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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Our group conducted a program evaluation of HELP Las Vegas Genesis Apartments (HELP Genesis). We began the evaluation on November of 2008 and concluded May 2009. HELP Genesis is a permanent supportive housing facility for veterans and homeless with disabilities. It was a concern that they may be a transitional housing facility because of their turnover rate. We concluded that this was not the case.

We have identified the following limitations in our analysis. There was a lack of accessibility to the budget and accounting documents, limited access to key contacts for necessary information, and time constraints which prohibited us from investigating the claim that there was a Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) violation in providing supporting documents.

We have identified two recommendations, (1) Include more transparency in the budgeting and accounting processes, (2) HELP Genesis is a permanent supportive housing facility and should continue to receive funding from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
PUPOSE OF REPORT

An evaluation of HELP Genesis was conducted through the months of November 2008 thru May 2009. The evaluators included Shauna Davis, Bristol Ellington, Alexis Mussi, and Jason LaMarr Wasden. The evaluators are students of the Masters in Public Administration (MPA) program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The evaluation is part of the capstone project and an analytical paper is submitted as part of the final requirements to graduate with the MPA degree. The purpose of the report is to document the process of the evaluation, as well as the methodology, findings, and recommendations.

The Evaluation Process

We first began the process with the Help Hope Home plan, which is under the direction of Shannon West, the Regional Homeless Services Coordinator, who is supervised by the Committee on Homelessness (COH). Help Hope Home is a coordinated approach by the COH, which is a subset of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC). A key aspect of the plan is for the Continuum of Care (COC) to provide recommendations to HUD for allocation of funds to qualified agencies that are focused on helping the homeless.

Our first meeting was held on November 12, 2008 with Regional Homeless Services Coordinator, Shannon West, at the Clark County Social Services building. Initially, Ms. West presented a general overview of Help Hope Home and the different
agencies involved. As stated on the Help Hope Home website, “Help Hope Home is Southern Nevada’s coordinated regional approach to assist individuals and families achieve stable and sustainable lives (www.helphopehome.org).”

We were informed that Michele Fuller-Hallauer would be the main person overseeing the evaluation. However, due to an illness, the group never met with Ms. Fuller-Hallauer; therefore, Ms. West became the primary contact for guidance and questions regarding the evaluation. At this stage of the process we had not yet been assigned a specific organization to evaluate.

The next meeting the group attended was on December 15, 2008 with the COC, they are the committee responsible for selecting the best qualified agencies dedicated to reducing homelessness to receive HUD funding. At this meeting we were assigned to evaluate HELP Genesis. HELP Genesis is a 75 bed permanent housing supportive services facility that helps homeless veterans and disabled homeless.

On February 3, 2009, the group was able to meet with the Executive Director of HELP Genesis, Beverly Johnson. The meeting was held at the HELP Genesis facility where Ms. Johnson gave us a tour and later informed us about the organization and its purpose. We asked questions regarding the services they provided, rules and regulations of the agency, the daily operations, and funding sources as well as expenditures. All information was communicated through an oral interview; no hard copies were given to verify that the information received was accurate.
Ms. Johnson seemed a bit hesitant and anxious that we were evaluating the organization. Therefore, Alexis Mussi, through friendly phone calls and emails, sought to reassure her that we were not there to cause conflict or make their organization look bad, but rather we could offer recommendations that may help the agency. In addition, Jason Wasden hosted a lunch meeting with Ms. Johnson and her assistant Mr. Sherman Rutledge to build a rapport and help ease their concerns about the program evaluation.

After the meeting with Ms. Johnson, we became familiar with the agency but we were still unclear as to what our exact focus should be to evaluate. A meeting was subsequently held with Ms. West on February 11, 2009 at UNLV to help us narrow our focus on what we specifically needed to evaluate. Ms. West directed us down the right a path and specifically narrowed our evaluation by possible concerns she had with the agency. Ms. West wanted to verify that (1) HELP Genesis is a permanent housing facility, (2) that they are serving only homeless veterans, and (3) that they are spending the money in accordance to what was specified when they were awarded the HUD funding. Further along in our research we realized that there was a possible miscommunication regarding the expectations the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition had of HELP Genesis and to what was actually stated on the application. We found that HELP Genesis clearly stated their type of program and the clientele they serve. This issue will be further addressed under the Interpretations and Conclusions section.
Once we understood Shannon's concerns, we formulated our questions of analysis and developed an instrument to gather the necessary data to answer the purposed questions. The questions were as follows:

1. Is the program operating in accordance to the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding?

2. Are the HUD funds recommended by the COC being spent in accordance to what was specified on the application?

3. Should Genesis be funded again?

Further discussion of questions will be found under the Overall Evaluation Goals section. The instrument created was designed in a designated format which allowed Ms. Johnson to either enter her answer in a specific space or select from a drop-down menu. The instrument was created using Microsoft Word and was designed for ease of use when entering and organizing data. More information is provided under the Methodology section. The completed instrument can be found under the Appendices section.

