be acquired with these funds?	If an entity does not have site control it should be clearly stated in the application. The entity should indicate when it estimates to obtain site control.	NA
Page 12 – What are the insurance requirements?	Insurance requirements are project specific and are determined after award. This will be added to the Super NOFA.	Page 12
page 14 – "please describe how proposed program will operate including how the shelter will be low barrier".....	Unclear what change is requested. Low barrier language already included.	NA
Page 15 – “alternative proof” – what does this apply to? Site control?	Applies to site control. Formatting will be corrected.	Page 15
Page 15 – change “city” to “jurisdiction”	This change will be made.	Page 15
Page 15 – last bullet on the page – is this the same as site control above. Clarify.	Yes – this is the same. SuperNOFA will be revised to add “see above” to reference requirements listed above.	Page 15
Page 17 – last bullet – add LGBTQ+	This change will be made.	Page 17
Page 17 – Are you requiring applicants to submit	No but awardees must comply with the policy.	

their Equal Access Policy?		
Page 21 – Tab H – Non-competitive ESG can only be used for RRH; suggest adding a line for RRH	A line for RRH will be added.	JG to make change.
Page 23 – Clarify the financial statement submission – confidential?	Language will be revised for clarification. Financial Statement should not be provided on the flash drive.	Page 23
Page 24 – last paragraph should say the County of Butte	This change will be made.	Page 24
Page 24 and Page 25 – there appear to be contradictory statements as to the decision-making body for award of funding decisions. On page 24 in the middle paragraph a process is described that includes what seems to be an action made by the entire CoC membership. This appears to be inconsistent with the Governance Charter of the CoC. Then on Page 25 under “APPEALS” a statement is made that funding recommendations go to the CoC Council. Could this be clarified?	In order to establish a voting quorum all voting members of the BCHCoC will be allowed to vote on the funding recommendations of the application review committee. This will allow a conflict free process since so many BCHCoC members will likely apply for funding made available by this Super NOFA. The CoC Council will serve as the appeals panel.	Page 24 & 25
Attachment E – Scoring. Perhaps separate scoring for Organization and Data. How will planning grants be scored?	This change will be made.	E
Page 25 – What does “must exceed all County procurement requirements” mean?	For HEAP and CESH funding streams, applicants must meet County procurement requirements. These will be provided to awardees.	Page 25
Page 25 – Will voting and non-voting members be able to cast votes? Very confusing	In order to establish a voting quorum all voting members of the BCHCoC will be allowed to vote on the funding recommendations of the application review committee. This will allow a conflict free process since so many Council members will likely apply for funding made available by this Super NOFA.	Page 24 & 25
Page 25 – How are you going to “prove” that an	Available reports from the federal and state	NA

entity had poor performance on a state or federal contract that did not lead to debarment?	agencies will be used to document poor performance. For example, HUD's CoC expenditure report.	
page 27 – Housing First.....(1) accepting applicant regardless of their sobriety or use of substances” Fails to mention those with mental health issues.	This is State of California regulation and cannot be modified by CoC. Please note that #1 does refer to mental health.	NA
Page 28 – Add Planning Grant as a category?	See above response related to Planning Grant.	NA
Page 29 – Low barrier shelters are listed as secondary priority of the CoC. What needs to happen to get low barrier shelter to be of primary importance?	(a) The document on page 29 was completed by the CoC prior to the fire. These were reaffirmed in December 2018. (b) All funds in this NOFA (except for required Rapid Rehousing set-aside) are for the expansion or preservation of emergency shelter. As per state requirements, shelters must be low barrier.	NA
Page 30 – Should the RFP referenced be the “SuperNOFA”? Conform the ESG regs “as applicable” Record retention for five years?	This language will be “cleaned up” to address these concerns.	RFP replaced with Super NOFA. Added as applicable to ESG. Change made to five years.
Page 33 – Exhibit F – Comment regarding the last sample award, this is mis-leading as ESG contracts are about 21 months and CESH is five years.	This is illustrative of braiding the funding sources available in the SUPER NOFA and project timelines that are shorter than the maximum terms allowed under a funding source. In this example the ESG funds would need to be spent before the three year contract expires and the CESH funds can be spent faster than five years.	NA