



## CoC Structure and Decision-Making Processes

### C: CoC Groups and Meetings Chart

The purpose of the CoC Groups and Meetings Chart is to help HUD understand the current structure and decision-making processes of your CoC. List the name and role (function served) of each group in the CoC planning process. Under “CoC Primary Decision-Making Group,” identify only one group that acts as the primary leadership or decision-making group for the CoC. Indicate the frequency of meetings and the number of organizations participating in each group. Under “Other CoC Committees, Sub-Committees, Workgroups, etc.” you should include any established group that is part of your CoC’s organizational structure *and which is involved in CoC planning* (add rows to the chart as needed). Please limit your description of each group’s role to 3 lines or less.

CoC Planning Groups		Meeting Frequency (check only one column)				Enter the number of organizations/entities that are members of each CoC planning group listed on this chart.
		At Least Monthly	At Least Quarterly	At Least Biannually	Annually	
<b>CoC Primary Decision-Making Group</b> (list only one group)						
<b>Name:</b>	Chicago Continuum of Care Governing Board	X				<b>28</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Establishes policies and priorities for the Chicago Continuum of Care.					
<b>Other CoC Committees, Sub-Committees, Workgroups, etc.</b>						
<b>Name:</b>	HUD McKinney Vento Committee	X				<b>12</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for the annual SuperNOFA process. Annually, the committee must analyze the HUD Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and recommend funding policies to the Governing Board.					
<b>Name:</b>	Evaluation Committee		X			<b>12</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for designing and implementing the process and tools for evaluating the work and progress of the Chicago Plan to End Homelessness.					
<b>Name:</b>	HMIS Committee		X			<b>12</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for monitoring the implementation of Chicago’s HMIS system, coordinating a users group, and evaluating and updating HMIS Standard Operating Procedures as necessary.					
<b>Name:</b>	Resource Development Committee		X			<b>12</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for the fiscal areas of the Continuum, including: reviewing the resource development needs of the Continuum office and Continuum programs and projects needed to implement the Chicago Plan to End Homelessness.					
<b>Name:</b>	Executive Committee	X				<b>5</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for proposing and preparing the agendas for Governing Board meetings, determining personnel policies, overseeing financials of the Continuum budgets, and making interim decisions as needed, with Governing Board ratification.					

<b>Name:</b>	Governance Committee		<b>X</b>			<b>12</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Oversees the governance functions of the Continuum Board. Its responsibilities include overseeing the selection and election of Board members by constituency groups and the Continuum, and updating bylaws of the Board as needed.					
<b>Name:</b>	Plan Advisory Committee		<b>X</b>			<b>12</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Monitors the implementation of Chicago's 10 year Plan to End Homelessness through the work of committees and task groups.					
<b>Name:</b>	Prevention Task Group		<b>X</b>			<b>17</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for developing the CoC's prevention strategies for discharge planning and the coordination of access to homeless prevention resources.					

<b>Name:</b>	Employment Resources Task Group				<b>X</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Coordinates a series of workshops for homeless service providers on employment resources available to people who are homeless.					
<b>Name:</b>	Evaluation Instrument Task Group		<b>X</b>			<b>10</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for the development of an effective evaluation instrument to rate and rank programs as part of the annual SuperNOFA process.					
<b>Name:</b>	Systems Projections Task Group			<b>X</b>		<b>6</b>
<b>Role:</b>	Responsible for developing a planning framework to understand system change and to update associated assumptions about the homeless population.					

### D: CoC Planning Process Organizations Chart

List the names of all organizations involved in the CoC under the appropriate category. If more than one geographic area is claimed on the 2007 Geography Chart (Chart B), you must indicate which geographic area(s) each organization represents in your CoC planning process. In the last columns, identify no more than two subpopulation(s) whose interests the organization is specifically focused on representing in the CoC planning process. For “Homeless Persons,” identify at least 2 homeless or formerly homeless individuals. Do not enter the real names of domestic violence survivors.

	Specific Names of All CoC Organizations	Geographic Area Represented	Subpopulations Represented, if any* (no more than 2 per organization)	
<b>PUBLIC SECTOR</b>	<b>STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES</b>			
	Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of Mental Health	CHICAGO	SMI	
	Illinois Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services	CHICAGO		
	Illinois Department of Human Services, Division of Human Capital Development	CHICAGO		
	Illinois Department of Veterans’ Affairs	CHICAGO	VET	
	Illinois Department of Children and Family Affairs	CHICAGO	Y	
	Office of the Governor	CHICAGO		
	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES</b>			
	City of Chicago, Department of Housing	CHICAGO		
	City of Chicago, Department of Human Services	CHICAGO		
	Chicago Commission on Human Relations	CHICAGO		
	City of Chicago, Department of Children and Youth Services	CHICAGO	Y	
	City of Chicago, Mayor’s Office of Workforce Development	CHICAGO		
	City of Chicago, Department of Public Health	CHICAGO	HIV	
	<b>PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES</b>			
	Chicago Housing Authority	CHICAGO		
	<b>SCHOOL SYSTEMS / UNIVERSITIES</b>			
	Chicago Public Schools	CHICAGO	Y	
	Loyola University	CHICAGO		
	University of Chicago	CHICAGO		
	DePaul University	CHICAGO		
	University of Illinois Chicago	CHICAGO		
	<b>LAW ENFORCEMENT / CORRECTIONS</b>			
	Chicago Police Department	CHICAGO		
	<b>LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (WIA) BOARDS</b>			
	<b>OTHER – FEDERAL AGENCIES</b>			

	US Department of Labor	CHICAGO		
	US. Dept of Veterans Affairs	CHICAGO	VET	
	Social Security Administration	CHICAGO		
<b>PRIVATE SECTOR</b>	<b>NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS</b>			
	AIDS Care	CHICAGO	HIV	
	AIDS Foundation of Chicago	CHICAGO	HIV	
	Alliance to End Homelessness of Suburban Cook County	COOK COUNTY		
	Apna Ghar, Inc.	CHICAGO	DV	
	Beacon Therapeutic	CHICAGO	SMI	DV
	Bobby E. Wright Mental Health Center	CHICAGO	SMI	
	Casa Central	CHICAGO		
	Casa Esperanza	CHICAGO		
	Chicago Abused Women Coalition	CHICAGO	DV	
	Chicago House	CHICAGO	HIV	
	Circle Family Care	CHICAGO		
	Connexions	CHICAGO		
	Community Counseling Centers of Chicago (C4)	CHICAGO	SMI	
	Community Mental Health Council	CHICAGO	SMI	SA
	Community Supportive Living Systems	CHICAGO	HIV	
	Connections for the Homeless	CHICAGO		
	Counseling Center of Lakeview	CHICAGO	SMI	
	Creative Consultant Solutions	CHICAGO		
	Deborah's Place	CHICAGO	SMI	SA
	Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic	CHICAGO		
	Family Rescue	CHICAGO	DV	
	Featherfist	CHICAGO		
	Goldie's Place	CHICAGO		
	Grand Prairie Services Behavioral Health Care	CHICAGO	SMI	
	Haymarket Center	CHICAGO	SA	
	Health Care Alternative Systems	CHICAGO	SA	
	Heartland Alliance	CHICAGO		
	Heartland Health Outreach	CHICAGO	SMI	SA
	Heartland Human Care Services	CHICAGO		
	Help Ease Local Poverty	CHICAGO		
	Hope Coalition for Housing	CHICAGO		
	Housing Opportunities for Women	CHICAGO		
Hull House	CHICAGO	Y		
Human Resources Development Institute	CHICAGO			

Humboldt Park Social Services	CHICAGO		
Hyde Park Transitional Housing Project	CHICAGO		
Inner Voice	CHICAGO	VET	
Inspiration Corporation	CHICAGO		
Institute for Women Today	CHICAGO		
Interfaith House	CHICAGO		
Jump Up	CHICAGO		
La Casa Norte	CHICAGO	Y	
Lakeview Pantry	CHICAGO		
Lawson YMCA	CHICAGO		
Lincoln Park Community Shelter	CHICAGO		
LUCHA	CHICAGO		
Maine Center	CHICAGO		
Matthew House	CHICAGO	SA	VET
Mercy Housing Lakefront	CHICAGO		
Mujeres Latinas en Accion	CHICAGO		
National Student Partnerships	CHICAGO		
New Phoenix Assistance Center	CHICAGO	HIV	
Next Steps	CHICAGO		
North Side Housing & Supportive Services	CHICAGO		
Polish American Association	CHICAGO		
Ravenswood Community Services	CHICAGO		
Renaissance Collaborative	CHICAGO		
Renaissance Social Services	CHICAGO		
REST	CHICAGO		
Sarah's Circle	CHICAGO		
Single Room Housing Assistance Corp.	CHICAGO		
Southwest Chicago PADS	CHICAGO		
Southwest Women Working Together	CHICAGO	DV	
StreetWise	CHICAGO		
Su Casa Catholic Worker	CHICAGO		
Taherah Towers, Inc	CHICAGO		
Teen Living Programs	CHICAGO	Y	
The Cara Program	CHICAGO		
The Night Ministry	CHICAGO	Y	
Thresholds	CHICAGO	SMI	
Trilogy, Inc.	CHICAGO	SMI	
Unity Parenting and Counseling Center	CHICAGO	Y	

Veterans Referral Team	CHICAGO	VET	
Vital Bridges	CHICAGO	HIV	
WECAN	CHICAGO		
West Englewood United Organization	CHICAGO		
WilPower	CHICAGO		
Workforce Employers Resource Collaborative	CHICAGO		
YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago	CHICAGO		
You Can Make It	CHICAGO		
<b>FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS</b>			
Bethel New Life	CHICAGO		
Brand New Beginnings	CHICAGO		
Breakthrough Urban Ministries	CHICAGO		
Cathedral Shelter	CHICAGO		
Catholic Charities	CHICAGO	VET	
Chicago Christian Industrial League	CHICAGO		
Circle Urban Ministries	CHICAGO		
Community Light Family and Youth	CHICAGO	Y	
Cornerstone Community Outreach	CHICAGO		
Elam Davies Social Service Agency	CHICAGO		
Excellent Way	CHICAGO		
Franciscan Outreach Association	CHICAGO		
Good News Partners	CHICAGO		
House of the Good Shepherd	CHICAGO		
Interfaith Council for the Homeless	CHICAGO		
Interfaith Open Communities	CHICAGO		
International Pro-Life Federation	CHICAGO		
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago	CHICAGO		
New Moms, Inc	CHICAGO	Y	
Port Ministries	CHICAGO		
Roseland Christian Community Health Center	CHICAGO	SMI	
Salvation Army	CHICAGO		
San Jose Obrero Mission	CHICAGO		
SisterHouse	CHICAGO		
St. Leonard's Ministries	CHICAGO		
St. Peter's AOC	CHICAGO		
Walls Memorial CME Church	CHICAGO		
<b>FUNDERS / ADVOCACY GROUPS</b>			
Chicago Coalition for the Homeless	CHICAGO		
Corporation for Supportive Housing	CHICAGO	SMI	
Emergency Fund	CHICAGO		
Eleanor Foundation	CHICAGO		
Grantmakers Concerned with Ending Homelessness	CHICAGO		
Housing Action Illinois	CHICAGO		
IL Coalition Against Domestic Violence	CHICAGO	DV	
Irvin Stern Foundation	CHICAGO		

National Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Greater Chicago	CHICAGO	SMI	
Partnership to End Homelessness	CHICAGO		
Polk Bros. Foundation	CHICAGO		
Prince Charitable Trusts	CHICAGO		
Supportive Housing Providers Association	CHICAGO		
United Way of Metropolitan Chicago	CHICAGO		
<b>BUSINESSES (BANKS, DEVELOPERS, BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS, ETC.)</b>			
Boeing Corporation	CHICAGO		
Harris Bank	CHICAGO		
MOC Associates, Inc.	CHICAGO		
The Technologist	CHICAGO		
Thinkinc.	CHICAGO		
<b>HOSPITALS / MEDICAL REPRESENTATIVES</b>			
Cermak Health Services of Cook County	CHICAGO	SMI	
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	CHICAGO	SMI	
Michael Reese Health Trust	CHICAGO		
Mt. Sinai	CHICAGO		
Resurrection Health Care	CHICAGO		
Stroger Hospital	CHICAGO		
<b>HOMELESS / FORMERLY HOMELESS PERSONS</b>			
Carolyn Smith	CHICAGO		
David Granberry	CHICAGO		
Dorothy Yancy	CHICAGO		
Fred Friedman	CHICAGO		
Kevin Brown	CHICAGO		
Lonnie Fulton	CHICAGO		
Mark Czyzewski	CHICAGO		
Jon Kushar	CHICAGO		
Ernestine Standberry	CHICAGO		
Len Palmer	CHICAGO		
Michael Jones	CHICAGO		
Kathy Powell	CHICAGO		
LaVonna Sargan	CHICAGO		
Tina Watkins	CHICAGO		
Jerry Pilipiak	CHICAGO		
Dewitt McClain	CHICAGO		
Greg Serskamous	CHICAGO		
Stephanie Hooker	CHICAGO		
Katherine Hanley	CHICAGO		
Mary Banks	CHICAGO		
Rosemary McDonald	CHICAGO		
Nancy Thomas	CHICAGO		
Dian Gilbert	CHICAGO		
Garfield Human	CHICAGO		
Evon McAllister	CHICAGO		
Janice Holden	CHICAGO		
John Quirk	CHICAGO		



Patricia Woods	CHICAGO		
<b>CONSTITUENCY GROUPS</b>			
AIDS Housing Advisory Committee	CHICAGO	HIV	
AIDS Housing Provider Committee	CHICAGO	HIV	
Chicago Chronic Homeless Group	CHICAGO	SMI	SA
Chicago Commission on Human Relations	CHICAGO		
Chicago Community Based Black Caucus	CHICAGO		
Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network	CHICAGO	DV	
Concerned Providers	CHICAGO		
Funders Forum	CHICAGO		
Healthcare for the Homeless		SMI	SA
Homeless Action Committee	CHICAGO	SMI	
Homeless Caucus	CHICAGO		
Homeless Committee of the Organization of the NorthEast	CHICAGO		
Homeless Families	CHICAGO		
Homeless Youth Providers	CHICAGO	Y	
Homelessness Prevention	CHICAGO		
Interim Housing Providers	CHICAGO		
Latino Council on Homelessness	CHICAGO		
Mental Health Caucus	CHICAGO	SMI	
Permanent Supportive Housing	CHICAGO	SMI	SA
Faith-Based	CHICAGO		
Wraparound Services	CHICAGO		
<b>OTHER</b>			
John Hobbs – Parliamentarian	CHICAGO		
Chris Persons – Community Representative	CHICAGO		
Illinois State Rep. Julie Hamos	CHICAGO		
<b>RESEARCH PARTNERS</b>			
Center for Urban Research and Learning	CHICAGO		
Mid America Institute on Poverty	CHICAGO		

**\*Subpopulations Key:** Seriously Mentally Ill (SMI), Substance Abuse (SA), Veterans (VET), HIV/AIDS (HIV), Domestic Violence (DV), and Youth (Y).

## E: CoC Governing Structure Chart

HUD is considering establishing standards for the governing process and structure of Continuums of Care. As part of this consideration, HUD is gathering information on existing governing structures and processes in CoCs. Specifically, this chart asks for information about the primary decision-making group that you identified in Chart C: CoC Groups and Meetings Chart. No requirements are in place yet; however, the information that you enter will inform HUD's decisions about how to move forward with standards in the future. **Please note:** a response to each question will earn full credit for this chart.

1. Is the CoC's primary decision-making body a legally recognized organization (check one)?

- Yes, a 501(c)(3)  
 Yes, a 501(c)(4)  
 Yes, other – specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
 No, not legally recognized

2. If your CoC were provided with additional administrative funds from HUD, would the primary decision-making body, or an agent designated by it (e.g. a city or non-profit organization), be able to be responsible for activities such as applying for HUD funding and serving as the grantee, providing project oversight, and monitoring? Explain.

**Yes. If our CoC were provided with additional funding, the Continuum of Care Governing Board, now known as the Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness, would designate an agent –either non-profit or city government– to be responsible for all HUD activities described above.**

3. What percentage of the decision-making body membership represents the private sector, including non-profit providers, homeless or formerly homeless persons, advocates and consumer interests, etc.?

71 %

4a. Indicate how the **members** of the primary decision-making body are selected (check all that apply):

- Elected                       Assigned/Volunteer  
 Appointed                       Other – specify: \_\_\_\_\_

4b. Briefly explain the selection process. (For example, if 5 members are appointed and 6 are elected, explain why this process was established and describe how it works.)

**Members of the Chicago Continuum of Care Governing Board, known as of January 1, 2007 as the Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness, are elected through a system of “constituency groups.” Constituency groups were required to register their membership with the Chicago Continuum of Care office. The Governing Board pre-established the ratio of public and private representation of constituency groups. A general election by the whole Continuum of Care then voted in the constituency groups to comprise the Governing Board. Each constituency group selected its own representative.**

5. Indicate how the **leaders** of the primary decision-making body are selected (check all that apply):

- Elected                       Assigned/Volunteer  
 Appointed                       Other – specify: The Chair of the Governing Board rotates annually between members of the Board that represent the public, private, and consumer sectors.