The instrument was distributed to Ms. Johnson by email on February 23, 2009. We asked to have the completed form with the supporting documents returned to us by Monday, March 9, 2009, allowing her 2 weeks. Ms. Johnson asked for an extension and the documents were returned to us on Tuesday March 17, 2009. Not all supporting documents were provided because HELP Genesis was concerned about confidentiality by the United States Department of Veteran’s Affairs (VA). More information regarding the findings can be found under the Interpretations and Conclusions section.
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Upon analysis of answers provided, we constructed a second form asking additional questions to supplement the answers originally provided. The follow-up questions were sent on Tuesday, April 7, 2009. Ms. Johnson has been out of the office so we asked Mr. Rutledge if he could provide us with the information. As willing as he was, we have not received the additional information. Further information regarding the follow-up questions can be found under the Methodology, Interpretations and Conclusions, and Appendices sections.

BACKGROUND ABOUT ORGANIZATION

HELP USA is a national not-for-profit organization aimed at empowering the homeless and others in need to become and remain self-reliant (www.helpusa.org). HELP USA was founded in 1986 by Andrew Cuomo. The HELP Acronym Stands for (Housing Enterprise for the Less Privileged). HELP USA does not believe that homelessness can be eradicated simply by providing shelter. They provide their clients with tools while they are being housed that assist them in becoming and remaining self-reliant.

According to HELP USA many of the shelters providing housing for the homeless felt extremely institutional. They wanted to provide a more aesthetically attractive structure that did not feel like a prison. They also wanted to provide services they believed would help people integrate back into society. Typical Services provided by...
HELP USA include: Medical Services, Domestic Violence Counseling and Advocacy, GED Support, Housing Placement Assistance, Early Childhood Education/Daycare, After School Programs, Mentoring for Children, Board of Education Programs (to re-establish children in schools), Client Case Management, Referrals to Additional Services, and On-Site Security.

The HELP I project in New York was HELP USA’s first success. They were recognized by the United States Congress as a national model that others could benchmark. HELP USA provides both transitional and permanent housing. They have 19 residential Communities in New York, three in Las Vegas, one in Buffalo, two in Philadelphia and one in Houston. Each community partners with the local governments and local nonprofits to meet the needs of each community. According to the web site HELP USA has served 170,000 people and they have a goal to add 200 units of housing each year.

In Las Vegas, HELP USA opened HELP Las Vegas Genesis Apartments in November 2006. HELP Genesis is a 75 bed facility providing permanent supportive housing for veterans and disabled homeless. It is a small part of a larger vision for the HELP Las Vegas Plaza. Genesis was Phase One of Three phases for the HELP Las Vegas Plaza. Phase II and III are currently in preconstruction and planning phases. They anticipate adding 125 units and plan to have all residences serve homeless veterans.
All facilities have a community room, support services area, central heating and air conditioning, lighted walkways and parking, security system at the building entrances, and internet capability in each unit. We toured the facility and were shown the fully furnished apartments with bathroom and kitchen. It is anticipated that all facilities constructed will have the same amenities.

**Literature Review**

Research on supportive permanent housing for Veterans suggests better outcomes for these individuals and society. On any given night, according to the VA, nearly 200,000 veterans may be homeless. A large portion of these individuals suffers from mental illnesses, substance abuse problems, and acute health problems. A study on Vietnam-era Veterans, suggests that, “the greatest effect on homelessness were support in the year after discharge from military service and social isolation (Rosenheck and Fontanta, 1994).”

Veterans are eligible for and receive services through the VA. The VA funds a variety of programs, including health care, compensation, employment, education, and training (Cunningham, 2007). The VA and HUD have a joint program, HUD-VASH, which provides permanent supportive housing to veterans with serious mental illness and substance use disorders. Through this program, Section 8 vouchers are provided to Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) throughout the country to distribute to homeless veterans (http://www1.va.gov/homeless/page.cfm?pg=2). Section 8 allows Veterans to choose where they want to live, while still getting access to case management services.
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The VA also has a Grant and Per Diem Program that annually awards funding to community agencies that provide services to homeless veterans. Only agencies with supportive services are eligible to apply for these funds (Cunningham, 2007).

