|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Correction/ Clarification/ Supplemental Information** |
| 9/16/15 | **Q.** Are the measures (in the budget and outcome forms, 1.1 – 1.8) fixed and required, or can the applicant alter a measure, add a measure, or subtract a measure from this list?  **A.** You are welcome to articulate additional metrics in your narratives; however, the metrics that will be measured by TCHC and TDHCA on a monthly basis are those that are pre-printed on the application. |
| 9/16/15 | **Q.** Ok, just to confirm my understanding, how does TDHCA and TCHC define case management as it relates to street outreach in this measure and what documentation would be required to demonstrate case management was performed?  **A.** There is a very good resource posted near the bottom of the TDHCA webpage of ESG [Program Guidance](https://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/community-affairs/esgp/guidance-solutions.htm) called “[Guide on Eligible ESG Uses (PDF)](https://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/community-affairs/esgp/docs/ESG-EligibleUses.pdf) (01/16/13)”:  <https://www.tdhca.state.tx.us/community-affairs/esgp/docs/ESG-EligibleUses.pdf>. Pages 3 – 4 include descriptions of eligible activities under case management. |
| 9/16/15 | **Q.** I read "if the applicant plans to serve 300 clients, then there must be 300 separate case files.  If we planned to DOPS 120 individuals, would the HMIS digital record be sufficient as a "case file?"  The HMIS record would hold eligibility information and Assessments that would support outcomes as opposed to our current system of paper case files that have agency required documentation, etc.  **A.** A *complete* HMIS file should be sufficient to document Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter activities.  Income eligibility, the fair market rent test, rent reasonable test, and habitability checks, etc., are needed in client files for homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing, however, and ETO is not currently programmed for these efforts.  Therefore, homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities would require an alternate means (most likely paper) of documentation. |
| 9/16/15 | **Q.** What constitutes a complete HMIS record?  **A.** A complete HMIS record would include the data required to establish a new record, HUD assessments and required data elements, and narrative case notes of sufficient detail that a third party reviewer could ascertain the services delivered and the outcomes achieved.  Additionally, data entry will need to be accurate, timely, and complete in accordance with your HMIS MOA. |
| 9/16/15 | **Q.** We are stumbling on the question in Narrative D:  Why do you believe the value of the services provided is appropriate? We don’t understand the question.  Are you asking why we think our services are a good fit for ESG?  **A.** It might be helpful to think in terms of economics:  http://healthsciences.utah.edu/notes/images/ValueEquationGraphic.jpg  Why do the services you propose to deliver at the cost for which you propose to deliver them represent the best use of public funds? |
|  | **Clarification.** In our Labor Day update (document [ESG-15-007](http://www.ahomewithhope.org/wp-content/uploads/ESG-15-007-TxESG-Competition-Labor-Day-Update-from-TCHC.pdf) on the webpage) we included a list of documents and data that applicants might wish to gather in preparation for the posting of the RFP and Application. Fortunately, TCHC was able to trim out some of the questions from the State that in our estimation were not relevant to due diligence and compliance. The RFP and Application contain the exclusive requirements for your submission. There is not, for example, an expectation that you include a list of your five largest donors into your narrative responses. |
| 9/17/15 | **Q.** Section 1.2 Total Number of Persons to be Served  This section seems to indicate that an applicant’s proposed numbers served need to reasonably correlate with the CoCs point in time homeless count.  However, the total new and unduplicated served in a program year does not correlate with a point in time number.   Can you provide some clarity here?   1. If you are saying that your proposed number would be higher than the PIT Count, that shouldn’t be the case since you would just be serving a smaller subset of the population and your totals should be less.  * Be realistic when compared to the number of homeless persons counted in the last point-in-time count for your corresponding CoC. For example, if the last point-in-time count for a given CoC counted 500 homeless persons, it would not make sense for an applicant to project to serve 2,000 persons when the main target population for the grant is the homeless population. * Be less than or equal to the total unduplicated count of persons to be served in all of the ESG program components - Street Outreach, Emergency Shelter, Rapid Re-Housing and Homelessness Prevention. In other words, the total number of persons to be served must be less than or equal to the sum of all numbers listed under questions 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6. Note that the total persons to be served is likely to be less (rather than equal) than the sum of all persons served in the different components, because some participants will likely receive services from multiple program components. |
| 9/17/15 | **Q.**   1. Am I only to set an output/outcome for activities that this grant is paying for specifically? For example: We are asking for support for Emergency Shelter activities and RRH activities.  Both of those services involve case management; however we do not plan to use these funds to pay for the case management component.  We have also not included costs for these services in our match.   Since case management is not covered in the requested funds or match should I or should I not  indicate an output on the Case management question? 2. The instructions indicate that adults and children should be counted in all questions except the income question.  I just want to clarify that this is the case because in prior projects with TDHCA SafeHaven has excluded children in any question that is relevant to household only (i.e. destinations and maintaining housing.)   **A.** For question one, you will include those who the grant is paying for specifically AND anyone in the project who will be served by Match funds.   * 1. ***Include persons to be served with ESG AND ESG Match funds***. Include activities, outputs and outcomes associated with both ESG and ESG match funds as shown in Appendix 2 of the RFP. Collaborative Applicants should include the total persons to be served and outcomes to be achieved for the partnership as a whole.  If a projected outcome cannot be linked to an activity that will result in such outcome, no points will be awarded for the proposed outputs/outcome.   For question two, yes, children are to be included in all questions except for increased income.   * 1. ***Include all members of the household, except when projecting the number of persons with increased income***. When projecting the number of persons to be served for each activity and the number of persons to achieve a given outcome, count all members of the household, except when counting the number of persons with increased incomes, where only the person receiving the income would be counted. Household members are defined as persons that are living together.  For clients that are escaping domestic violence, a household includes all members of the household who are fleeing together. |

Reminder! The deadline for submitting questions—and the last point at which we would post any additional information to the website—is 9/17/2015 at 12:30:00 PM. Please address any questions on the application to [tchc@ahomewithhope.org](mailto:tchc@ahomewithhope.org) and reference “ESG-15” in the subject line.