## F: CoC Project Review and Selection Chart

The CoC solicitation of projects and project selection should be conducted in a fair and impartial manner. Please mark all appropriate boxes to indicate all of the methods and processes the CoC used in the past year to assess project(s) performance, effectiveness, and quality, particularly with respect to the Project Priorities Chart (CoC-Q). This applies to new and renewal projects. Check all that apply:

<b>1. Open Solicitation</b>	
a. Newspapers <input type="checkbox"/>	d. Outreach to Faith-Based Groups <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Letters/Emails to CoC Membership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	e. Announcements at CoC Meetings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Responsive to Public Inquiries <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	f. Announcements at Other Meetings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Objective Rating Measures and Performance Assessment</b>	
a. CoC Rating & Review Committee Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	j. Assess Spending (fast or slow) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Review CoC Monitoring Findings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	k. Assess Cost Effectiveness <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Review HUD Monitoring Findings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	l. Assess Provider Organization Experience <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Review Independent Audit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	m. Assess Provider Organization Capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Review HUD APR for Performance Results <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	n. Evaluate Project Presentation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Review Unexecuted Grants <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	o. Review CoC Membership Involvement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Site Visit(s) <input type="checkbox"/>	p. Review Match <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Survey Clients <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	q. Review All Leveraging Letters (to ensure that they meet HUD requirements) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Evaluate Project Readiness <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>3. Voting/Decision System</b>	
a. Unbiased Panel / Review Committee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	d. One Vote per Organization <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Consumer Representative Has a Vote <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	e. Consensus (general agreement) <input type="checkbox"/>
c. All CoC Members Present Can Vote <input type="checkbox"/>	f. Voting Members Abstain if Conflict of Interest <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## G: CoC Written Complaints Chart

<b>Were there any written complaints received by the CoC regarding any CoC matter in the last 12 months?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>
<b>If Yes, briefly describe the complaints and how they were resolved.</b>	
<p>Throughout the SuperNOFA process, any agency is welcome to submit appeals and complaints on the evaluation process. During the 2007 process, the Planning Council received one formal complaint regarding their program's evaluation instrument score. The Chicago Planning Council discussed the issue with the agency and also issued a written letter acknowledging the concerns of the agency, providing a more detailed explanation of their decision.</p>	







(1)	(2)					(3)			(4)									
Provider Organizations	Prevention					Outreach			Supportive Services									
	Mortgage	Rental Assistance	Utility Assistance	Counseling/Advocac	Legal Assistance	Street Outreach	Mobile Clinic	Law Enforcement	Case Management	Life Skills	Alcohol & Drug	Mental Health	Healthcare	HIV/AIDS	Education	Employment	Child Care	Transportation
Teen Living Program						X			X	X		X	X		X	X		X
Thresholds, Inc.		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Trilogy, Inc.									X			X						
Unity Parenting and Counseling Center									X	X		X						
University of Chicago Mandel Legal Aid Clinic				X	X													
Vision House									X					X				
Vital Bridges		X	X	X					X	X	X		X	X	X			X
West Englewood United Organization									X	X		X			X	X		
Winfield Moody Health Center											X	X	X					
YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago				X					X	X				X			X	

---

## CoC Housing Inventory and Unmet Needs

### I: CoC Housing Inventory Charts

This section includes three housing inventory charts—for emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing. Note that the information in these charts should reflect a point-in-time count. For the Permanent Housing Inventory Chart, the beds listed under “new inventory” should indicate beds that became available for occupancy for the first time between February 1, 2006 and January 31, 2007. For complete instructions in filling out this section, see the Instructions section at the beginning of the application.

## I: CoC Housing Inventory Charts

Emergency Shelter: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart													
Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds	Other Beds	
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds		Seasonal	O/V*
<b>Current Inventory</b> (Available for Occupancy on or before Jan. 31, 2006)			Ind.	Fam.									
Breakthrough Urban Ministries	Mens Center	N	0	0	171296	SM		0	0	30	30	0	0
City of Chicago Dept. of Human Services	Emergency Overflow Beds	D	0	0		M		0	0	0	0	0	500
Franciscan Outreach	House of Mary & Joseph*	PS	250	0		SMF		0	0	250	250	0	0
Good Samaritan Community Services	Hope House	D	0	0		SM		0	0	30	30	0	0
House of the Good Shepherd	House of the Good Shepherd	DV	0	0		FC	DV	14	38	0	38	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	A Little Bit of Heaven	PS	50	0		SM		0	0	50	50	0	0



### Emergency Shelter: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds	Other Beds	
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds		Seasonal	O/V*
Inner Voice Inc	Breakthrough Urban Ministries-Joshua	N	0	0		SF		0	0	30	30	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Cornerstone -Naomi	PA	35	0		SF		0	0	35	35	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Cornerstone-Sylvia	PA	0	65		FC		21	65	0	65	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Excellent Way House	PS	0	30		FC		15	30	0	30	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Great Hope Family Center	PS	0	20		FC		6	20	0	20	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Great Hope La Cruzada	N	0	0		SM		0	0	85	85	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Humboldt Park Social Svc Warming Ctr	PS	0	0		SM		0	0	0	0	60	0
Inner Voice Inc	Olive Branch Mission	PS	0	75		FC		23	75	0	75	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	Olive Branch Mission - Open Doors	PS	75	0		SM		0	0	75	75	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	REST-Epworth Emergency Response Shelter	PS	65	0		SM		0	0	65	65	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	REST-Men's Shelter	PA	5	0		SM		0	0	5	5	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	REST-Women's Shelter	PA	10	0		SF		0	0	10	10	0	0

### Emergency Shelter: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds	Other Beds	
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds		Seasonal	O/V*
Inner Voice Inc	Salvation Army Tom Seay Uptown Corps	PS	0	0		SM		0	0	0	0	95	0
Inner Voice Inc	Walls Memorial Church	N	60	0		SM		0	0	60	60	0	0
Inner Voice Inc	You Can Make It	PS	0	50		FC		17	50	0	50	0	0
LAMBB Multi-Purpose	LAMBB House	N	0	0		FC		15	40	0	40	0	0
Neopolitan Lighthouse	Domestic Violence Program	DV	0	0		FC	DV	5	25	0	25	0	0
Northside Housing and Supportive Services	Addison Overnight Shelter*	PS	27	0		SM		0	0	27	27	0	0
Pacific Garden Mission	Bible Program	D	0	0		SM		0	0	120	120	0	0
Pacific Garden Mission	Gospel League Home (Private)	D	0	0		SF		0	0	100	100	0	0

### Emergency Shelter: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds	Other Beds	
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds		Seasonal	O/V*
Pacific Garden Mission	Men's Overnight (Private)	D	0	0		SM		0	0	450	450	0	0
Seniors of the Third Ward	Washington/King Resource Center	N	0	0		SM		0	0	80	80	0	0
Southwest Women Working Together	AMANI House	PS	0	33		FC		9	33	0	33	0	0
Southwest Women Working Together	DVERN	DV	0	0		M	DV	3	8	0	8	0	0
St. Joseph Home	St. Joseph Home	D	0	0		FC		6	20	0	20	0	0
Teen Living Programs	Bronzeville Youth Shelter	D	0	0		YMF		0	0	8	8	0	0
<b>SUBTOTALS:</b>			577	273		<b>SUBTOTAL CURRENT INVENTORY:</b>		134	404	1510	1914	155	500
<b>New Inventory in Place in 2006</b> (Available for Occupancy Feb. 1, 2006 – Jan. 31, 2007)			Ind.	Fam.									

### Emergency Shelter: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds	Other Beds					
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds		Seasonal	O/V*				
Inner Voice Inc	Lena Washington Center	PS	0	65		FC		20	65	0	65	0	0				
Inner Voice Inc	You Can Make It II	PS	0	15		FC		5	15	0	15	0	0				
<b>SUBTOTALS:</b>			0	80	<b>SUBTOTAL NEW INVENTORY:</b>			25	80	0	80	0	0				
<b>Inventory Under Development (Available for Occupancy after January 31, 2007)</b>			Anticipated Occupancy Date														
<i>No New Emergency Shelter is planned for 2006</i>			N/A		N/A			0	0	0	0	0	0				
<b>Unmet Need</b>						<b>Unmet Need Total:</b>						0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Year-Round Beds--Individuals</b>					<b>Total Year Round Beds--Families</b>												
Total Year-Round Individual Emergency Shelter (ES) Beds:			1510		Total Year-Round Family Emergency Shelter (ES) Beds:						484						
Number of DV Year Round Individual ES Beds:			0		Number of DV Year Round Family ES Beds:						71						
Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round Individual ES Beds (Line 6 minus Line 7)			1510		Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round Family ES Beds (Line 6 minus Line 7)						413						

**Emergency Shelter: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS	Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds	Other Beds	
					A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds		Seasonal	O/V*
Total Year-Round Individual ES Beds in HMIS			577	Total Year-Round Family ES Beds in HMIS						353		
HMIS Coverage—Individual ES Beds (divide line 9 by line 8 and multiply by 100. Round to a whole number):			38%	HMIS Coverage—Family ES Beds (divide line 9 by line 8 and multiply by 100. Round to a whole number):						85%		

## I: CoC Housing Inventory Charts

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			Ind.	Fam.		A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds	
<b>Current Inventory</b> <b>(Available for Occupancy on or before January 31, 2006)</b>			Ind.	Fam.							
Alexian Brothers	Bonaventure House	PA	35	0	171296	SMF	HIV	0	0	35	35
APNA GHAR	Emergency Shelter	DV	0	0		M	DV	2	6	6	12
APNA GHAR	Supportive Housing*	DV	0	0		M	DV	2	6	5	11
APNA GHAR	Transitional Housing	DV	0	0		SF	DV	0	0	4	4
Bethel New Life	Family Wellness Center*	PA	0	90		FC		24	90	0	90
Bethel New Life	Westside Housing for Independent Living	PA	0	65		FC		11	65	0	65
Casa Central	La Posada Interim Housing*	PA	0	116		FC		21	116	0	116
Casa Central	La Posada Scattered Site*	PS	0	200		FC		46	200	0	200
Casa Esperanza	Casa Esperanza	D	0	0		FC		4	13	0	13
Catholic Charities	Forever Free Recovery Home Phase I	D	0	0		FC		15	34	0	34

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			A	B		Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds			
Catholic Charities	Forever Free Recovery Home Phase II	D	0	0		FC		10	21	0	21
Catholic Charities	New Hope Apartments*	PS	0	247		FC		81	247	0	247
Catholic Charities	St. Francis Family Shelter	PS	0	47		FC		15	47	0	47
Catholic Charities	St. Sylvester Family Shelter	PS	0	42		FC		14	42	0	42
Central American Martyrs Center	Su Casa Catholic Worker	D	0	0		FC		6	25	0	25
Chicago Abused Women Coalition	Greenhouse Shelter*	DV	0	0		M	DV	10	39	0	39
Chicago Christian Industrial League	Pathways Supportive Housing Program*	PA	56	0		SM		0	0	56	56
Chicago Christian Industrial League	Family Supportive Housing Program*	PA	0	66		FC		22	66	0	66
Chicago Christian Industrial League	O'Hare	PA	78	0		SM		0	0	78	78

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			A	B		Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds			
Chicago Christian Industrial League	Second Stage Supportive Housing*	PA	69	0		SM		0	0	69	69
Circle Urban Ministries	Community Care*	PS	0	0		FC		13	96	0	96
Community Mental Health Council	Acute Care Residential	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	12	12
Community Mental Health Council	Englewood Residential Facility	D	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	16	16
Community Mental Health Council	Englewood Transitional Living Facility Program	D	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	13	13
Community Mental Health Council	Ruth Williams Crisis House	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	8	8
Community Supportive Living Systems Inc.	Alpha Correctional	N	0	0		SM	HIV	0	0	8	8
Concerned Citizens	Mother's House I	N	0	0		M		9	27	19	46
Concerned Citizens	Mother's House II	PA	11	10		M		7	10	11	21
Concerned Citizens	Mother's House III	N	0	0		M		6	9	9	18



### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds	
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Hannah House	PS	0	75		FC		25	75	0	75
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Leland House*	PS	0	60		FC		18	60	0	60
Deborah's Place	Teresa's Interim Housing	PA	10	0		SF		0	0	10	10
Family Rescue	Ridgeland Apts. & and Daycare*	DV	0	0		FC	DV	22	70	0	70
Family Rescue	Rosenthal Family Lodge*	DV	0	0		M	DV	13	33	3	36
Featherfist	FORT-Featherfist Outreach Retention and Treatment*	PS	24	0		SMF		0	0	24	24
Featherfist	Foundations*	PS	0	62		FC		17	62	0	62
Featherfist	Hope Village*	PS	0	60		FC	MI	19	60	0	60
Good News Partners	New Life Shelter	PS	0	30		M		10	30	0	30
Haymarket Center	MISA Expansion*	PS	9	0		SM	MI	0	0	9	9
Heartland Health Outreach	TB Supportive Housing	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	10	10

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds	
Heartland Human Care Services	Families Building Community 1-3*	PA	0	150		FC		49	150	0	150
Heartland Human Care Services	Rafael Center – EPOCH*	N	0	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	39	39
Heartland Human Care Services	Rafael Center - First Step*	PA	13	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	13	13
Heartland Human Care Services	Rafael Center - Next Step*	PA	16	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	16	16
Heartland Human Care Services	Rafael Ctr-TLC*	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	14	14
Heartland Human Care Services	Stable Futures 1 & 2*	PA	64	0		SMF		0	0	64	64
Holy Rock	Helping Arms Outreach Ministries	PA	0	16		FC		4	16	0	16
HOW	Family Two	PS	0	28		FC		8	28	0	28
HOW	Home First	N	0	0		M		3	7	2	9
HOW	Singles Two*	PS	50	0		SF		0	0	50	50

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds	
Hull House	Emerge*	N	0	0		M		5	20	15	35
Human Resources Development Inst., Inc.	Supportive Housing for Women*	PS	16	0		SF		0	0	16	16
Humboldt Park Social Services	Interim Housing	PA	2	20		M	SW;FC	6	20	2	22
Inner Voice Inc	Eddie Beard Veterans TH*	PS	15	0		SMF	VET	0	0	15	15
Inner Voice Inc	It Takes a Village	PS	0	60		FC		20	60	0	60
Inner Voice Inc	Pioneer House*	PS	16	0		SM		0	0	16	16
Inner Voice Inc	Tab House South	PS	8	75		FC		25	75	8	83
Inner Voice Inc	Tab House South II	PS	0	50		FC		16	50	0	50
Inner Voice Inc	Tab House West	PS	0	90		FC		25	90	0	90
Inner Voice Inc	Thelma's Place	PS	0	54		FC		15	54	0	54
Inspiration Corporation	IC Short Term Support Housing*	PA	15	0		SMF		0	0	15	15
Institute of Women Today	Maria's Shelter	PS	25	25		M		8	25	25	50

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds	
Interfaith House	Respite Program*	PA	52	0		SMF		0	0	52	52
Interfaith House	Supportive Living Program*	PA	12	0		SMF		0	0	12	12
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago	Singer Transitional Residence*	PS	15	8		M		3	8	15	23
Korean American Women in Need	Services to Non-English Speaking DV Victims	DV	0	0		M	DV	3	12	0	12
Lincoln Park Community Shelter	Transitional Housing Program	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	35	35
New Phoenix Assistance Center	NPAC w/short term support*	N	0	0		M	HIV	9	14	2	16
New Phoenix Assistance Center	NPAC w/short term support*	N	0	0		M	HIV	9	18	1	19
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Emergency Housing Program*	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	23	23
Olive Branch Mission	Life Transformation Opportunities	PS	30	0		SM		0	0	30	30
Salvation Army	Evangeline Booth Lodge	N	0	0		FC		15	50	0	50

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			A	B		Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds			
San Jose Obrero Mission	Casa San Jose Obrero	PS	34	0		SM		0	0	34	34
Southwest Women Working Together	Courage Homes*	DV	0	0		FC	DV	20	70	0	70
Southwest Women Working Together	Courage Homes Expansion*	DV	0	0		FC	DV	20	40	0	40
Southwest Women Working Together	Open Door*	DV	0	0		FC	DV	13	42	0	42
St. Leonards Ministries	Grace House	PS	18	0		SF		0	0	18	18
St. Leonards Ministries	St. Leonard's House	N	0	0		SM		0	0	40	40
Teen Living Programs	Belfort House*	D	0	0		SMF		0	0	18	18
Teen Living Programs	Scattered Site Program (CaSSA)	D	0	0		SMF		0	0	10	10
Unity Parenting & Counseling	Harmony Village*	PS	17	50		FC		20	50	17	67
Vital Bridges	Bridges to Homes	D	0	0		SMF		0	0	15	15

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* *Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			A	B		Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds			
West Englewood United Organization	Clara's House	N	0	0		M		10	49	8	57
YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago	Austin Transitional Living Program*	D	0	0		SM		0	0	60	60
<b>SUBTOTALS:</b>			710	1796	<b>SUBTOTAL CURRENT INVENTORY:</b>			748	2497	1105	3602
<b>New Inventory in Place in 2006 (Available for Occupancy Feb. 1, 2006 – Jan. 31, 2007)</b>			Ind.	Fam.							
Ashanti	Ashanti Residential	D	0	0		SMF		0	0	42	42
Community Mental Health Council	Community Residential Facility	D	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	16	16
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Naomi Center Interim Housing*	PA	65	0		SF		0	0	65	65
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Sylvia Center Interim Housing*	PA	0	97		FC		19	97	0	97
Great Hope Family Center	Mercy Family Center	PS	0	65		FC		11	65	0	65
Haymarket Center	Homeless Program	PS	9	0		SM	MI	0	0	9	9