Supportive housing has proven to be an effective way to provide stable housing for homeless persons with mental illnesses (Rosenheck et al, 2003). According to the Corporation for Supportive Housing 75-85% of individuals who enter supportive housing are still there after the first year (http://www.csh.org/document/docWindow.cfm?fuseaction=document.viewDocument&documentid=986&documentFormatId=2070). There is a 79% retention rate of tenants in supportive housing with psychiatric and substance abuse disorders (Barrow et al, 2004). The National Alliance to End Homelessness examined studies in New York, Denver, and Portland that all showed providing supportive housing for homeless is cost effective as well. The Denver permanent housing program was able to reduce the cost of services (health, mental health, substance abuse, shelter) by $15,773 per person per year (Perlman and Parvensky, 2006).

OVERALL EVALUATION GOALS

As indicated previously, our meeting with Shannon West on February 11, 2009 allowed us to narrow our evaluation and focus on specific concerns that Ms. West wanted clarified. Her concerns consisted of (1) Is HELP Genesis indeed a permanent housing facility, (2) Are they are serving only homeless veterans, and (3) Are they are spending
the money in accordance to what was specified when they were awarded the HUD funding. Ms. West also wanted to be advised if HUD money should be awarded to HELP Genesis in upcoming years. To answer Ms. West’s questions, we formulated three central questions that were used as a guiding tool when developing the instrument to collect the data. These questions are as follows:

1. Is the program operating in accordance to the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding?
2. Are the HUD funds recommended by the COC being spent in accordance to what was specified on the application?
3. Should HELP Genesis be funded again?

Question number 1, “Is the program operating in accordance to the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding?” This question seeks to clarify any misrepresentations that the agency may have presented. When awarded grant money, there is a high level of accountability and every statement on the agency’s application is looked at and expected to be true. Ms. West was under the impression from their application that HELP Genesis is a permanent housing facility and therefore expected a very low turnover rate of residents. Ms. West was also concerned that the agency was allowing clients other than their specified clientele to reside in the facility; treating their facility more like a transitional housing facility and not a permanent housing facility.

Question one seeks to answer these questions and evaluate whether they are a permanent housing program and if they are serving their designated population. We also
asked for a copy of HELP Genesis's COC application so that we could verify what they stated as pertaining to their type of facility and the population served. Stated previously, we found that there may be a miscommunication between expectations and the type of program HELP Genesis is. Further discussion on this matter will be provided under the Interpretations and Conclusions section.

Question two, "Are the HUD funds recommended by the COC being spent in accordance to what was specified on the application?" This question seeks to identify the revenue sources and expenditures of HELP Genesis. Ms. West was concerned how the HUD funding was being spent and felt there were specific restrictions as to how the money could be spent. She also was concerned about HELP Genesis's other revenue sources; she felt if they were already receiving funding from other sources then maybe they are not in need of HUD funding.

Question three is the overall question of whether HELP Genesis should be funded again. If there are apparent discrepancies with the operations of HELP Genesis, then Ms. West may want to fund another organization. On the other hand, we may determine HELP Genesis has been operating in accordance to what they stated on their COC application. Therefore, we would be in a position to advise Ms. West that HELP Genesis is deserving of being awarded HUD funding.
METHODOLOGY

After the various meetings we had, as well as email correspondence and phone communication, we narrowed our evaluation to three central questions. We used the three questions as a guide to create instrument I.

Question one sought to obtain the documents necessary to further analyze whether or not HELP Genesis was operating in accordance to how they indicated on their application. Specifically, we were focused on their clientele and if they were a permanent housing program. To determine if they were a permanent housing program, we asked questions pertaining to turnover. If they are a permanent housing program then there would be a low turnover rate—they would have a low number of clientele served. We also asked them to verify that their residents were indeed veterans or disabled homeless.

To answer question two, we kept it very simple and asked them to list their sources of revenue as well as their expenditures. Documentation such as their 990 tax form was requested to verifying their statements. We also requested that the Southern Regional Planning Coalition provide us with a copy of the files indicating how much money was awarded to Help Genesis so that we could compare documents.

Question three, “Should HELP Genesis be funded again,” would be answered according to our analysis of questions one and two. If they are accountable for their
statements on their application are operating and spending the funds as required, then yes HELP Genesis would be a good organization to be funded again.