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds	
Hyde Park Transitional Housing Project	Hyde Park Transitional Housing Project	D	0	0		FC		1	3	0	3
Inner Voice Inc	Family Restoration*	PS	0	52		FC		14	52	0	52
Inner Voice Inc	Ubuntu Community Center	PS	0	75		FC		21	75	0	75
New Life Family Services	River of Life Transitional Shelter	PS	0	30		FC		3	30	0	30
Night Ministry, The	Open Door Youth Shelter-West Town*	PS	16	0		YMF		0	0	16	16
Port Ministries	Theresa's House	D	0	0		FC		20	60	0	60
REST	Men's Interim Housing Site	PS	60	0		SM		0	0	60	60
REST	Women's Interim Housing Site	PS	40	0		SF		0	0	40	40
Roseland Christian Ministries	Roseland Christian Ministries	PS	75	0		FC		27	75	0	75
Urban Family & Community Shelters	Prima Center for Women & Children	PA	0	22		FC		7	22	0	22
You Can Make It	You Can Make It	PS	0	50		FC		15	50	0	50

### Transitional Housing: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name* <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds		
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv. Beds			
<b>SUBTOTALS:</b>			265	391	<b>SUBTOTAL NEW INVENTORY:</b>		138	529	248	777			
<b>Inventory Under Development (Available for Occupancy after January 31, 2007)</b>			Anticipated Occupancy Date										
Matthew House	Herman Jenkins Residence		2007			SM		0	20	20	40		
Hyde Park Transitional Hsg Project	Hyde Park Transitional Hsg Project		2007			FC		1	3	0	3		
Night Ministry, The	Open Door Youth Center - Lakeview		2007			YMF		0	0	16	16		
Salvation Army	Evangeline Booth Lodge (expansion)		2007			FC		15	50	0	50		
<b>SUBTOTAL INVENTORY UNDER DEVELOPMENT:</b>								16	73	36	109		
<b>Unmet Need</b>								<b>UNMET NEED TOTALS:</b>		0	0	0	0
<b>Total Year-Round Beds—Individuals</b>					<b>Total Year-Round Beds—Families</b>								
1. Total Year-Round Individual Transitional Housing Beds:		1353		6. Total Year-Round Family Transitional Housing Beds:		3026							
2. Number of DV Year-Round Individual TH Beds:		18		7. Number of DV Year-Round Family TH Beds:		318							
3. Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round Individual TH Beds (Line 1 minus Line 2):		1335		8. Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round Family TH Beds (Line 6 minus Line 7):		2708							
4. Total Year-Round Individual TH Beds in HMIS:		975		9. Total Year-Round Family TH Beds in HMIS		2187							
5. HMIS Coverage—Individual TH Beds (Divide Line 4 by Line 3 and multiply by 100. Round to a whole number):		73%		10. HMIS Coverage—Family TH Beds (Divide Line 9 by Line 8 and multiply by 100. Round to a whole number):		81%							



## I: CoC Housing Inventory Charts

<b>Permanent Supportive Housing*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart</b>											
Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			Ind.	Fam.		A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
<b>Current Inventory (Available for Occupancy on or before January 31, 2006)</b>			Ind.	Fam.							
AFC Community Center	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	N	0	0	171296	FC		5	15	0 / 0	15
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	CHHP HOPWA SPNS Grant*	PS	33	6		M	HIV	2	6	33 / 15	39
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Chicago Hsg for Health HUD SHP*	PA	60	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	60 / 11	60
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	RCN HOPWA SPNS Grant	PS	9	27		M	HIV	15	27	9 / 3	36
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Safe Start I HUD SHP Grant*	PS	5	12		M	HIV	4	12	5 / 5	17
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Safe Start I HUD SHP Grant*	PA	16	4		M	HIV	2	4	16 / 12	20
AIDS Foundation of Chicago/Dept.Public Health	Housing & Health Study-HOPWA SPNS Grant	N	0	0		M	HIV	11	26	85 / 15	111
AIDSCare, Inc.	Westside Supportive Living	N	0	0		M	HIV	4	12	8 / 0	20
Ambassadors for Christ	Laflin Apartments	D	0	0		FC		12	30	0 /	30
Bethel New Life	DOH-LIHTF-SHP	N	0	0		FC		10	30	0 / 0	30
Bethel New Life	Douglas Villa/ Scattered Site	PS	0	48		FC	MI	16	48	0 / 0	48
Brand New Beginnings	Sojourner Truth	N	0	0		FC		23	69	0 / 0	69
Breakthrough Urban Ministries	Breakthrough Supportive Housing	PA	15	0		SMF		0	0	15 / 6	15

### Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Breakthrough Urban Ministries	DOH-LIHTF-SHP I*	PA	10	0		SMF		0	0	10 / 0	10
Breakthrough Urban Ministries	DOH-LIHTF-SHP II*	PS	8	0		SMF		0	0	8 / 0	8
Cathedral Shelter of Chicago	Cressey House*	PS	18	42		M		9	42	18 / 18	60
Center for New Horizons	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	N	0	0		FC		11	33	0 / 0	33
Chicago Christian Industrial League	600 South*	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	169 / 38	169
Chicago Christian Industrial League	The Studios*	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	169 / 29	169
Chicago DHS	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	N	0	0		FC		25	75	0 / 0	75
Chicago DHS	Families First	N	0	0		FC		30	70	0 / 0	70
Chicago DHS	S+C ARCH*	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	59 / 59	59
Chicago DHS	Shelter Plus Care I*	N	0	0		M		34	105	4 / 2	109
Chicago DHS	Shelter Plus Care II*	N	0	0		M		24	77	30 / 1	107
Chicago DHS	Shelter Plus Care III*	N	0	0		M		27	97	3 / 0	100
Chicago House and Social Service Agency	First Step Program*	N	0	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	3 / 0	3
Chicago House and Social Service Agency	The Family Support Program*	N	0	0		FC	HIV	12	36	0 / 0	36
Chicago House and Social Service Agency	The Independent Living Program	N	0	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	24 / 5	24
Chicago House and Social Service Agency	The Supportive Living Program*	N	0	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	16 / 16	16

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Children’s Place Association	1800 Apartments	D	0	0		FC	HIV	3	15	0 / 0	15
Christian Community Health Center (fka Roseland CHM)	CDBG	PS	0	9		FC	HIV	3	9	0 / 0	9
Christian Community Health Center (fka Roseland CHM)	Genesis Project - Shelter Plus Care*	PA	9	3		M	HIV	1	3	9 / 0	12
Community Mental Health Council	Dr. Jones House*	PA	8	0		SM	MI	0	0	8 / 8	8
Community Mental Health Council	Englewood Assertive Community Treatment*	PA	8	0		SM	MI	0	0	8 / 8	8
Community Mental Health Council	Permanent Living Arrangements*	PS	8	4		M	MI	2	4	8 / 0	12
Community Mental Health Council	Permanent Living Facility*	PA	15	0		SMF	MI	0	0	15 / 15	15
Community Supportive Living Systems Inc.	Emerald House*	N	0	0		SM	HIV	0	0	8 / 6	8
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Friendly Towers (seniors)	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	98 / 4	98
Deborah's Place	Dolores' Safe Haven*	PA	15	0		SF		0	0	15 / 15	15
Deborah's Place	Marah's Permanent Housing Program*	PA	30	0		SF		0	0	30 / 9	30
Deborah's Place	Patty Crowley Apartments*	PA	39	0		SF		0	0	39 / 29	39
Deborah's Place	Rebecca Johnson Apts.*	PA	90	0		SF		0	0	90 / 55	90
Featherfist	DOH-LIHTF-SHP I*	N	0	0		FC		12	36	0 / 0	36
Featherfist	DOH-LIHTF-SHP II*	N	0	0		FC		25	75	0 / 0	75

### Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Healthcare Alternative Systems	Transitional Housing Program*	PS	16	0		SM		0	0	16 / 16	16
Heartland Health Outreach	ACT Residential	PS	16	0		SMF	MI	0	0	16 / 0	16
Heartland Health Outreach	Antonia Safe Haven*	PA	6	0		SMF	MI	0	0	6 / 6	6
Heartland Health Outreach	Assisted Permanent Housing*	PA	8	0		SMF	MI	0	0	8 / 0	8
Heartland Health Outreach	Pathways Home - Safe Haven*	PA	24	0		SMF	MI	0	0	24 / 24	24
Heartland Health Outreach	Pathways Home Permanent Housing*	PA	26	0		SMF		0	0	26 / 22	26
Heartland Health Outreach	PSH Program*	PA	18	0		SMF	MI	0	0	18 / 10	18
Heartland Health Outreach	Shelter Plus Care 2*	PS	30	0		SMF	MI	0	0	30 / 16	30
Heartland Housing	Karibuni Place	PA	60	0		SMF		0	0	60 / 55	60
Heartland Housing	Leland	D	0	0		SMF		0	0	50 / 45	50
Heartland Housing	Los Vecinos	PA	50	0		SMF		0	0	50 / 48	50
Heartland Housing	Mae Suites	PA	39	0		SMF		0	0	39 / 34	39
Heartland Human Care Services	Neon Street Dorms*	PA	10	0		SMF		0	0	10 / 0	10
Heartland Human Care Services	Rafael Center - Shelter Plus Care*	PS	73	0		SMF	SMW	0	0	73 / 0	73
HOW	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	PA	8	0		SF		0	0	8 / 0	8
HOW	HOPWA	PS	6	5		M		2	5	6 / 0	11
HOW	Shelter Plus Care – CHHPS*	PS	10	10		M	MI	4	10	10 / 2	20
HOW	Shelter Plus Care 1*	PS	5	38		M	MI	10	38	5 / 1	43
HOW	Shelter Plus Care 2*	PS	6	48		M		15	48	6 / 2	54
HOW	Shelter Plus Care 3*	PS	5	48		M	MI	17	48	5 / 1	53

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
HOW	Shelter Plus Care 4*	PS	2	34		M	MI	10	34	2 / 0	36
Human Resources Developmt. Institute Inc.	Shelter Plus Care*	PA	35	0		SMF	MI	0	0	35 / 17	35
Inner Voice Inc	Shelter Plus Care*	N	0	0		M		35	137	5 / 0	142
Inspiraton Corporation	Supportive Housing Program*	PA	14	0		SMF		0	0	14 / 6	14
Interfaith Council for the Homeless	Interfaith Homes	PS	0	18		FC		6	18	0 / 0	18
Interfaith Council for the Homeless	Shelter Graduates' Housing First	PA	0	60		FC		20	60	0 / 0	60
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Casa Kirk	D	0	0		FC		9	39	0 / 0	39
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	HOPE I*	N	0	0		FC		20	91	0 / 0	91
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	HOPE II	D	0	0		FC		13	41	0 / 0	41
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Independence House*	N	0	0		FC		25	110	0 / 0	110
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Sanctuary Place*	PA	63	27		M		6	27	63 / 63	90
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Vision House*	N	0	0		M	HIV	18	46	7 / 7	53
La Casa Norte	Solid Ground*	PA	16	0		SM		0	0	16 / 0	16
Mercy Housing Lakefront	BelRay Apts.*	PA	70	0		SMF		0	0	70 / 24	70
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Carlton Apts.*	PA	70	0		SMF		0	0	70 / 15	70

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Delmar Apts.*	PA	163	0		SMF		0	0	163 / 52	163
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Harold Washington Apts.*	PA	71	0		SMF		0	0	71 / 5	71
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Holland Apts*	PA	73	24		M		8	24	73 / 17	97
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Major Jenkins Apts.*	PA	160	0		SMF		0	0	160 / 57	160
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Malden Arms*	PA	86	0		SMF		0	0	86 / 5	86
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Miriam Apts.*	PA	66	0		SF		0	0	66 / 21	66
Mercy Housing Lakefront	South Loop Apts*	PA	207	0		SMF		0	0	207 / 54	207
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Wentworth Commons*	PA	24	55		M		27	55	24 / 11	79
New Moms	Cooperative Living Program*	PS	0	15		FC		10	15	0 /	15
New Moms	Cooperative Living Program Expansion*	PS	0	6		FC		2	6	0 /	6
New Moms	Cooperative Living Program IDHA	PS	0	6		FC		2	6	0 /	6
New Phoenix Assistance Center	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	N	0	0		FC		5	15	0 / 0	15
New Phoenix Assistance Center	NPAC Permanent SHP*	N	0	0		M	HIV	8	14	3 /	17
Northside Housing and Supportive Services	Housing Trust I*	PA	5	0		SM		0	0	5 / 5	5
Northside Housing and Supportive Services	Housing Trust II*	PA	14	0		SM		0	0	14 / 5	14
Northside Housing and Supportive Services	Supportive Housing Program I*	PA	5	0		SM		0	0	5 / 5	5

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Northside Housing and Supportive Services	Supportive Housing Program II*	PA	15	0		SM		0	0	15 / 7	15
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Carter House*	PA	20	0		SMF	MI	0	0	20 / 1	20
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Union House*	PA	10	0		SMF	MI	0	0	10 / 6	10
Olive Branch Mission	Hope of A Home*	PS	9	0		SM		0	0	9 / 9	9
Polish American Association	Supportive Housing Program*	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	8 / 2	8
Renaissance Collaborative, The	Renaissance Apts. - Wabash Y*	PA	101	0		SMF		0	0	101 / 50	101
Renaissance Social Services, Inc	Housing Expansion Project*	PA	8	15		M		5	15	8 / 5	23
Renaissance Social Services, Inc	Housing Stability Program*	PA	30	18		M		6	18	30 / 30	48
REST	REST Supportive Housing Program-1*	PA	75	0		SMF	MI	0	0	75 / 54	75
REST	REST Supportive Housing Program-2*	PA	25	0		SMF	MI	0	0	25 / 20	25
Safer Foundation	Focus	N	0	0		SM		0	0	10 / 0	10
Single Room Housing Assistance Corp. (SRHAC)	Permanent Supportive Housing*	PA	120	0		SMF		0	0	120 / 120	120
Southwest Women Working Together	Open Door I Expansion*	PS	0	80		FC		20	80	0 / 0	80
Southwest Women Working Together	Shelter Plus Care*	PS	0	40		FC		10	40	0 / 0	40

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Southwest Women Working Together	Shelter Plus Care 2*	PS	0	60		FC		15	60	0 / 0	60
St. Leonards Ministries	St. Andrew's Court - Shelter Plus Care*	PS	42	0		SM		0	0	42 / 30	42
Supportive Services Development Corporation	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	N	0	0		FC		12	36	0 / 0	36
Thresholds	Austin YMCA Safe Haven	PA	15	0		SMF	MI	0	0	15 / 15	15
Thresholds	Bridge North - Shelter Plus Care I*	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	58 / 0	58
Thresholds	Bridge North - Shelter Plus Care II*	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	61 / 0	61
Thresholds	Bridge West - Mayes Shelter Plus Care I*	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	35 / 4	35
Thresholds	Bridge West - Mayes Shelter Plus Care II*	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	80 / 19	80
Thresholds	Glenwood House	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	22 / 0	22
Thresholds	Grais Apts/ Wayne Apts LP*	PA	44	0		SMF	MI	0	0	44 / 20	44
Thresholds	Lawson YMCA Safe Haven	PS	10	0		SMF	MI	0	0	10 / 8	10
Thresholds	Menard/Austin Apts.	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	57 / 0	57
Thresholds	Rowan Trees*	PA	45	0		SMF	MI	0	0	45 / 13	45
Unity Parenting & Counseling	DOH-LIHTF-SHP*	N	0	0		FC		12	36	0 / 0	36
Unity Parenting & Counseling	Focus Hope	N	0	0		M	HIV	8	24	4 / 4	28



**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
			A	B		Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds			
Unity Parenting & Counseling	Focus Hope 2	N	0	0		M		9	30	10 / 10	40
WECAN	Butler/Lindon Apartment*	D	0	0		M		16	48	26 / 0	74
WECAN	Eddie Mae & Alex Johnson Apartments*	D	0	0		M		0	0	29 / 0	29
YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago	Lakeview YMCA	D	0	0		SM		0	0	64 / 0	64
YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago	Lawson House - Low Income Trust	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	69 / 0	69
YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago	Lawson House YMCA - Section 8	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	110 / 34	110
<b>SUBTOTALS:</b>			2525	762		<b>SUBTOTAL CURRENT INVENTORY:</b>		707	2230	3909/1496	6139
<b>New Inventory in Place in 2006 (Available for Occupancy Feb. 1, 2006 – Jan. 31, 2007)</b>			Ind.	Fam.							
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PA	15	0		SMF	HIV	0	0	15 / 15	15
Breakthrough Urban Ministries	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PS	15	0		SMF		0	0	15 / 15	15
Christian Community Health Center (fka Roseland CHM)	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PA	15	0		SMF		0	0	15 / 15	15
Circle Family Care	Chronic Homeless Initiative	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	5 / 5	5
Community Mental Health Council	Project Wraparound	PS	0	0		SMF		0	0	15 / 15	15
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PS	5	0		SMF		0	0	5 / 5	5
Featherfist	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PS	20	0		SMF		0	0	20 / 20	20