An instrument was created using Microsoft Word to gather the necessary data and documents in an organized and efficient manner. The instrument was a form designed to allow Ms. Johnson to fill in the answers by typing in the designated box or selecting from a pull-down menu.

Nine variables were requested on the form they includes: name of occupant, room number occupied, length of stay, veteran status, documentation of veteran status, disabled and supporting documentation, reason for leaving the program, number of occupants residing in the apartment, and date when occupant entered and left the program.

Instrument questions are listed as follows:

I. Is the program operating in accordance to the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding? Is Genesis a true permanent housing program? (Evaluate turn-over)

1. Of the 75 apartments, how many were filled 6 months after Genesis first opened?
   a. Of those residents, how many are still living at Genesis?

2. How many total people has Genesis served from its inception to current date (not including spouses, etc, living in apartment with tenant)?

3. Of those tenants, how many were tenants when Genesis first opened?
   a. How many are still living at Genesis?

4. What is the average length of stay for residents?

5. What is the most common reason why residents leave Genesis Apartments?
6. How is the program operating in accordance with the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding?

II. Is Genesis Apartments only housing the population indicated on their application (i.e. homeless veterans and disabled homeless)?

1. Of the total amount of tenants served, how many are veterans?

2. Of the total amount of tenants served, how many are not veterans but are individuals who are disabled and homeless?

3. Are any tenants served that are not veterans or disabled homeless?
   a. If yes explain why.

III. Are the COC funds being spent in accordance to what was specified on the application?

1. How much money was awarded to HELP Genesis from the COC per year?

2. How are the COC funds being spent? (Exact dollar amount needed)

IV. What rules are the tenants expected to follow?

V. What services are provided for them?

After receiving and analyzing the completed form, Instrument II was created in the same format asking supplemental questions for the purpose of clarifying a few of their answers. The supplemental questions were sent in an email. The questions asked included:

1. A total of 57 individuals were identified as having a 3/17/09 date for leaving the program. Will you clarify whether the following individuals are current residents?

2. What are the names of Current Residents not listed above?
3. Resident Clarence Kirsch in unit 104 was identified N/A in column entitled, Reason for leaving; however his last day in the program was 2/9/09. Please indicate the reason why Mr. Kirsch left the program?

4. Please provide the reason for the eviction of the following tenants?

5. It was indicated there was one non veteran in the facility, what is the tenant’s name, unit number and is this individual a current resident?
   
   5a. What is the Tenants Name?
   
   5b. What is the Tenants Unit Number?
   
   5c. Is the tenant a current resident?

   If not what is the reason for leaving?

6. How much was awarded by the COC each year of operation?

7. Of the amount awarded from the COC, how has the money been allocated each year?

Data

The type of data collected was both nominal and integral. The group created two instruments/forms to collect the data that the agency could type their responses into. These forms were e-mailed to the program. The data was analyzed by the group and it was decided that follow up questions needed to be asked to clarify some issues. A second form was sent and is pending analysis.
Limitation of Evaluation

There were a few problems with the documentation requested. Ms. Johnson was unable to provide us proof of veteran status and additionally she was not allowed to disclose the disability status of the residents. She stated that disclosing the disability status would be a violation of the HIPAA Act. Due to these limitations, we cannot accurately assess whether HELP Genesis is indeed housing only homeless veterans or disabled homeless.

We decided to assume that the program could provide original documentation if needed by an external organization. We initially asked for copies of the DD-214, Hink, and documented disability forms. They were not provided for us because of confidentiality concerns. We are assuming that the documentation could be provided to agencies requiring this information. All their documents are housed in their corporate office in New York.

Other limitations include time constraints and access to key contacts. We were originally assigned to Michele Fuller-Hallauer as our main point of contact. Due to illness we never met with Michelle and so requested information needed from Catherine Huang. Catherine was helpful but was not able to provide the budget and past documents from 2006 for HELP Genesis. HELP Genesis up to this point has not provided The Annual Progress Reports for fiscal years 2006-2009. Additionally HELP Genesis has yet to return the responses/clarification to the second instrument distributed. Had we had
additional time we may have been able to meet with the key contacts and obtain the responses requested of HELP Genesis.

**INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

*Permanent Housing*

We first reviewed the application submitted by Help Genesis to document their status as a permanent housing facility. Through this process we discovered that the HELP Las Vegas Housing Corporation application was for a transitional housing facility. We then asked for the HELP Genesis permanent housing application. Ms. West indicated that she wanted to verify that HELP Genesis was not a transitional housing facility. Upon inspection of their application we verified that HELP Genesis is a permanent supportive services housing facility for veterans and homeless with disabilities.

As stated from the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition's business case, permanent housing includes the following services as needed: case management, substance abuse treatment, health care services, medical health services, training and employment, work experience, and legal services (www.helphopheome.org/helphopheome_business_case.pdf). Through our research we found that supportive services are vital to reducing recidivism of homelessness. According to Fichter and Quadflieg, which conducted a three year prospective study of homelessness in Munich, Germany, permanent housing alone does not significantly

---
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improve the mental health of homeless individuals. The author concluded that permanent housing coupled with supportive services helps to remedy homelessness (Fichter, Guadflieg, 2006).

**Turnover**

From 2006 to present they have helped 127 individuals (126 veterans/disabled and 1 spouse). Ten occupants left for Section 8 Senior Housing, 18 occupants were evicted, 3 moved out of state, 25 left for Section 8 Housing, 5 are deceased, 1 moved in with his girlfriend, 2 abandoned the apartment, and 63 were marked as not applicable.

We assumed that the majority of the 63 NA occupants are currently housing at HELP Genesis. We have made several attempts to clarify this information but have not received any response. Through our discussions with Ms. Johnson, she believes the tenants are leaving for Section 8 because of the lack of restrictions.

Ms. West was concerned that the lingering of homeless individuals in front of HELP Genesis was being housed transitionally. We identified verbally that they received their occupants from the VA and referrals from other HELP agencies in the valley. During our site visit there were homeless individuals lined up across the street, but we did not witness any of these people in the Genesis apartments. From our observation and the responses provided to the instruments, we concluded that HELP Genesis is serving the clientele specified on their application.

The average number of days for occupants’ length of stay from 2006-2009 is 414 and the median number of days is 363. According to a report on the John McDermott
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House, September 2008, veterans in a transitional supportive services housing facility the average length of stay was 256 days and the median length of stay was 169. Participants that stayed longer than 169 days had a 72% chance of successfully completing the program and returning to a traditional housing situation (http://www.johnmcdermott.com/charity/mcdhouse-report-sept08.html). We inferred from this data that HELP Genesis is not a transitional housing facility due to the fact that their average stay is 158 days longer and their median stay is 194 days longer than the transitional veteran's supportive services facility.

**Budget**

The budget at this point is unclear because we have not received The Annual Progress Reports from either agency. We cannot interpret and make conclusions regarding the budget data because it was not provided. The one conclusion we can make is that the transparency of the budget availability needs to be improved.

**Funding**

With the information that we have been able to collect up to this point we concluded that, HELP Genesis is a permanent supportive housing facility for veterans and homeless with disabilities and should be funded again. This is a qualitative analysis future quantitative data may become available to allow for a different conclusion. If future information regarding the budget arises and another conclusion is drawn; a possible recommendation would be to align the budget to better suit the needs of the agency, assuming they have not been grossly negligent in their fiscal responsibilities.
From a qualitative lens it appears that their expenses are real and HELP Genesis could make a case to spend the money in a variety of areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Better Documenting and Accounting
  - Record keeping should be improved so that all stakeholders can easily access and understand budget.
  - HELP Genesis needs to find a way to provide verification of disability and/or veteran status to authorized individuals.
  - The 990 form should readily be available for inspection.
- HELP Genesis should be funded again as a permanent supportive housing facility.
  - Turnover in HELP Genesis is minimal and is mainly attributed to Section 8 Housing which is not restrictive.
APPENDIX I - INSTRUMENT I
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Application Instructions:

Answer the following questions and complete the form below. You can tab through the form and fill in the answers to the questions. Save the form as you answer, so that you do not lose data while entering the information.

We will need a copy of the organization’s 990 and supporting documentation for the tenants’ status of veteran or documented disability. Attach the documentation to the back of this application for each veteran and documented disability. Write the room number on the documentation for disability or veteran’s status, and ensure that the individuals name is legible.

The questions in bold do not need to be answered—they will be answered by the group at the end of the evaluation.

1. Is the program operating in accordance to the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding? Is Genesis a true permanent housing program? (Evaluate turn-over)
   1. Of the 75 apartments, how many were filled 6 months after Genesis first opened?
      a. Of those residents, how many are still living at Genesis?
   2. How many total people has Genesis served from its inception to current date (not including spouses, etc, living in apartment with tenant)?
   3. Of those tenants, how many were tenants when Genesis first opened?
      b. How many are still living at Genesis?
   4. What is the average length of stay for residents?
   5. What is the most common reason why residents leave Genesis Apartments?
6. How is the program operating in accordance with the description indicated on the application submitted for COC funding?