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS		Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds
						A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds	
Healthcare Alternative Systems	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PS	15	0		SMF		0	0	15 / 15	15
HOW	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PS	10	0		SF		0	0	10 / 10	10
Inner Voice Inc	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PA	25	0		SMF		0	0	25 / 25	25
Inspiration Corporation	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PA	4	0		SMF		0	0	4 / 4	4
Interfaith House	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PA	20	0		SMF		0	0	20 / 20	20
Matthew House	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PS	10	0		SMF		0	0	10 / 10	10
Sarah's Circle	Chronic Homeless Initiative	PA	10	0		SF		0	0	10 / 10	10
Thresholds	Chronic Homeless Initiative	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	25 / 25	25
Unity Parenting & Counseling	Chronic Homeless Initiative	N	0	0		SMF		0	0	10 / 10	10
Catholic Charities/DOH	Street-To-Home Initiative	PA	20	0		SMF		0	0	30 / 20	30
Franciscan Outreach/DOH	Street-To-Home Initiative	PA	20	0		SMF		0	0	20 / 20	20
Heartland Health Outreach-DOH	Street-To-Home Initiative	PA	15	0		SMF		0	0	15 / 15	15
West Englewood United Organization	Clara's Place	N	0	0		M	MI	13	52	0 / 0	52
Thresholds - DOH	Street-To-Home Initiative	N	0	0		SMF	MI	0	0	35 / 30	35
<b>SUBTOTALS:</b>			219	0		<b>SUBTOTAL NEW INVENTORY:</b>		13	52	319/304	371
<b>Inventory Under Development (Available for Occupancy after January 31, 2007)</b>			Anticipated Occupancy Date								
Affordable Housing Preservation	Washington Park SRO		2007		SMF			0	0	31/0	31
Brand New Beginnings	Harriet Tubman Apt		2007		FC			28	126	0/0	126
Catholic Charities	St. Leo's Residence		2007		SMF			0	0	141/0	141

**Permanent Supportive Housing\*: Fundamental Components in CoC System – Housing Inventory Chart**

Provider Name	Facility Name <small>*Place an asterisk after the facility name if it receives HUD McKinney-Vento dollars.</small>	HMIS Part. Code	Number of Year-Round Beds in HMIS	Geo Code ☒	Target Pop.		Year-Round			Total Year-Round Beds		
					A	B	Fam. Units	Fam. Beds	Indiv./CH Beds			
Chicago House & Social Svc Agency	Fred Woods Expansion		2007	FC	HI V		6	18	0/0	18		
Chicago House & Social Svc Agency	Gaining Ground		2007	M	HI V		6	18	12/0	30		
Chicago LIHTF	Rental Subsidy Bill		2007	M			115	345	635/ 125	980		
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Near North SRO		2007	SMF			0	0	50/0	50		
New Moms	IDHS Dorm		2007	FC			22	1	0/0	1		
Night Ministry, The	Open Door West Town Transitional Living Facility		2007	SMF			0	0	8/0	8		
<b>SUBTOTAL INVENTORY UNDER DEVELOPMENT:</b>							177	508	877/ 125	1385		
<b>Unmet Need</b>							<b>UNMET NEED TOTALS:</b>		35	115	1954/ 1018	2069

<b>Total Year-Round Beds—Individuals</b>		<b>Total Year-Round Beds—Families</b>	
1. Total Year-Round Individual Permanent Housing Beds:	4228	6. Total Year-Round Family Permanent Housing Beds:	2282
2. Number of DV Year-Round Individual PH Beds:	0	7. Number of DV Year-Round Family PH Beds:	0
3. Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round Individual PH Beds (Line 1 minus Line 2):	4228	8. Subtotal, non-DV Year-Round Family PH Beds (Line 6 minus Line 7):	2282
4. Total Year-Round Individual PH Beds in HMIS:	2744	9. Total Year-Round Family PH Beds in HMIS	762
5. HMIS Coverage—Individual PH Beds (Divide Line 4 by Line 3 and multiply by 100. Round to a whole number):	65%	10. HMIS Coverage—Family PH Beds (Divide Line 9 by Line 8 and multiply by 100. Round to a whole number):	33%

## J: CoC Housing Inventory Data Sources and Methods Chart

Complete the following charts based on data collection methods and reporting for the Housing Inventory Chart, including Unmet Need determination. The survey must be for a 24-hour point-in-time (PIT) count during the last week of January 2007.

<b>(1) Indicate date on which Housing Inventory count was completed: <u>January 31, 2007</u></b>	
<b>(2) Identify the method used to complete the Housing Inventory Chart (check one):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Housing inventory survey</b> – CoC conducted a housing inventory survey (via mail, fax, e-mail, web-based, phone or on-site) of homeless programs/providers to update current bed inventories, target populations for programs, beds under development, etc.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – Used HMIS data to complete the Housing Inventory Chart
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS plus housing inventory</b> – Used HMIS data supplemented by a survey of providers NOT participating in the HMIS
<b>(3) Indicate the percentage of providers completing the housing inventory survey:</b>	
<u>83</u> %	Emergency shelter providers
<u>97</u> %	Transitional housing providers
<u>99</u> %	Permanent supportive housing providers
<b>(4) Indicate steps to ensure data accuracy for 2007 Housing Inventory Chart (check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Instructions</b> – Provided written instructions for completing the housing inventory survey.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Training</b> – Trained providers on completing the housing inventory survey.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Updated prior housing inventory information</b> – Providers submitted updated 2006 housing inventory to reflect 2007 inventory.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Follow-up</b> – CoC followed-up with providers to ensure the maximum possible response rate and accuracy of the housing inventory survey.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Confirmation</b> – Providers or other independent entity reviewed and confirmed information in 2007 Housing Inventory Chart after it was completed.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – Compared HMIS and housing inventory survey data to check for consistency.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify: 2007 Point-in-Time Shelter Count
<b>Unmet Need:</b>	
<b>(5) Indicate type of data that was used to determine unmet need (check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Sheltered count</b> (point-in-time)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unsheltered count</b> (point-in-time)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Housing inventory</b> (number of beds available)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Local studies or data sources</b> – specify: Chicago Department of Human Services Annual Report Data (FY06), CoC Implementation Schedule (2005), Regional Roundtable Consumer Survey Data (2000)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>National studies or data sources</b> – specify:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Provider opinion through discussions or survey forms</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(6a) Indicate the method(s) used to calculate or determine unmet need (check all that apply):</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Stakeholder discussion</b> – CoC stakeholders met and reviewed data to determine CoC's unmet need
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Locally-determined formula</b> – Used locally-determined formula based on local point-in-time (PIT) count data and housing inventory to calculate unmet need
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Applied statistics</b> – Used local PIT enumeration data and applied national or other local statistics
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>HUD unmet need formula</b> – Used HUD's unmet need formula*
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(6b) If more than one method was used in 6a, please describe how these methods were used.</b>	

\*The HUD Unmet Need Guide and Worksheet can be found by going to:  
<http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm>

## CoC Homeless Population and Subpopulations

### K: CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

Complete the following chart based on the most recent point-in-time count conducted. Your CoC must have completed a point-in-time count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons during the last week in January 2007. Part 1 and Part 2 must be completed using statistically reliable, unduplicated counts or estimates of homeless persons in sheltered and unsheltered locations at a one-day point in time. Please note: this chart is embedded as an Excel spreadsheet within this Word document. **To enter data, double-click anywhere on the chart.** For further instructions for filling out this section, see the Instructions section.

Indicate date of last point-in-time count: (01/25/2007)				
Part 1: Homeless Population	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
1. Number of Households <u>with</u> Dependent Children:	119	457	22	598
1a. Total Number of Persons in these Households (adults and children)	414	1573	65	2052
2. Number of Households <u>without</u> Dependent Children**	1661	694	1568	3923
2a. Total Number of Persons in these Households	1664	695	1568	3927
<b>Total Persons (Add Lines 1a and 2a):</b>	2078	2268	1633	5979
Part 2: Homeless Subpopulations below)	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
a. Chronically Homeless	334		684	1018
b. Severely Mentally Ill	780		652	1432
c. Chronic Substance Abuse	1,112		999	2111
d. Veterans	394		304	698
e. Persons with HIV/AIDS	97		100	197
f. Victims of Domestic Violence	769		339	1108
g. Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18)	33		0	33

\*Optional for unsheltered homeless subpopulations

\*\* Includes single individuals, unaccompanied youth, and other adults (such as a married couple without children)

\*\*\*For "sheltered" chronically homeless subpopulations, list persons in emergency shelter only.

## L: CoC Homeless Population and Subpopulations Data Sources & Methods Chart

Complete the following charts based on the most recent point-in-time (PIT) count conducted.

### L-1: Sheltered Homeless Population and Subpopulations

<b>(1a) Check method(s) used to count sheltered homeless persons in the CoC (check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Survey</b> – Providers count the total number of clients residing in their programs during the PIT count.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – CoC used HMIS to complete the PIT sheltered count and subpopulation information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(1b) If multiple methods are checked, briefly describe how data collected using the methods were combined to produce the count.</b>	
<b>(2a) Check the method(s) used to gather the subpopulation information on sheltered homeless persons reported in Part 2: Homeless Subpopulations (check all that apply):</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Point-in-time (PIT) interviews with each adult and unaccompanied youth</b> – All sheltered adults and unaccompanied youth were interviewed to gather subpopulation information.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Sample of PIT interviews plus extrapolation</b> – A sample of sheltered adults and unaccompanied youth were interviewed to gather subpopulation information, and extrapolation techniques were applied to produce the total sheltered homeless population.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Non-HMIS client-level information</b> - Providers used individual client records (e.g., case management files) to provide subpopulation data for each adult and unaccompanied youth.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Provider expertise</b> – Providers estimated the percentage of clients belonging to each subpopulation based on their knowledge of their client population as a whole.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – CoC used HMIS to gather subpopulation information on sheltered homeless persons.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> –specify:
<b>(2b) If multiple methods are checked, briefly describe how the methods were combined to produce the subpopulation information.</b>	
N/A	
<b>(3) Indicate CoC's steps to ensure data quality of the sheltered count (check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Instructions</b> – Provided written instructions to providers for completing the sheltered PIT count.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Training</b> – Trained providers on completing the sheltered PIT count.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Remind and Follow-up</b> – Reminded providers about the count and followed up with providers to ensure the maximum possible response rate and accuracy.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – Used HMIS to verify data collected from providers for the sheltered PIT count.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> –specify: Required providers to return data within 24 hours of the PIT count.
<b>(4) How often will sheltered counts of sheltered homeless people take place in the future?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Biennial (every two years)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Annual</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Semi-annual</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(5) Month and Year when next count of sheltered homeless persons will occur: January 2009</b>	
<b>(6) Indicate the percentage of providers providing populations and subpopulations data collected via survey, interview and/or HMIS:</b>	
<b>100%</b>	Emergency shelter providers
<b>100%</b>	Transitional housing providers

\*Please refer to 'A Guide to Counting Sheltered Homeless People' for more information on unsheltered enumeration techniques.

**L-2: Unsheltered Homeless Population and Subpopulations\***

<b>(1) Check the CoC's method(s) used to count unsheltered homeless persons (check all that apply):</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Public places count</b> – CoC conducted a point-in-time (PIT) count <u>without</u> client interviews.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Public places count with interviews</b> – CoC conducted a PIT count and interviewed unsheltered homeless persons encountered during the public places count: <input type="checkbox"/> ALL persons were interviewed <b>OR</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sample of persons were interviewed
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Public places count using probability sampling</b> – High and low probabilities assigned to designated geographic areas based on the number of homeless people expected to be found in each area. The CoC selected a statistically valid sample of each type of area to include in the point-in-time count and extrapolated results to estimate the entire homeless population.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Service-based count</b> – Interviewed people using non-shelter services, such as soup kitchens and drop-in centers, and counted those that self-identified as unsheltered homeless persons.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – Used HMIS for the count of unsheltered homeless people homeless people or for subpopulation information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(2) Indicate the level of coverage of the PIT count of unsheltered homeless people:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Complete coverage</b> – The CoC counted every block of the jurisdiction.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Known locations</b> – The CoC counted in areas where unsheltered homeless people are known to congregate or live.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Combination</b> – CoC combined complete coverage with known locations by conducting counts for every block <u>in a portion of the jurisdiction</u> (e.g. central city) AND conducting counts in other portions of the jurisdiction where unsheltered persons are known to live.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Used service-based or probability sampling</b> (coverage is not applicable)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> –specify:
<b>(3) Indicate community partners involved in PIT unsheltered count (check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Outreach teams</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Law Enforcement</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Service Providers</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Community volunteers</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Homeless and/or formerly homeless persons</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify: City employees and City Sister Agency employees
<b>(4) Indicate CoC's steps to ensure data quality of the unsheltered count (check all that apply):</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Training</b> – Conducted training(s) for PIT enumerators.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>HMIS</b> – Used HMIS to check for duplicate information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(5) How often will CoC conduct PIT counts of unsheltered homeless people in the future?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Biennial (every two years)</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Annual</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Semi-annual</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Quarterly</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other</b> – specify:
<b>(6) Month and Year when next PIT count of unsheltered homeless persons will occur:</b>	
<b>January 2009</b>	

\*Please refer to 'A Guide to Counting Unsheltered Homeless People' for more information on unsheltered enumeration techniques.

# CoC Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)

## M: CoC HMIS Charts

CoCs should complete this section in conjunction with the lead agency responsible for the HMIS. All information is to be as of the date of application submission.

### M-1: HMIS Lead Organization Information

Organization Name: Chicago Department of Human Services	Contact Person: Jonathan Lam
Phone: 312-746-8220	Email: jlam@cityofchicago.org
Organization Type: State/local government <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-profit/homeless provider <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>	

### M-2: List HUD-defined CoC Name(s) and Number(s) for every CoC in HMIS Implementation:

HUD-Defined CoC Name*	CoC #	HUD-Defined CoC Name*	CoC #
Chicago CoC	IL-510		

\*Find HUD-defined CoC names & numbers at: <http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm>

### M-3: HMIS Implementation Status

HMIS Data Entry Start Date for your CoC <b>OR</b> Anticipated Date Entry Start Date for your CoC (mm/yyyy)	<b>If no data entry date, indicate reason:</b>
<b>06/2005</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> New CoC in 2007
	<input type="checkbox"/> Still in planning/software selection process
	<input type="checkbox"/> Initial implementation

Briefly describe significant challenges/barriers the CoC has experienced in:

1. HMIS implementation: Inadequate/lack of proper system utilization.

The Chicago CoC has experienced barriers in achieving full implementation of HMIS for all HUD funded agencies and other non-HUD funded agencies in the CoC. Specifically, the challenges revolve around staff capacity, ability to adapt to technology, and frequent staff turnover of user agencies. For many, HMIS is introducing technology and computerized systems to their agencies for the first time. All of these issues have an impact on the implementation and usage of HMIS.

2. HMIS Data and Technical Standards Final Notice requirements:

Related to the above, another challenge to implementation is ensuring that members of the Chicago CoC develop and maintain internal management procedures to ensure compliance with the Data and Technical Standards. CDHS staff has found through data review that in some instances, agencies are not following – likely due to a lack of understanding – the HUD or local technical standards resulting in missing data for both Universal Data Elements and Program-specific Data Elements that are required per the Chicago CoC HMIS Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's). The Chicago CoC will review and update its SOP's in 2007 to address and support compliance with the HMIS Data and Technical Standards Final Notice and provide technical support to do so at the agency level.

### M-4: CoC Client Records

Calendar Year	Number of Client Records Entered in HMIS / Analytical Database (Duplicated) for CoC	Number of Unduplicated Clients Entered in HMIS / Analytical Database for CoC
2004	1,949	1,819
2005	6,970	6,237
2006	10,086	8,209

**Please provide a brief explanation of the reason(s) for any decreases in the number of records (duplicated or unduplicated) from year to year.**

In the Chicago CoC 2006 Exhibit 1, we reported zero client records for 2004 and over 9,000 client records for 2005. At the time of the 2006 application, the Chicago CoC "Business Objects" reporting universe was still in its infancy, and technically was not production ready. Since last year's application, the reporting universe



has since undergone major revisions to streamline its data retrieval and aggregation making it much more accurate for reporting.

**M-5: Data Collection/Completeness and Coverage**

(a) Indicate the percentage of unduplicated client records with null or missing values on the date that the point-in-time count was conducted.

Universal Data Element	% Null/Missing Values	Universal Data Element	% Null/Missing Values
Name	5.99 %	Gender	0%
Social Security Number	0%	Veteran Status	5.55 %
Date of Birth	.08%	Disabling Condition	39.84 %
Ethnicity	0%	Residence Prior to Program Entry	26.89 %
Race	0%	Zip Code of Last Permanent Address	5.48 %

**Briefly describe how the CoC ensures that valid program entry and exit dates are being recorded in the HMIS for persons served.**

In order for a client record to be created in HMIS a valid program entry date is required. Chicago Department of Human Services (CDHS) HMIS staff also runs reports of HMIS data to analyze program start/exit date entry fields at the agency level. If there are invalid entry or exit dates CDHS will contact the agency for correction. HMIS users in the Chicago CoC will be trained to run these reports in house after July 2007.

(b) Indicate current OR anticipated HMIS bed coverage of 75% for each housing type.

	75% bed coverage	Anticipate 75% bed coverage	Date anticipate achieving
Emergency Shelter	N	Y	June 30, 2008
Transitional Housing	Y	Y	N/A
Permanent Supportive Housing	N	Y	December 1, 2007

**(c) If CoC has not yet achieved or does not anticipate achieving 75% bed coverage for all beds (including DV beds), please explain why.**

We have not met 75% bed coverage in Emergency Shelter for singles due to one very large Emergency Shelter organization that accounts for 43% of the beds for individuals that is privately funded. To date this organization has declined participation.

We have not achieved 75% bed coverage for Permanent Supportive Housing, but are very close to achieving it for individuals (65%). Approximately 1,257 family beds in 23 programs – representing 55% of our inventory are either required or authorized to use HMIS but have not yet begun entering clients. Therefore, we do expect to achieve 75% bed coverage for Permanent Supportive Housing for singles and families.

**M-6: Training, Data Quality and Implementation of HMIS Data & Technical Standards**

For each item listed below, place an “X” in the appropriate box to indicate your response: Yes (Y), No (N) or Planned/In Progress (P). Check *only one column* per item.

	Y	N	P
<b>1. Training Provided:</b>			
Basic computer training		X	
HMIS software training	X		
Privacy / Ethics training	X		
Security Training	X		
System Administrator training	X		
<b>2. CoC Process/Role:</b>			
Is the CoC able to aggregate all data to a central location at least annually?		X	
Does the CoC monitor compliance with HMIS Data & Technical Standards Final Notice?			X
<b>3. Security—Participating agencies have:</b>			
Unique username and password access?	X		
Secure location?	X		
Locking screen savers?	X		
Virus protection with auto update?	X		
Individual or network firewalls?	X		
Restrictions on access to HMIS via public forums (e.g. PKI digital certificates or IP filtering)?	X		
<b>4. Security—Agency responsible for centralized HMIS data collection and storage has:</b>			
Procedures for off-site storage of HMIS data?	X		
Disaster recovery plan that has been <u>tested</u> ?	X		
<b>5. Privacy Requirements:</b>			
If your state has additional confidentiality provisions, have they been implemented? <input type="checkbox"/> Check here if there are no additional state confidentiality provisions.			X
Is there a “Purpose for data collection” sign at each intake desk for all participating agencies?	X		
Has each participating agency adopted a written privacy policy, including the uses and disclosures of client information?	X		
Does each participating agency have a privacy policy posted on its website (if applicable)?	X		
<b>6. Data Quality—CoC has process to review and improve:</b>			
Client level data quality (i.e. missing birth dates etc.)?			X
Program level data quality (i.e. data not entered by agency in over 14 days)?			X
CoC bed coverage (i.e. percent of beds)?			X
<b>7. Unduplication of Client Records—the CoC:</b>			
Uses only HMIS data to generate unduplicated count?		X	
Uses data integration or data warehouse to generate unduplicated count?		X	
<b>8. OPTIONAL: Uses of HMIS Data—CoC uses HMIS data for:</b>			
Point-in-Time Count		X	
Project/Program performance monitoring			X
Program purposes (e.g. case management, bed management, program eligibility screening)	X		
Statewide data aggregation (e.g. data warehouse)		X	

---

## **Part III: CoC Strategic Planning**

### **N: CoC 10-Year Plan, Objectives, and Action Steps Chart**

Please provide local action steps and measurable achievements for attaining each of the five national HUD objectives listed, as part of the goal to end chronic homelessness and help to move families and individuals to permanent housing. The percentages listed in these national objectives are the national averages. Your CoC should aim for these targets as a minimum. HUD expects all CoCs to be meeting or exceeding these standards, as these standards will be modestly increasing over time. This is to ensure that CoCs continue to work to serve the hardest-to-serve homeless populations.

If your CoC will not be able to meet one or more objectives, please describe barriers in the space provided. You may list additional CoC objectives as needed. Please note that your Continuum will be reporting on your achievements with respect to each of these objectives in the 2008 application.

For further, detailed instructions for filling out this section, see the Instructions section.

**N: CoC 10-Year Plan, Objectives, and Action Steps Chart**

<b>Objectives to End Chronic Homelessness and Move Families and Individuals to Permanent Housing</b>	<b>2007 Local Action Steps</b> How are you going to do it? List action steps to be completed within the next 12 months.	<b>Lead Person</b> List name and title or organization of one person responsible for accomplishing each action step.	<b>Baseline (Current Level)</b>	<b>Numeric Achievement in 12 months</b>	<b>Numeric Achievement in 5 years</b>	<b>Numeric Achievement in 10 years</b>
1. Create new PH beds for chronically homeless persons.	Implement a second Samaritan Initiative Project providing scattered-site and project-based permanent housing for 150 chronically homeless individuals.	Virgil Tolbert, Executive Director, Roseland Christian Health Ministries	1,800	2,000	2,300	2,600
	Successfully apply for a third Samaritan Initiative Project providing project-based and scattered-site permanent housing for 100 chronically homeless individuals.	Nancy Radner, CEO, Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness				
2. Increase percentage of homeless persons staying in PH over 6 months to at least 71%.	Prioritize high permanent housing retention performance standards among CoC members.	Nancy Radner, CEO, Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness	84%	85%	86%	86%
	Increase the use of eviction-prevention strategies among permanent housing providers through trainings and monitoring of outcomes.	Nancy Radner, CEO, Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness				
3. Increase percentage of homeless persons moving from TH to PH to at least 61.5%.	Implement system-wide housing locator program to increase movement from ES & TH to PH.	Ellen Sahli, Deputy Commissioner, Chicago Department of Housing	62%	63%	65%	67%

	Provide technical assistance and training to TH providers to increase permanent housing placement rates.	Katrina Vanvalkenburg, Associate Director, Corporation for Supportive Housing				
4. Increase percentage of homeless persons employed at exit to at least 18%.	Formalize efforts between WorkNet Chicago and homeless service providers to increase number of homeless households with income from employment.	Ellen Sahli, Deputy Commissioner, Chicago Department of Housing	17.7%	18%	22%	25%
5. Ensure that the CoC has a functional HMIS system.	Complete training and certificates for all HUD and City funded programs and ensure complete bed coverage	Jim LoBianco, Managing Deputy Commissioner, Chicago Department of Human Services	61% Bed Coverage	70% Bed Coverage	77% Bed Coverage	80% Bed Coverage
	Implement system-wide data quality measures	Jim LoBianco, Managing Deputy Commissioner, Chicago Department of Human Services				
<b>Barriers: If your CoC will not meet one or more of the above objectives, briefly describe why not (use less than two paragraphs).</b>						
<b>Other CoC Objectives in 2007</b>						
1. Increase receipt of mainstream resources for chronically homeless individuals.	Successfully pilot the SSI Presumptive Eligibility Project to systematically change the way chronically homeless individuals with mental illness access benefits.	Sue Augustus, Executive Director, Corporation for Supportive Housing	50			
2.						

## O: CoC Discharge Planning Policy Chart

For each category of publicly funded institution or system of care in your CoC, check a box to indicate the level of development of a discharge planning policy. Check **only one** box per category. Use the space provided to describe the discharge planning policy for each category, or the status of development. For detailed instructions for filling out this section, see the Instructions section.

Publicly Funded Institution(s) or System(s) of Care in CoC Geographic Area	None	Initial Discussion	Protocol in Development	Formal Protocol Finalized	Formal Protocol Implemented
<b>Foster Care</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Health Care</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Mental Health</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Corrections</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Foster Care:</p> <p>In response to the Foster Care Independence Act (FCIA) of 1999, Illinois developed the Youth Housing Assistance Program, which provides housing advocacy and cash assistance to youth aging out of foster care. Illinois' Youth Housing Assistance Program targets youth between the ages of 17 1/2 and 21 at high risk of becoming homeless who are approaching emancipation or who have already emancipated from the foster care system. Youth receive: 1) Housing Advocacy - services to help youth locate housing, receive budget counseling, and gain access to community resources and social services, 2) Start-up Grant – emancipating youth can receive up to \$800 (\$1200 if youth is parenting, pregnant, or disabled) to cover start up costs including deposits, furniture, appliances, etc., 3) Partial Housing Subsidy- if youths' housing cost exceeds 30% of their income, their landlord will receive up to \$100 per month for up to 12 months following the youths' emancipation, and 4) Cash assistance - Youth are provided up to \$2,000 per 12-month period following emancipation to help youth stabilize after a crisis. If any employed youth loses a job and needs to pay rent before another job is secured, youth are eligible for a \$600 one-time exception. Follow-up services are provided for a minimum of three months after the client secures appropriate housing.</p> <p>Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) is an active participant in the Chicago CoC and the Homelessness Prevention Constituency Group. Through this group, the CoC understands DCFS programs to prevent homelessness among youth and families involved in the foster care system. No McKinney-Vento resources are used during the DCFS discharge planning process.</p>					
<p>Health Care:</p> <p>Stakeholders: Stroger Hospital, AIDS Foundation of Chicago/Chicago Housing for Health Partnership</p>					

**Mental Health:**

In July 2005, the Illinois Department of Human Services, Office of Mental Health updated its “Continuity of Care Agreement” which outlines the protocol for placement into a state mental health facility and discharge from a state mental health facility. The discharge-planning component of the Agreement includes provisions for housing, community mental health, and employment/benefits services. The newly revised state Continuity of Care agreement states that the state hospital is not to discharge a person into homelessness if there is a reasonable expectation that the person will have housing if the discharge is delayed, unless the consumer insists on being discharged and is not certifiable under the mental health code, or if after diligent search no housing resources or resources to pay for housing can be identified.

The Illinois Department of Humans Services Office of Mental Health (OMH) is an active member of the Chicago CoC. Through the State Government Constituency Group and the Mental Health Constituency Group, the CoC members understand that State Mental Health Facilities are prohibited from discharging patients directly into homeless funded programs. The State contracts with community mental health providers who have the primary responsibility to make housing placements for patients leaving state facilities. They are responsible for abiding by the Continuity of Care agreement and HUD McKinney-Vento program rules. The state does work with its contracted providers to maintain a list of non-McKinney residential programs, such as Thresholds Psychiatric and Rehabilitation Centers, and private landlords that will accept patients being discharged.

**Corrections:\***

In May 2004, the Circuit Court of Cook County’s Criminal Division piloted a Mental Health Court that was then fully established in 2005. The Mental Health Court involves a team comprising a judge, prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation officers and social service agencies oversee mentally ill probationers to ensure compliance with treatment and monitor progress toward improved mental health. This program provides discharge planning from jail for clients that otherwise would be at high risk for occurrence or re-occurrence of homelessness.

Treatment Alternatives for Safer Communities (TASC), the lead service provider, and its partners make housing arrangements and placements for the probationers in this program. Housing is arranged with private market apartments or other non-homeless residential programs. Housing providers used include unsubsidized single-room occupancy units at Mercy Housing Lakefront Delmar Apartments. TASC and Thresholds have access to up to 25 permanent housing units subsidized through the Chicago Low-Income Housing Trust Fund’s city and state funds. A participant would only be connected to a HUD McKinney-Vento program if they became homeless after their initial housing placement, at which point they would meet the HUD homeless definition.

The Homelessness Prevention Constituency Group of the Chicago CoC has made the larger body aware of this policy and program of the Cook County Jail.

\*Please note that “corrections” category refers to local jails and state or federal prisons.

## P: CoC Coordination Chart

A CoC should regularly assess the local homeless system and identify shortcomings and unmet needs. One of the keys to improving a CoC is to use long-term strategic planning to establish specific goals and then implement short-term/medium-term action steps. Because of the complexity of the existing homeless system and the need to coordinate multiple funding sources, there are often multiple long-term strategic planning groups. It is imperative for CoCs to coordinate, as appropriate, with each of these existing strategic planning groups to meet the local CoC shortcomings and unmet needs. Answer each question in the checkbox provided, using an X to indicate Yes or No for each.

	YES	NO
<b>1. Consolidated Plan Coordination</b>		
a. Do Con Plan planners, authors and other Con Plan stakeholders participate in CoC general planning meetings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Do CoC members participate in Con Plan planning meetings, focus groups, or public forums?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Were CoC strategic plan goals addressing homelessness and chronic homelessness used in the development of the Con Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Jurisdictional 10-year Plan Coordination</b>		
a. Is there one or more formal jurisdictional 10-year Plan(s) being developed and/or being implemented within your CoC geography that are separate from the CoC 10-year plan? (If No, you may skip to Question 3a.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Do 10-year Plan conveners, authors and other stakeholders participate in CoC general planning meetings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have 10-year Plan participants taken steps to align their planning process with the local CoC plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Were CoC strategic plan goals used in the development of the 10-year Plan(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Provide the number of jurisdictions within your CoC geography that have formally implemented a 10-year plan(s).		
<b>3. Public Housing Agency Coordination</b>		
a. Do CoC members meet with CoC area PHAs to improve coordination with and access to mainstream housing resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## CoC 2007 Funding Priorities

### Q: CoC Project Priorities Chart

**Column (1):** New this year, check the box in this column if the first project listed is a proposed Samaritan bonus project. **Column (5):** The requested project amount must not exceed the amount entered in the project summary budget in Exhibit 2. If the project summary budget exceeds the amount shown on this priorities list, the project budget will be reduced to the amount shown on the CoC Project Priorities Chart.

**Column (7):** Place the component type under the appropriate program for each project in column 7.

Acceptable entries include PH, TH, SH-PH, SH-TH, SRO, SSO, HMIS, TRA, SRA, PRA, or PRAR. Do not simply enter an "X" in the box provided. **Column (9):** For the Shelter Plus Care Renewals priority number, please continue project numbering from the top portion of the chart – please do not restart S+C project priority numbering from 1.

For further instructions for filling out this section, see the Instructions section.