II. Is Genesis Apartments only housing the population indicated on their application (i.e. homeless veterans and disabled homeless)?

4. Of the total amount of tenants served, how many are veterans?

5. Of the total amount of tenants served, how many are not veterans but are individuals who are disabled and homeless?

6. Are any tenants served that are not veterans or disabled homeless? Yes
   a. If yes explain why.

III. Are the COC funds being spent in accordance to what was specified on the application?

3. How much money was awarded to Genesis from the COC per year?

4. How are the COC funds being spent? (Exact dollar amount needed)

IV. What rules are the tenants expected to follow?

V. What services are provided for them?

1 Remember, don’t forget the attachments needed.
   Copy of the organizations 990, documentation of disability, and documentation of veteran’s status. Write the room number on the documentation for disability or veteran’s status, and ensure that the tenants name is legible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number Occupied</th>
<th>Name of Occupant</th>
<th>Length of Stay in Months</th>
<th>Veteran</th>
<th>Documentation of Veteran Status</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Documentation of Disability</th>
<th>Reason for Leaving Program</th>
<th>Number of Occupants</th>
<th>Other Occupants Relationship to Tenant</th>
<th>Date Entered Program</th>
<th>Date Left Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DD-214</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td>1/1/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II - INSTUMENT II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Name of Tenants</th>
<th>Question Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A total of 57 individuals were identified as having a 3/17/09 date for leaving the program. Will you clarify whether the following individuals are current residents?</td>
<td>Harold Wolford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santo Carpinteri</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Nelson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfonso Merancio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therman Brodie</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Wilder</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Landry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wesley Stanley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Weideman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Dayton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Morsey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keith West</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Ervin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randy Stotler</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Spriggs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Greider</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Butler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Leach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Carman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll Barber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ghoston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Leary Ankton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Rendell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Kuhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis O’Brien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Verkuilen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Whisler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Nissem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What are the names of Current Residents not listed above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mahoney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathryn DeShields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Crosby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brady Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Hammock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Weidner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hansen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Cleary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bernie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Perry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ferzoco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Spears</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David McCoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorthy Tafoya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Resident Clarence Kirsch in unit 104 was identified N/A in column entitled, Reason for leaving; however his last day in the program was 2/9/09. Please indicate the reason why Mr. Kirsch left the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ronnie Wooley</th>
<th>Paul Whitten</th>
<th>John Cook</th>
<th>Charles Gooden</th>
<th>Huey Gilyard</th>
<th>James Reed</th>
<th>Terry Sproston</th>
<th>Stephen Flood</th>
<th>Arthur Wright</th>
<th>Ernest Collins</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Please provide the reason for the eviction of the following tenants?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Current Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward &amp; Audrey Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymondo Macias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Benner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. It was indicated there was one non-veteran in the facility, what is the tenant's name, unit number and is this individual a current resident?

5a. What is the Tenant's Name?  
Edward & Audrey Smith
5b. What is the Tenant's Unit Number?  
Raymondo Macias
5c. Is the tenant a current resident?  
Yes
If not, what is the reason for leaving?  

6. How much was awarded by the COC each year of operation?  
1

7. Of the amount awarded from the COC, how has the money been allocated each year?
127 Total Occupants 2006-2009
Number of Days in Program & Percentage Occupants

- Number of Occupants 803-862 Days: 16 (13%)
- Number of Occupants 725-797 Days: 16 (13%)
- Number of Occupants 602-693 Days: 7 (5%)
- Number of Occupants 500-582 Days: 11 (9%)
- Number of Occupants 419-497 Days: 10 (8%)
- Number of Occupants 315-376 Days: 12 (9%)
- Number of Occupants 208-284 Days: 19 (15%)
- Number of Occupants 104-189 Days: 14 (11%)
- Number of Occupants 0-96 Days: 22 (17%)
Reason for Move Percentage of 127 Occupants

- Move girlfriend: 1 (1%)
- Abandoned Apt: 2 (1%)
- Evicted: 18 (14%)
- Moved Out of State: 3 (2%)
- N/A: 63 (50%)
- Deceased: 5 (4%)
- Senior Housing: 202 (8%)
- Section 8: 25 (20%)


Can, H. V., & Are, H. Housing vouchers are critical for ending family homelessness.