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ** Chicago Department of Human Services	Mercy Housing Lakefront	Mercy Housing Lakefront Shelter Plus Care Application	1	\$4,274,760	5			SRA	
Featherfist	Featherfist	SHI Renaissance Project Servcies Grant 2007	2	\$157,500	1	PH			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Chicago Department of Human Services	Chicago HMIS-Enterprise Case Management	3	\$318,498	1		HMIS		
Community Mental Health Council	Community Mental Health Council	Permanent Living Facility	4	\$73,013	1		PH		
Community Mental Health Council, Inc	Community Mental Health Council, INC	Englewood Assertive Community Treatment	5	\$127,696	1		PH		
Community Mental Health Council, Inc	Community Mental Health Council,inc	Permanent Living Arrangements	6	\$68,194	1		PH		
Housing Opportunities for Women	Housing Opportunities for Women	Singles Two Expansion	7	\$249,999	1		TH		
Matthew House,Inc	Matthew House,Inc	Diaconea Supportive Program	8	\$137,592	1		SSO		
Lakeview Shelter	Lakeview Shelter	Intensive Case Management	9	\$68,079	1		SSO		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
Lakeview Shelter	Lakeview Shelter	Supportive Housing Program	10	\$124,578	1		SSO		
Chicago Department of Housing	Chicago Department of Housing	Low-Income Housing Trust Fund Chronic Homeless Int.	11	\$2,144,196	1		PH		
Housing Opportunities for Women	Housing Opportunities for Women	Singles Two	12	\$198,368	1		TH		
Heartland Health Outreach	Heartland Health Outreach	Pathways Home Outpatient	13	\$355,855	1		SSO		
Community Mental Health Council, Inc	Community Mental Health Council, Inc	Dr Jones House-CILA	14	\$101,081	1		PH		
Deborah's Place	Deborah's Place	Rebecca Johnson Apartments	15	\$188,064	1		PH		
Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago	Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago	New Hope Apartments	16	\$1,662,838	1		TH		
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Carter House	17	\$227,522	1		PH		
Deborah's Place	Deborah's Place	Marah's Permanent Supportive Housing	18	\$414,750	1		TH		
Inspiration Corporation	Inspiration Corporation	IC Rolling Stock - renewal	19	\$199,911	1		TH		
Heartland Health Outreach	Heartland Health Outreach	Pathways Home Permanent Housing	20	\$488,342	1		PH		
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Mercy Housing Lakefront	Carlton, Miriam, Delmar Apartments	21	\$259,631	1		PH		
New Phoenix Assistance Center	New Phoenix Assistance Center	NPAC SHP w/ Short Term Support	22	\$271,509	1		TH		
Beacon Therapeutic Diagnostic and Treatment Center	Beacon Therapeutic Diagnostic and Treatment Center	Shelter Outreach Services/HUD	23	\$1,083,562	1		SSO		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	FBC Expansion 3	24	\$142,708	1		TH		
Community Mental Health Council, Inc	Community Mental Health Council, inc	Project WrapAround	25	\$124,298	1		PH		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
Deborah's Place	Deborah's Place	Dolores' Safe Haven	26	\$330,293	1		SH-PH		
New Phoenix Assistance Center	New Phoenix Assistance Center	NPAC SHP w/ Short Term Support	27	\$240,500	1		TH		
Inspiration Coporation	Inspiration Coporation	Inspiration Café SSO	28	\$92,736	1		SSO		
Inspiration Corporation	Inspiration Corporation	The Employment Project	29	\$123,536	1		SSO		
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Cornerstone Community Outreach	Leland House Project-Based Permanent Supportive Housing	30	\$132,224	1		TH		
Sarah's Circle	Sarah's Circle	Case Mangement and Rental of Space	31	\$68,250	1		SSO		
Heartland Health Outreach	Heartland Health Outreach	Assisted Permanent Housing	32	\$130,437	1		PH		
Residents for Effective Shelter Transitions	Residents for Effective Shelter Transitions	REST SHP 1	33	\$185,563	1		PH		
Residents for Effective Shelter Transitions	Residents for Effective Shelter Transitions	REST SHP 2	34	\$279,399	1		PH		
Deborah's Place	Deborah's Place	Patty Crowley Apartments	35	\$150,144	1		PH		
The Thresholds, INC	The Thresholds, INC	Wayne Street Grais Apartments	36	\$403,605	1		SSO		
Apna Ghar, Inc.	Apna Ghar, Inc.	Supportive Housing Program / Transitions Housing	37	\$124,785	1		TH		
Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Permanent Supportive Housing Program	38	\$422,546	1		PH		
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Mercy Housing Lakefront	South Loop Apartments	39	\$248,858	1		PH		
Heartland Health Outreach	Heartland Health Outreach	Antonia Safe Haven	40	\$368,219	1		SH-PH		
Family Rescue, Inc	Family Rescue	Ridgeland Apartments and Day Care	41	\$611,859	1		TH		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Permanent Supportive Housing	42	\$485,991	1		PH		
Chicago Department of Housing	Chicago Department of Housing	Low Income Housing Trust Fund 1	43	\$668,151	1		PH		
Interfaith Council for the Homeless	Interfaith Council for the Homeless	Sanctuary Place	44	\$312,242	1		PH		
La Casa Norte	La Casa Norte	Solid Ground Supportive Housing	45	\$94,394	1		TH		
Heartland Health Outreach	Heartland Health Outreach	Supportive Permanent Housing	46	\$278,540	1		PH		
Chicago House	Heartland Health Outreach	First Step Program	47	\$45,122	1		TH		
Featherfist	Featherfist	HUTS	48	\$124,967	1		SSO		
Casa Central Social Services Corporation	Casa Central Social Services Corporation	La Posada Scattered Site	49	\$375,000	1		TH		
New Moms, Inc	New Moms, Inc	Cooperative Living Program	50	\$253,698	1		TH		
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Union House	51	\$160,827	1		PH		
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Mercy Housing Lakefront	Holland Apts-Families	52	\$147,456	1		PH		
Interfaith House	Interfaith House	Supportive Living Program	53	\$189,889	1		TH		
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Mercy Housing Lakefront	Recovery-Belray-Holland Singles	54	\$198,619	1		PH		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Families Building Community	55	\$693,873	1		TH		
The Inner Voice, INC	The Inner Voice	Eddie Beard Homeless Veterans' Transitional Housing Program	56	\$205,452	1		TH		
Cathedral Shelter of Chicago	Cathedral Shelter of Chicago	Supportive Services - Non-Cressey House Residents	57	\$57,931	1		SSO		
Lawson House YMCA	Lawson House YMCA	Life Development Center	58	\$256,954	1		PH		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
The Inner Voice, INC	The Inner Voice	Learning Center (SSO)	59	\$348,807	1		SSO		
Casa Central Social Services Corporation	Casa Central Social Services Corporation	La Posada Interim Housing	60	\$471,265	1		TH		
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Safe Start	61	\$279,179	1		PH		
The Thresholds, INC	The Thresholds, INC	Rowan Tree's	62	\$308,318	1		PH		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Next Step	63	\$443,441	1		TH		
The Thresholds, INC	The Thresholds, INC	Lawson Safe Haven	64	\$163,961	1		SH-PH		
Featherfist	Featherfist	Hope Village	65	\$532,528	1		TH		
New Phoenix Assistance Center	New Phoenix Assistance Center	NPAC SHP Permanent Supportive Housing	66	\$325,780	1		PH		
The Thresholds, INC	The Thresholds, INC	Austin Safe Haven	67	\$244,918	1		SH-PH		
Interfaith House	Interfaith House	Interfaith Respite	68	\$210,674	1		TH		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Neon Street Dorm	69	\$47,013	1		TH		
Featherfist	Featherfist	Foundations	70	\$256,623	1		TH		
Mercy Housing Lakefront	Mercy Housing Lakefront	Wentworth Commons	71	\$142,542	1		PH		
The Inner Voice, INC	The Inner Voice, INC.	Pioneer Transitional Housing Program	72	\$79,458	1		TH		
Hull House	Hull House	Emerge Transitional Housing Program	73	\$389,025	1		TH		
Healthcare Alternatives Systems, INC	Healthcare Alternatives Systems, INC	Transitional Housing Program	74	\$214,748	1		TH		
The Inner Voice, INC	The Inner Voice	Family Regeneration	75	\$398,649	1		SSO		
Heartland Health Outreach	Heartland Health Outreach	Pathways Home Safe Haven	76	\$948,721	1		SH-PH		
Thresholds,Inc	Thresholds,Inc	Thresholds - Rowan Trees-Gap	77	\$42,840	1		PH		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Families Building Community II-Expansion	78	\$343,819	1		TH		
Renaissance Social Services, Inc	Renaissance Social Services, Inc	Housing Stability Program II	79	\$82,803	1		PH		
Featherfist	Featherfist	EPIC	80	\$144,241	1		SSO		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Violence Recovery Services	81	\$46,298	1		TH		
Unity Parenting	Unity Parenting	Focus Hope II	82	\$434,757	1		PH		
Human Resources Development Institute, Inc.	Human Resources Development Institute, Inc.	Supportive Housing for Women	83	\$469,909	1		TH		
Cornerstone Community Outreach	Cornerstone Community Outreach	Transitional Housing with Supportive Services	84	\$79,017	1		TH		
Lawson YMCA	Lawson YMCA	Life Development Center - Gap	85	\$66,438	1		PH		
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago	Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago	Singer Residence	86	\$163,103	1		TH		
Cathedral Shelter of Chicago	Cathedral Shelter of Chicago	Supportive Services- Cressey House Residents	87	\$38,482	1		PH		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Neon Street Dorm 2	88	\$207,935	1		TH		
McDermott Center	Haymarket Center	Undomiciled Mentally Ill Substance Abuse (UMISA)	89	\$64,474	1		SSO		
Chicago Abused Women Coalition	Chicago Abused Women Coalition	Greenhouse Shelter	90	\$26,328	1		SSO		
The Night Ministry	The Night Ministry	Open Door Interim Youth Shelter	91	\$74,260	1		TH		
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Care for Chronically Medically Ill Adults (CHHP)	92	\$381,249	1		PH		
The Thresholds, INC	The Thresholds, INC	Mobile Assessment Unit	93	\$221,650	1		SSO		
Featherfist	Featherfist	FORT	94	\$318,130	1		TH		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Independence House	95	\$85,890	1		PH		
Bethel New Life	Bethel New Life	Family Wellness Center	96	\$350,557	1		TH		
St. Leonards Ministries	St. Leonards Ministries	Psychological Services	97	\$47,250	1		SSO		
AIDS Foundation of Chicago	AIDS Foundation of Chicago	Safe Start II	98	\$368,524	1		PH		
Featherfist	Featherfist	ORCA	99	\$293,526	1		TH		
Chicago Department of Housing	Chicago Department of Housing	Low Income Trust Fund 2	100	\$804,459	1		PH		
Renaissance Collaborative	Renaissance Collaborative	TRC Permanent Supportive Housing Project	101	\$184,451	1		PH		
Northwestern Memorial Hospital	Northwestern Memorial Hospital	New Home Project	102	\$332,899	1		SSO		
Teen Living Programs	Teen Living Programs	Clustered and Scattered Site Apt. (CaSSA)	103	\$194,376	1		TH		
Bethel New Life	Bethel New Life	Westside Housing for Independent Living	104	\$219,153	1		TH		
Unity Parenting and Counseling, Inc	Unity Parenting and Counseling, Inc	Harmony Village	105	\$514,531	1		TH		
Community Supportive Living Systems, Inc	Community Supportive Living Systems, Inc	Emerald House	106	\$203,150	1		PH		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Stable Futures-THP	107	\$939,084	1		TH		
Family Rescue, Inc	Family Rescue	Rosenthal Family Lodge	108	\$64,628	1		SSO		
Goldies Place	Goldies Place	Successful Transitions	109	\$67,735	1		SSO		
Renaissance Social Services	Renaissance Social Services	Housing Stability Program II	110	\$60,585	1		PH		
Heartland Human Care Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Stable Futures II (expansion)	111	\$147,354	1		TH		
Bethel New Life	Bethel New Life	Douglas Villa - Permanent Housing Scattered Site	112	\$96,983	1		SSO		

HUD-defined CoC Name: Chicago Continuum of Care						CoC #: IL-510			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7) Program and Component Type			
SF-424 Applicant Name	Project Sponsor Name	Project Name	Priority	Grant Amount	Term	SHP New	SHP Renewal	S+C New	SRO New
Inspiration Corporation	Inspiration Corporation	Cafe Too	113	\$354,283	1		SSO		
Chicago Christian Industrial League	Chicago Christian Industrial League	600 South	114	\$58,275	1		PH		
LUCHA	LUCHA	Social Services Gap Program	115	\$35,700	1		PH		
Chicago Department of Human Services	Housing Opportunities for Women	Shelter Plus Care 5	116	\$492,660	5			SRA	
Inspiration Corporation	Inspiration Corporation	IC Rolling Stock 2	117	\$455,100	2	TH			
Deborah's Place	Sarah's Circle	Deborah's Place Safe Haven Expansion	118	\$682,506	2	SH-PH			
Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	SRHAC Expansion Proposal #1	119	\$750,000	2	PH			
Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Single Room Housing Assistance Corp	Single Room Housing Assistance Corp--Expansion	120	\$750,000	2	PH			
Faithway House	Faithway House	Project Trust	121	\$261,538	2	PH			
Circle Urban Ministries	Circle Urban Ministries	Second Stage Family Shelter	122	\$68,498	1		TH		
<b>(8) Subtotal: Requested Amount for CoC Competitive Projects:</b>				<b>\$39,819,682</b>					

(9) Shelter Plus Care Renewals:						S+C Component Type			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Cathedral Shelter of Chicago	Cressey House	123	\$249,360	1	PRAR			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Chicago Department of Human Services	Emergency Services	124	\$577,476	1	TRA			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Chicago Department of Human Services	Community Services	125	\$382,092	1	TRA			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Chicago Department of Human Services	S+C I	126	\$436,056	1	TRA			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Chicago House & Social Service Agency	Res. for Families with HIV/AIDS	127	\$41,148	1	SRA			
Chicago Department of Human Services	Heartland Health Outreach	S+C II	128	\$196,200	1	TRA			



<b>(9) Shelter Plus Care Renewals:</b>						<b>S+C Component Type</b>
Chicago Department of Human Services	Heartland Human Care Services	Rafael Center	129	\$636,852	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Housing Opportunities for Women	Shelter Plus Care IV	130	\$138,420	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Housing Opportunities for Women	Shelter Plus Care Mini-Continuum	131	\$138,420	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Housing Opportunities for Women, Inc.	S+C I	132	\$160,860	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Housing Opportunities for Women, Inc.	S+C II	133	\$239,940	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Housing Opportunities for Women, Inc.	S+C III	134	\$253,140	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Human Resources Development Institute, Inc.	HRDI Shelter Plus Care	135	\$349,440	1	TRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Interfaith Housing Development Corp.	100 S. Morgan (Hope I)	136	\$385,620	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Interfaith Housing Development Corp.	Vision House	137	\$259,392	1	PRAR
Chicago Department of Human Services	Interfaith Housing Development Corporation	Sanctuary Place	138	\$497,868	1	PRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Lakeview Shelter, Inc.	PSH Project	139	\$130,860	1	TRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Lakeview Shelter, Inc.	Lakeview Shelter	140	\$43,620	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Olive Branch Mission	Hope of a Home	141	\$41,148	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Residents for Effective Shelter Transitions (REST)	REST S+C	142	\$572,988	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Roseland Christian Health Ministries	The Genesis Project	143	\$103,548	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Southwest Women Working Together	S+C II	144	\$183,276	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Southwest Women Working Together	S+C I	145	\$137,160	1	TRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	St. Leonard's Ministries	St. Andrew Court	146	\$261,720	1	PRAR
Chicago Department of Human Services	The Inner Voice, Inc.	S+C I & II	147	\$492,192	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Thresholds	Thresholds Shelter Plus Care III	148	\$305,340	1	TRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Thresholds	Thresholds Shelter Plus Care IV	149	\$392,580	1	SRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Thresholds, Inc. I	S+C I	150	\$261,720	1	TRA
Chicago Department of Human Services	Thresholds, Inc. II	S+C II	151	\$261,720	1	TRA

(9) Shelter Plus Care Renewals:	S+C Component Type
<b>(10) Subtotal: Requested Amount for S+C Renewal Projects:</b>	<b>\$8,130,156</b>
<b>(11) Total CoC Requested Amount (line 8 + line 10):</b>	<b>\$47,949,838</b>

\*HUD-defined CoC names & numbers are available at: <http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm>.

\*\*Check this box if this is a #1 priority Samaritan bonus project.

CoC-Q

## R: CoC Pro Rata Need (PRN) Reallocation Chart (Only for Eligible Hold Harmless CoCs)

CoCs that receive the 1-year Hold Harmless PRN amount may reduce or eliminate one or more of the SHP grants eligible for renewal in the 2007 CoC competition. CoCs may reallocate the funds made available through this process to create new permanent housing project(s). These reallocation project(s) may be for SHP (1, 2, or 3 years), S+C (5 years), and Section 8 SRO (10 years) projects and their respective eligible activities.

### \*Reallocation projects WILL be funded if all of the following apply:

1. Reallocation project is for permanent supportive housing (SHP-PH, SHP-Safe Haven PH, S+C, Section 8 SRO).
2. Reallocation project is not rejected by HUD (meets all "threshold" requirements)
3. CoC scores at least 65 points in the CoC competition.
4. Reallocation project is **not** the Samaritan bonus project.

**Reallocation projects may have a 1-year grant term when they are SHP-PH or SHP-Safe Haven PH projects.**

**NOTE:** Reallocated funds placed in the Samaritan bonus project will lose their reallocation status. Therefore, if the CoC scores below the funding line, the CoC will lose the reallocated funds included in the Samaritan bonus project.

**1a. Will your CoC be using the PRN reallocation process?**  Yes  No

**1b. If Yes,** explain the open decision making process the CoC used to reduce and/or eliminate projects (use no more than one-half page).

For the 2007 HUD application, the Chicago CoC Governing Board, now called the Chicago Planning Council on Homelessness, passed ranking policies that placed renewals that *did not* pass the local threshold standards below all other projects, including new permanent housing applications that *did* meet local threshold standards. At least two public meetings were held to discuss the ramifications of the approved ranking policies. These meetings included discussions on de-funding of renewal programs with the result that those grants would be prohibited from coming back as a renewal, and therefore eliminated. During the decision-making process, the Board understood that there were renewal projects that did not pass threshold and that these projects would not be funded and lose their renewal status.

<b>2. Enter</b> the total 1-year amount of <i>all</i> SHP projects that are eligible for renewal in 2007, which amount you have <b>verified with your field office</b> :	<i>Example:</i> \$530,000	<b>\$32,645,778</b>
<b>3. Starting</b> with the total entered above for question 2, subtract the amount your CoC proposes to use for new permanent housing project, and enter the remaining amount: <i>(In this example, the amount proposed for new PH project is \$140,000)</i>	<i>Example:</i> \$390,000	<b>\$31,995,618</b>

<b>4. Enter the Reduced or Eliminated Grant(s) in the 2007 Competition</b>					
(1) Expiring Grants	(2) Program Code	(3) Component	(4) Annual Renewal Amount	(5) Reduced Amount	(6) Retained Amount from Existing Grant
IL01B510107	SHP	TH	\$396,874	328,376	68,498
IL01B510122	SHP	PH	\$210,118	210,118	0
IL01B961032	SHP	PH	\$111,666	111,666	0
<b>(7) TOTAL:</b>			\$718,658.00	650,160	68,498

<b>5. Newly Proposed Permanent Housing Projects in the 2007 Competition*</b>			
(8) 2007 Project Priority Number	(9) Program Code	(10) Component	(11) Transferred Amounts
#2 (Featherfist)	SHP	PH	\$157,500
#116 (CDHS)	SPC	SRA	\$492,660
<b>(12) TOTAL:</b>			\$650,160

\*No project listed here can be a #1 priority Samaritan Bonus project

---

### S: CoC Project Leveraging Summary Chart

HUD homeless program funding is limited and can provide only a portion of the resources needed to successfully address the needs of homeless families and individuals. HUD encourages applicants to use supplemental resources, including State and local appropriated funds, to address homeless needs.

Enter the name of your Continuum and list the total amount of leveraged resources available. To get this number, find the total at the bottom of the Project Leveraging Chart for all Exhibit 2 project applications, add up all of these the totals, and enter this single number in the chart below. Complete only one chart for the entire CoC (do *not* add any rows). Provide information *only* for contributions for which you have a *written commitment in hand at the time of application*.

**Warning:** HUD will prosecute false claims and statements. Conviction may result in criminal and/or civil penalties (18 U.S.C. 1001, 1010, 1012; 31 U.S.C. 3729, 3802)

Name of Continuum	Total Value of Written Commitment
<i>Example:</i> River County CoC	\$10,253,000
Chicago Continuum of Care	\$61, 431, 791

---

### T: CoC Current Funding and Renewal Projections Chart

Congress has asked HUD to provide estimates of expected renewal amounts over the next five years. Please complete the chart below to help HUD arrive at the most accurate estimate possible. For further instructions in filling out this chart, see the Instructions section.

## T: CoC Current Funding and Renewal Projections

<b>Supportive Housing Program (SHP) Projects:</b>													
<b>Type of Housing</b>		<b>All SHP Funds Requested (Current Year)</b>		<b>Renewal Projections</b>									
		<b>2007</b>		<b>2008</b>		<b>2009</b>		<b>2010</b>		<b>2011</b>		<b>2012</b>	
Transitional Housing (TH)		16,836,626		15,658,153		15,658,153		15,658,153		15,658,153		15,658,153	
Safe Havens-TH		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Permanent Housing (PH)		10,435,890		13,302,642		15,430,527		15,430,527		15,430,527		10,435,890	
Safe Havens-PH		2,056,115		2,056,115		2,056,115		2,056,115		2,056,115		2,056,115	
SSO		5,152,810		4,965,937		4,965,937		4,965,937		4,965,937		4,965,937	
HMIS		320,000		320,000		320,000		320,000		320,000		320,000	
<b>Totals</b>		<b>34,801,441</b>		<b>36,302,847</b>		<b>38,430,731</b>		<b>38,430,731</b>		<b>38,430,731</b>		<b>34,801,441</b>	
<b>Shelter Plus Care (S+C) Projects:</b>													
<b>Number of S+C Bedrooms</b>		<b>All S+C Funds Requested (Current Year)</b>		<b>Renewal Projections</b>									
		<b>2007</b>		<b>2008</b>		<b>2009</b>		<b>2010</b>		<b>2011</b>		<b>2012</b>	
		<b>Units</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>\$</b>
SRO		197	\$1,288,380	230	\$1,504,200	230	\$1,504,200	230	\$1,504,200	230	\$1,504,200	230	\$1,504,200
0		283	\$2,573,580	294	\$2,564,856	404	\$3,524,496	404	\$3,524,496	454	\$3,960,696	457	\$3,986,868
1		149	\$1,687,296	220	\$2,196,480	220	\$2,196,480	220	\$2,196,480	220	\$2,196,480	225	\$2,246,400
2		121	\$1,447,380	153	\$1,716,660	153	\$1,716,660	153	\$1,716,660	164	\$1,840,080	166	\$1,862,520
3		104	\$1,426,464	110	\$1,508,760	117	\$1,604,772	117	\$1,604,772	126	\$1,728,216	126	\$1,728,216
4		8	\$123,936	8	\$123,936	11	\$170,412	11	\$170,412	17	\$263,364	17	\$263,364
5		3	\$53,460	3	\$53,460	3	\$53,460	3	\$53,460	3	\$53,460	3	\$53,460
<b>Totals</b>		<b>865</b>	<b>\$8,600,496</b>	<b>1,018</b>	<b>\$9,668,352</b>	<b>1,138</b>	<b>\$10,770,480</b>	<b>1,138</b>	<b>\$10,770,480</b>	<b>1,214</b>	<b>\$11,546,496</b>	<b>1,224</b>	<b>\$11,645,028</b>

## Part IV: CoC Performance

### U: CoC Achievements Chart

For the five HUD national objectives in the **2006** CoC application, enter the 12-month measurable achievements that you provided in Exhibit 1, Chart N of the **2006 CoC application**. Under “Accomplishments,” enter the *numeric* achievement that your CoC attained within the past 12 months that is *directly related* to the measurable achievement proposed in 2006. Below, if your CoC did not meet one or more of your proposed achievements, please describe the reasons for this.

<b>2006 Objectives to End Chronic Homelessness and Move Families and Individuals to Permanent Housing</b>	<b>12-month Measurable Achievement Proposed in 2006</b>  (from Chart N of your 2006 CoC application)	<b>Accomplishments</b>  (Enter the numeric achievement attained during past 12 months)
<b>Example:</b> 1. Create new PH beds for chronically homeless persons.	1. Create 5 new TRA S+C beds for chronically homeless persons through New Hope Housing Project. 2. Create 12 new PH beds through the River County PH project.	1. Created 5 new PH beds. 2. Created 8 out of the 12 new beds proposed in 2006.
2. Increase percentage of homeless persons staying in PH over 6 months to 71%.	1. Hire 2 additional case managers at New Hope Housing Project, which will allow for improved service provision. 2. Complete assessment of barriers to staying in PH and implement 5 key findings from this assessment.	73% of homeless persons stayed in PH over 6 months.
1. Create new PH beds for chronically homeless persons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implement a Street to Home Initiative, moving 100 unsheltered homeless individuals into permanent housing with supportive services;</li> <li>▪ Dedicate 125 new Chicago Low Income Housing Trust Fund subsidies for chronically homeless individuals residing in homeless shelters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 85 of 100 new PH beds through the Street to Home Initiative were occupied by chronically homeless individuals</li> <li>▪ Dedicated funding for approximately 750 long-term homeless individuals including chronically homeless individuals</li> </ul>
2. Increase percentage of homeless persons staying in PH over 6 months to 71%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prioritize and incentivize high permanent housing retention performance standards among CoC members;</li> <li>▪ Increase the use of eviction-prevention strategies among permanent housing providers through trainings and monitoring of outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 84% of homeless persons stayed in PH over 6 months</li> </ul>
3. Increase percentage of homeless persons moving from TH to PH to 61.5%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implement system-wide housing locator program to increase movement from ES &amp; TH to PH;</li> <li>▪ Re-define services in shelters to focus on placement into permanent housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 62% of homeless persons moved from TH to PH</li> </ul>

4. Increase percentage of homeless persons becoming employed by 11%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formalize efforts between WorkNet Chicago and homeless service providers to increase number of homeless households with income from employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 17.7% of homeless persons obtained income from employment</li> </ul>
5. Ensure that the CoC has a functional HMIS system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Complete training and certificates for all HUD and City funded programs and ensure complete bed coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 82 participating agencies</li> </ul>
<p>Goal #4: In the 2006 application we submitted a goal that 22% of homeless persons would become employed. While did achieve this goal as evidenced in our 2006 Chicago Department of Human Services Annual Report, our most recent CoC APR data reported lower rates of employment than our stated goal. We now understand that our employment goals will relate only to our HUD APR performance.</p>		
<p><b>Significant accomplishments:</b>          In December 2006 the Chicago Low Income Housing Trust Fund approved a \$4 million allocation of permanent housing rental subsidies in support of Chicago’s Plan to End Homelessness, specifically for homeless individuals and families with tenure of homelessness in shelters and on the street. This will support at least 750 units of permanent housing annually.</p> <p>Another significant accomplishment over the past 12 months was the creation of the Homelessness Prevention Call Center. The Call Center is a central access point to homelessness prevention resources via 311 City Services. All data is captured into the same system as Chicago’s HMIS, from which we hope to learn more about the efficacy of homelessness prevention resources.</p>		

**V: CoC Chronic Homeless (CH) Progress Chart**

The data in this chart should come from point-in-time counts also used for Chart K: Populations and Subpopulations Chart and Chart I: Housing Inventory Chart. For further instructions in filling out this chart, please see the Instructions section.

<p><b>1. Enter the total number of chronically homeless persons in your CoC and the total number of permanent housing beds designated for the chronically homeless in your CoC for each year.</b></p>		
<p><b>Year</b></p>	<p><b>Number of CH Persons</b></p>	<p><b>Number of PH beds for the CH</b></p>
<p><b>2005</b></p>	<p>1,266</p>	<p>399</p>
<p><b>2006</b></p>	<p>1,266</p>	<p>1,214</p>
<p><b>2007</b></p>	<p>1,018</p>	<p>1,800</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe the reason(s) for any increases in the total number of chronically homeless persons between 2006 and 2007:</b></p> <p>N/A</p>		
<p><b>2. Indicate the number of new PH beds in place and made available for occupancy for the chronically homeless between February 1, 2006 and January 31, 2007:</b></p>		<p style="text-align: center;">304</p>

3. Identify the amount of funds from each funding source for the development and operations costs of the **new** CH beds created between February 1, 2006 and January 31, 2007.

<b>Cost Type</b>	<b>Public/Government</b>				<b>Private</b>
	<b>HUD McKinney- Vento</b>	<b>Other Federal</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Local</b>	
<b>Development</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Operations</b>	\$1,923,946	\$0	\$0	\$510,000	\$0
<b>Total</b>	\$1,923,946	\$0	\$0	\$510,000	\$0



## W: CoC Housing Performance Chart

The following chart will assess your CoC's progress in reducing homelessness by helping clients move to and stabilize in permanent housing, access mainstream services and gain employment. Both housing and supportive services projects in your CoC will be examined. Provide information from the most recently submitted APR for the appropriate RENEWAL project(s) on your CoC Project Priorities Chart. **Note:** If you are not submitting any renewals in this year's competition for the applicable areas presented below, check the appropriate "No applicable renewals" box in the chart.

<b>1. Participants in Permanent Housing (PH)</b>		
HUD will be assessing the percentage of all participants who remain in S+C or SHP permanent housing (PH) for more than six months. SHP projects include both SHP-PH and SHP-Safe Haven PH renewals. Complete the following chart using data based on the <u>most recently submitted</u> APR for Question 12(a) and 12(b) for PH projects included on your CoC Priority Chart:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	No applicable PH renewals are on the CoC Project Priorities Chart	APR Data
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>All</u> PH renewal projects with APRs submitted are included in calculating the responses below	
a.	Number of participants who <b>exited</b> PH project(s)—APR Question 12(a)	935
b.	Number of participants who did <b>not leave</b> the project(s)—APR Question 12(b)	3124
c.	Number who <b>exited</b> after staying 7 months or longer in PH—APR Question 12(a)	745
d.	Number who did <b>not leave</b> after staying 7 months or longer in PH—APR question 12(b)	2668
e.	Percentage of all participants in PH projects staying 7 months or longer (c. + d. divided by a. + b., multiplied by 100 = e.)	84.08%
<b>2. Participants in Transitional Housing (TH)</b>		
HUD will be assessing the percentage of all TH clients who moved to a permanent housing situation. TH projects include SHP-TH and SHP-Safe Haven/TH <i>not</i> identified as permanent housing. Complete the following chart using data based on the <u>most recently submitted</u> APR Question 14 for TH renewal projects included on your CoC Priorities Chart.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	No applicable TH renewals are on the CoC Project Priorities Chart	APR Data
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>All</u> TH renewal projects with APRs submitted are included in calculating the responses below	
a.	Number of participants who exited TH project(s)—including unknown destination	1750
b.	Number of participants who moved to PH	1089
c.	Percent of participants in TH projects who moved to PH (b. divided by a., multiplied by 100 = c.)	62.23 %

## X: Mainstream Programs and Employment Project Performance Chart

HUD will be assessing the percentage of clients in all your renewal projects who gained access to mainstream services, especially those who gained employment. This includes all S+C renewals and all SHP renewals, excluding HMIS projects. Complete the following charts based on responses to APR Question 11 for each of the renewal projects included on your CoC Priority Chart. For further instructions for filling out this section, see the Instructions section at the beginning of the application.

<input type="checkbox"/>	No applicable renewal projects for the Mainstream Programs and Employment Chart are included in the CoC Priorities Chart.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All renewal projects on the CoC Priorities Chart that are not exempted from reporting in the APR are included in calculating the responses below.

(1) Number of Adults Who Left (Use same number in each cell)	(2) Income Source	(3) Number of Exiting Adults with Each Source of Income	(4) Percent with Income at Exit (Col 3 ÷ Col 1 x 100)
<i>Example:</i> 105	a. SSI	40	38.1%
<i>Example:</i> 105	b. SSDI	35	33.3%
6074	a. SSI	<b>957</b>	<b>15.8%</b>
6074	b. SSDI	<b>328</b>	<b>5.4%</b>
6074	c. Social Security	<b>84</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
6074	d. General Public Assistance	<b>272</b>	<b>4.5%</b>
6074	e. TANF	<b>272</b>	<b>4.5%</b>
6074	f. SCHIP	<b>48</b>	<b>0.8%</b>
6074	g. Veterans Benefits	<b>99</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
6074	h. Employment Income	<b>1076</b>	<b>17.7%</b>
6074	i. Unemployment Benefits	<b>88</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
6074	j. Veterans Health Care	<b>82</b>	<b>1.4%</b>
6074	k. Medicaid	<b>971</b>	<b>16.0%</b>
6074	l. Food Stamps	<b>2251</b>	<b>37.1%</b>
6074	m. Other (please specify)	<b>527</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
6074	n. No Financial Resources	<b>2003</b>	<b>33.0%</b>

## Y: Enrollment and Participation in Mainstream Programs Chart

It is fundamental that your CoC *systematically* helps homeless persons identify, apply for and follow-up to receive benefits under **SSI, SSDI, TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, SCHIP, WIA, and Veterans Health Care** as well as **any other State or Local program that may be applicable**. Which policies are currently in place in your CoC to help clients secure these mainstream benefits for which they are eligible?

Check those activities implemented by a <b>majority</b> of your CoC's homeless assistance providers (check all that apply):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A majority of homeless assistance providers have case managers systematically assist clients in completing applications for mainstream benefit programs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CoC systematically analyzes its projects' APRs to assess and improve access to mainstream programs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The CoC has an active planning committee that meets at least three times a year to improve CoC-wide participation in mainstream programs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A majority of homeless assistance providers use a single application form for four or more of the above mainstream programs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The CoC systematically provides outreach and intake staff specific, ongoing training on how to identify eligibility and program changes for mainstream programs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CoC or any of its projects has specialized staff whose primary responsibility is to identify, enroll, and follow-up with homeless persons on participation in mainstream programs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A majority of homeless assistance providers supply transportation assistance to clients to attend mainstream benefit appointments, employment training, or jobs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A majority of homeless assistance providers have staff systematically follow-up to ensure that mainstream benefits are received.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The CoC coordinates with the State Interagency Council(s) on Homelessness to reduce or remove barriers to accessing mainstream services.

## Z: Unexecuted Grants Awarded Prior to the 2006 CoC Competition Chart

Provide a list of all HUD McKinney-Vento Act awards made prior to the 2005 competition that are not yet under contract (i.e., signed grant agreement or executed ACC).

Project Number	Applicant Name	Project Name	Grant Amount
Example: MI23B901002	Michiana Homes, Inc.	TH for Homeless	\$514,000
		<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## AA: CoC Participation in Energy Star Chart

HUD promotes energy-efficient housing. All McKinney-Vento funded projects are encouraged to promote energy efficiency, and are specifically encouraged to purchase and use Energy Star labeled products. For information on the Energy Star initiative go to: <http://www.energystar.gov>.

Have you notified CoC members of the Energy Star initiative?  Yes  No

Percentage of CoC projects on CoC Priority Chart using Energy Star appliances: 74 %

## AB: Section 3 Employment Policy Chart

	YES	NO
1. Is any project in your CoC requesting HUD funds for housing rehabilitation or new construction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. <b>If you answered yes to Question 1:</b> Is the project requesting \$200,000 or more?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. <b>If you answered yes to Question 2:</b> What activities will the project undertake to ensure that employment and other economic opportunities are directed to low- and very low-income persons, per the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (known as "Section 3")? <b>Check all that apply:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project will have a preference policy for hiring low- and very low-income persons residing in the service area or neighborhood where the project is located, and for hiring Youthbuild participants/graduates.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project will advertise at social service agencies, employment and training centers, community centers, or other organizations that have frequent contact with low- and very low-income individuals, as well as local newspapers, shopping centers, radio, etc.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project will notify any area Youthbuild programs of job opportunities.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the project will be awarding competitive contracts of more than \$100,000, it will establish a preference policy for "Section 3 business concerns"* that provide economic opportunities and will include the "Section 3 clause"** in all solicitations and contracts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project has hired low- or very low-income persons.</p>		
<p>*A "Section 3 business concern" is one in which: 51% or more of the owners are section 3 residents of the area of service; <u>or</u> at least 30% of its permanent full-time employees are currently section 3 residents of the area of service, or within three years of their date of hire with the business concern were section 3 residents; <u>or</u> evidence of a commitment to subcontract greater than 25% of the dollar award of all subcontracts to businesses that meet the qualifications in the above categories is provided.</p> <p>**The "Section 3 clause" can be found at 24 CFR Part 135.</p>		

<b>America's Affordable Communities Initiative</b>	<b>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</b>	OMB approval no. 2510-0013 (exp. 03/31/2010)
--	---	---

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours. This includes the time for collecting, reviewing, and reporting the data. The information will be used to encourage applicants to pursue and promote efforts to remove regulatory barriers to affordable housing. Response to this request for information is required in order to receive the benefits to be derived. This agency may not collect this information, and you are not required to complete this form unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

## Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers

### Part A. Local Jurisdictions. Counties Exercising Land Use and Building Regulatory Authority and Other Applicants Applying for Projects Located in such Jurisdictions or Counties [Collectively, Jurisdiction]

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>1.</b> Does your jurisdiction's comprehensive plan (or in the case of a tribe or TDHE, a local Indian Housing Plan) include a "housing element? A local comprehensive plan means the adopted official statement of a legislative body of a local government that sets forth (in words, maps, illustrations, and/or tables) goals, policies, and guidelines intended to direct the present and future physical, social, and economic development that occurs within its planning jurisdiction and that includes a unified physical plan for the public development of land and water. If your jurisdiction does not have a local comprehensive plan with a "housing element," please enter no. If no, skip to question # 4.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>2.</b> If your jurisdiction has a comprehensive plan with a housing element, does the plan provide estimates of current and anticipated housing needs, taking into account the anticipated growth of the region, for existing and future residents, including low, moderate and middle income families, for at least the next five years?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>3.</b> Does your zoning ordinance and map, development and subdivision regulations or other land use controls conform to the jurisdiction's comprehensive plan regarding housing needs by providing: a) sufficient land use and density categories (multifamily housing, duplexes, small lot homes and other similar elements); and, b) sufficient land zoned or mapped "as of right" in these categories, that can permit the building of affordable housing addressing the needs identified in the plan? (For purposes of this notice, "as-of-right," as applied to zoning, means uses and development standards that are determined in advance and specifically authorized by the zoning ordinance. The ordinance is largely self-enforcing because little or no discretion occurs in its administration.). If the jurisdiction has chosen not to have either zoning, or other development controls that have varying standards based upon districts or zones, the applicant may also enter yes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>4.</b> Does your jurisdiction's zoning ordinance set minimum building size requirements that exceed the local housing or health code or is otherwise not based upon explicit health standards?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<p><b>5.</b> If your jurisdiction has development impact fees, are the fees specified and calculated under local or state statutory criteria? If no, skip to question #7. Alternatively, if your jurisdiction does not have impact fees, you may enter yes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>6.</b> If yes to question #5, does the statute provide criteria that sets standards for the allowable type of capital investments that have a direct relationship between the fee and the development (nexus), and a method for fee calculation?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>7.</b> If your jurisdiction has impact or other significant fees, does the jurisdiction provide waivers of these fees for affordable housing?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>8.</b> Has your jurisdiction adopted specific building code language regarding housing rehabilitation that encourages such rehabilitation through graduated regulatory requirements applicable as different levels of work are performed in existing buildings? Such code language increases regulatory requirements (the additional improvements required as a matter of regulatory policy) in proportion to the extent of rehabilitation that an owner/developer chooses to do on a voluntary basis. For further information see HUD publication: “<i>Smart Codes in Your Community: A Guide to Building Rehabilitation Codes</i>” (<a href="http://www.huduser.org/publications/destech/smartcodes.html">www.huduser.org/publications/destech/smartcodes.html</a>)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>9.</b> Does your jurisdiction use a recent version (i.e. published within the last 5 years or, if no recent version has been published, the last version published) of one of the nationally recognized model building codes (i.e. the International Code Council (ICC), the Building Officials and Code Administrators International (BOCA), the Southern Building Code Congress International (SBCI), the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)) without significant technical amendment or modification. In the case of a tribe or TDHE, has a recent version of one of the model building codes as described above been adopted or, alternatively, has the tribe or TDHE adopted a building code that is substantially equivalent to one or more of the recognized model building codes?</p> <p>Alternatively, if a significant technical amendment has been made to the above model codes, can the jurisdiction supply supporting data that the amendments do not negatively impact affordability.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>10.</b> Does your jurisdiction’s zoning ordinance or land use regulations permit manufactured (HUD-Code) housing “as of right” in all residential districts and zoning classifications in which similar site-built housing is permitted, subject to design, density, building size, foundation requirements, and other similar requirements applicable to other housing that will be deemed realty, irrespective of the method of production?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

<p>11. Within the past five years, has a jurisdiction official (i.e., chief executive, mayor, county chairman, city manager, administrator, or a tribally recognized official, etc.), the local legislative body, or planning commission, directly, or in partnership with major private or public stakeholders, convened or funded comprehensive studies, commissions, or hearings, or has the jurisdiction established a formal ongoing process, to review the rules, regulations, development standards, and processes of the jurisdiction to assess their impact on the supply of affordable housing?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>12. Within the past five years, has the jurisdiction initiated major regulatory reforms either as a result of the above study or as a result of information identified in the barrier component of the jurisdiction’s “HUD Consolidated Plan?” If yes, attach a brief list of these major regulatory reforms.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>13. Within the past five years has your jurisdiction modified infrastructure standards and/or authorized the use of new infrastructure technologies (e.g. water, sewer, street width) to significantly reduce the cost of housing?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>14. Does your jurisdiction give “as-of-right” density bonuses sufficient to offset the cost of building below market units as an incentive for any market rate residential development that includes a portion of affordable housing? (As applied to density bonuses, "as of right" means a density bonus granted for a fixed percentage or number of additional market rate dwelling units in exchange for the provision of a fixed number or percentage of affordable dwelling units and without the use of discretion in determining the number of additional market rate units.)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>15. Has your jurisdiction established a single, consolidated permit application process for housing development that includes building, zoning, engineering, environmental, and related permits? Alternatively, does your jurisdiction conduct concurrent, not sequential, reviews for all required permits and approvals?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>16. Does your jurisdiction provide for expedited or “fast track” permitting and approvals for all affordable housing projects in your community?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>17. Has your jurisdiction established time limits for government review and approval or disapproval of development permits in which failure to act, after the application is deemed complete, by the government within the designated time period, results in automatic approval?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>18. Does your jurisdiction allow “accessory apartments” either as: a) a special exception or conditional use in all single-family residential zones or, b) “as of right” in a majority of residential districts otherwise zoned for single-family housing?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>19. Does your jurisdiction have an explicit policy that adjusts or waives existing parking requirements for all affordable housing developments?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>20. Does your jurisdiction require affordable housing projects to undergo public review or special hearings when the project is otherwise in full compliance with the zoning ordinance and other development regulations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p><b>Total Points:</b></p>		

**Part B. State Agencies and Departments or Other Applicants for Projects Located in Unincorporated Areas or Areas Otherwise Not Covered in Part A**

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
1. Does your state, either in its planning and zoning enabling legislation or in any other legislation, require localities regulating development have a comprehensive plan with a "housing element?" If no, skip to question # 4	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
2. Does your state require that a local jurisdiction's comprehensive plan estimate current and anticipated housing needs, taking into account the anticipated growth of the region, for existing and future residents, including low, moderate, and middle income families, for at least the next five years?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
3. Does your state's zoning enabling legislation require that a local jurisdiction's zoning ordinance have a) sufficient land use and density categories (multifamily housing, duplexes, small lot homes and other similar elements); and, b) sufficient land zoned or mapped in these categories, that can permit the building of affordable housing that addresses the needs identified in the comprehensive plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
4. Does your state have an agency or office that includes a specific mission to determine whether local governments have policies or procedures that are raising costs or otherwise discouraging affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
5. Does your state have a legal or administrative requirement that local governments undertake periodic self-evaluation of regulations and processes to assess their impact upon housing affordability address these barriers to affordability?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
6. Does your state have a technical assistance or education program for local jurisdictions that includes assisting them in identifying regulatory barriers and in recommending strategies to local governments for their removal?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
7. Does your state have specific enabling legislation for local impact fees? If no skip to question #9.	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
8. If yes to the question #7, does the state statute provide criteria that sets standards for the allowable type of capital investments that have a direct relationship between the fee and the development ( <i>nexus</i> ) and a method for fee calculation?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
9. Does your state provide significant financial assistance to local governments for housing, community development and/or transportation that includes funding prioritization or linking funding on the basis of local regulatory barrier removal activities?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes



<p>10. Does your state have a mandatory state-wide building code that a) does not permit local technical amendments and b) uses a recent version (i.e. published within the last five years or, if no recent version has been published, the last version published) of one of the nationally recognized model building codes (i.e. the International Code Council (ICC), the Building Officials and Code Administrators International (BOCA), the Southern Building Code Congress International (SBCI), the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)) without significant technical amendment or modification?</p> <p>Alternatively, if the state has made significant technical amendment to the model code, can the state supply supporting data that the amendments do not negatively impact affordability?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>11. Has your jurisdiction adopted specific building code language regarding housing rehabilitation that encourages such rehabilitation through graduated regulatory requirements applicable as different levels of work are performed in existing buildings? Such code language increases regulatory requirements (the additional improvements required as a matter of regulatory policy) in proportion to the extent of rehabilitation that an owner/developer chooses to do on a voluntary basis. For further information see HUD publication: “<i>Smart Codes in Your Community: A Guide to Building Rehabilitation Codes</i>” (<a href="http://www.huduser.org/publications/destech/smartcodes.html">www.huduser.org/publications/destech/smartcodes.html</a>)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>12. Within the past five years has your state made any changes to its own processes or requirements to streamline or consolidate the state’s own approval processes involving permits for water or wastewater, environmental review, or other State-administered permits or programs involving housing development. If yes, briefly list these changes.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>13. Within the past five years, has your state (i.e., Governor, legislature, planning department) directly or in partnership with major private or public stakeholders, convened or funded comprehensive studies, commissions, or panels to review state or local rules, regulations, development standards, and processes to assess their impact on the supply of affordable housing?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>14. Within the past five years, has the state initiated major regulatory reforms either as a result of the above study or as a result of information identified in the barrier component of the states’ “Consolidated Plan submitted to HUD?” If yes, briefly list these major regulatory reforms.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>15. Has the state undertaken any other actions regarding local jurisdiction’s regulation of housing development including permitting, land use, building or subdivision regulations, or other related administrative procedures? If yes, briefly list these actions.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p><b>Total Points:</b></p>		

Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers 2006  
City of Chicago

Regulatory Reform or Change Introduced	Description of Impact on Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing	Lead Local Office of Agency	Comments
HUD's Robert L. Woodson, Jr. Award for the Chicago Partnership for Affordable Neighborhoods (CPAN) Program	The CPAN program encourages developers of market-rate townhomes and condominiums to make at least 10% of their units affordable. In return, city officials help expedite the permit process (see below), absorb permit fees, and identify qualified homebuyers.	Department of Housing (DOH)	The award was given in recognition of the successful efforts of the City of Chicago in reducing regulatory barriers to affordable housing.
Department of Housing Project Fee Waivers for Chicago Partnership for Affordable Neighborhoods (CPAN)	CPAN promotes voluntary inclusionary housing developments in Chicago. Developers who participate in CPAN get fees waived in relation to the proportion of affordable units: plan review, permit and inspection for building, elevator, wrecking and fencing permits.	Department of Construction and Permits (DCAP)	Creates incentives to include affordable housing units in residential developments.
City Lots for City Living	City Lots for City Living allows eligible applicants to purchase vacant City-owned property for \$1 if the land will be used for affordable housing activities. Land can be used as sites for single-family (1-4 units), owner-occupied units, and for rental buildings.	DOH	This program significantly reduces or removes land acquisition cost for affordable housing, thereby lowering the cost of affordable housing development.
Bungalow Initiative Standard Designs Program	As a component of the City's Bungalow Initiative, which aims to preserve this historic housing stock, owners can purchase pre-approved renovation designs for as little as \$5.	DOH	Pre-approved designs reduces the price of home renovation and encourages preservation of Chicago's historic bungalows. It also reduces the time needed to get a permit.
Troubled Buildings Initiative 1	The Troubled Buildings Initiative (TBI) works proactively to stem the deterioration and loss of viable housing stock through targeted enforcement efforts and direct interventions with building owners. TBI effectively mobilizes the resources and expertise of eight City departments and Community Investment Corporation as a agreed partner to ensure that structures are made safe and habitable and to help owners gain financing to rehabilitate problem buildings	DOH	Preserves existing housing stock throughout the City.
Troubled Buildings Initiative 2	The original program was expanded in 2005 to include buildings with one to four units. Neighborhood Housing Services is the City's partner for this program.	DOH	Preserves existing housing stock throughout the City.

Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers 2006  
 City of Chicago

Regulatory Reform or Change Introduced	Description of Impact on Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing	Lead Local Office of Agency	Comments
Preserving Communities Together	Expedites the process wherein the City can take possession of vacant, abandoned buildings and turn them over to an approved party, (such as an individual, community group, or developer) for the express purpose of creating affordable housing.	DOH	Reduces land costs to the developer, enabling the creation of more affordable housing.
Department of Housing Project Fee Waivers for the Multifamily Program	Multifamily affordable housing projects get the following fees waived: DCAP plan review, permit and inspection fees for building, elevator, wrecking, fencing and accessibility code review; DOH Low-income Housing Tax Credit service fee; Water Management tap fees, connection and inspection, and sealing permits; driveway, street opening, and use of public way by CDOT.	DOH; DCAP; Department of Water Management; Department of Transportation (CDOT).	Reduces the cost of developing affordable multifamily housing.
Department of Housing Project Fee Waivers for New Homes and City Lots	New Home Projects and City Lots get the following fees waived: (DCAP) plan review, permit, field inspection; (DOH) trees and sod; (Water) tap fees, connection and inspection, demolition of existing water tap, water liens against City-owned lots; (CDOT) curbs, gutters, sidewalks provided on an as-needed basis.	DOH; DCAP; Dept. of Water Management; Dept. of Transportation (CDOT).	Reduces the cost of developing affordable housing.
Water Permit Group	The Water Permit Group was moved to the Department of Contracts and Permits to streamline the permit process.	DCAP	Saves the developer time and money, making housing development more affordable.
Elimination of Trade Permits for Standard Plan Review	Since September 2004, DCAP has eliminated trade permits associated with all Standard Pan Review and medium-sized projects including refrigeration, heating, ventilation, and electrical.	DCAP	Saves time and money in the preparation of applications.
Voluntary Compliance for Corrections to Standard Review Plan	Since November 2004, DCAP has allowed "voluntary compliance" for simple corrections in the Standard Plan Review process. Owners/developers no longer need to return to DCAP to demonstrate simple corrections to drawings and applications. DCAP increased the scope of this program in December 2005 to allow licensed Architects to voluntarily comply all corrections in all occupancies except Assembly, Institutional and Hazardous Use.	DCAP	DCAP plans to increase the number of voluntary compliance corrections in 2005.

Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers 2006  
City of Chicago

Regulatory Reform or Change Introduced	Description of Impact on Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing	Lead Local Office of Agency	Comments
Fire Prevention Review Team Transferred to DCAP	DCAP now acts as a "one-stop shop" for fire prevention reviews. Fire alarm permits can now be tracked through the DCAP website and the time to get these permits has reduced from 100 days to 20 days.	DCAP	Technical updates to fire alarm permit standards have also been made, saving developers time and money. This also promotes better code compliance and reduces the number of post-permit reviews.
Expedited Permits for Green and Affordable Projects	Developers will get expedited permits if their project is green and (any combination of) affordable, accessible, transit-oriented, or in underserved.	DCAP	In June 2005, the Green Permit Program was launched. This program encourages environmentally friendly housing development by speeding up the permit process and thereby reducing costs.
On-line Permits and On-line Permit Applications	Starting September 2005, Architects and other design professionals have been able to apply for all medium-sized permits with plans on-line. Starting in September 2006, residents will be able to receive on-line permits to replace existing mechanical equipment or building components that do not require architectural plans, as long as they are in compliance with City codes and are using licensed contractors. Developers/residents can also check their permit status on-line.	DCAP	In September 2005, Chicago became one of the first cities in the country to have permit applications for residential and small commercial on-line.
Porch Prototype Permits	DCAP provides pre-approved residential porch prototype plans for customer use at no cost. These prototypes reduce the expense of hiring a design professional and the time to permit.	DCAP	Prototypes reduce the expense of hiring a design professional and the time to permit.
Residential Self-Certification Program	Starting in May 2005, DCAP has allowed residential permits for less than 4 dwelling units to be self-certified by licensed Architects, thereby significantly reducing the time and cost to permit.	DCAP	Prior to permitting, DCAP verifies permit fees, facilitates appropriate inspections, and does an overall drawing and application quality control and quality assurance review.

Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers 2006  
City of Chicago

<b>Regulatory Reform or Change Introduced</b>	<b>Description of Impact on Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing</b>	<b>Lead Local Office of Agency</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Licensing of General Contractors	Building permits are only awarded to general contractors that have been licensed by the City of Chicago. This ensures that work is done properly, protecting the building owner and residents from fraud and damage. The City of Chicago can then mandate the licensed contractors return and correct any poor work.	Department of Buildings (DOB)	This increases quality control and avoids unnecessary costs.
Fast-Track Abatement Program	This program addresses the epidemic of vacant and open structures. Instead of spending money on demolishing all dangerous and hazardous buildings, the program abates hazardous conditions through repair.	DOB	This program offers an alternative to demolition, which was the only previous recourse for troubled buildings. It also encourages housing preservation and creates more affordable housing options for individual homeowners and renters of rehabbed buildings.
Voluntary Compliance Program	The program allows building owners to correct code violations in a timely manner without being fined. This encourages owners to concentrate the investment of resources for the safety and durability of their buildings instead of fines court costs.	DOB	This process bypasses the Administrative Hearing or Circuit Court and moves the owner/property quickly to compliance.
Newly-established B2 Zone	The re-write of Chicago's zoning code created a new B2 Zone. This allows residential units on the 1st floor "as of right." Properties with residential units in this new zoning district are approved without having to go through the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).	Department of Zoning (DOZ)	This reduces the cost of development by avoiding the delays often associated with the ZBA.
Front Yard Averaging	As long as the front yard of the new development does not exceed the average length of the two adjacent property front yards, there is automatic approval without seeking an administrative adjustment.	DOZ	This process makes housing development more flexible and lowers the cost of construction.
Downtown Affordable Housing Density Bonus	New downtown developments can exceed their floor area ratio (build higher buildings) if they create affordable housing units in the development.	DOZ	The density bonus provides incentives for affordable housing development.
Zoning Review	The Department of Zoning is now conducting all standard permit zoning review which can occur before or during the permit application process with DCAP.	DOZ	Time and money can ultimately be saved by allowing housing developers the opportunity to have their zoning reviewed prior to their intake appointment.

Questionnaire for HUD's Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers 2006  
 City of Chicago

<b>Regulatory Reform or Change Introduced</b>	<b>Description of Impact on Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing</b>	<b>Lead Local Office of Agency</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Sewer Permit Process	Invoices for sewer construction permits are handled by the Chicago Department of Revenue. There are also electronic permits available for specified sewer repairs. In addition, permits for environmentally-friendly sewer work are processed the same day.	Department of Water Management	Payment and transaction documentation is completed faster.
Private Drain Policy	New developments can reuse the private sewer line (instead of removing the old line and installing a new one) even if it is over 75 years old, as long as the developer can televise and document that the line is working.	Department of Water Management (DWM)	Saves the developer time and money, making housing development more affordable.
Private Drain Program	The department repairs existing private drains in the public right-of-way for single family homes up to four units.	DWM	Over \$5.0 million per year is spent on this program, saving homeowners significant out-of-pocket expenses.
CHA Water & Sewer Infrastructure in the Right-Of-Way	The dept. funds, designs, and builds CHA water and sewer improvements in the right-of-way.	DWM	In 2005, \$2.7 million was spent on this initiative, significantly reducing the time and cost associated with design, construction, and permitting.
Coordinated Permitting for Downspouts	A developer affidavit was added to the permit process to allow for downspouts to splash at grade in lieu of installing underground sewer connections.	DWM	Saves developers time and materials costs and conforms to best management storm water practices.
Alternative Pipe Materials Pilot	Pilot program to evaluate the use of recycled plastic and/or alternative plastic pipe materials was approved in 2005. May result in the revision of city plumbing code, which currently prohibits the use of plastic pipe materials.	DWM	Alternative pipe materials for storm water detention could save housing developers approximately 25 - 30 percent in material and installation costs.
Affordable Requirements Ordinance (ARO)	ARO requires residential developments using all types of city land, and any zoning change or planned development that increases project density to have at least 10% of the residential units be affordable in residential developments with 10 or more units.	DOH	ARO is expected to produce 1,000 units of affordable housing each year.